ent quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transporting of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Everett Townsend Club, No. 1, Everett, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

465. Also, petition of the Left Liberal Party of Greece, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to imposing the formation of a government of the center and the left in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

466. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the program for Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

467. Also, petition of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

468. Also, petition of Puerto Rican Industrial Soldiers Association, of Guayama, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to compensation for the Puerto Rican industrial soldiers of the First World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

We open our hearts unto Thee, our Father, and pray that Thy spirit may indwell each one of us and give us poise and power. We believe in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to believe what Thou hast said. We trust in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to trust Thee for guidance in the decisions we have to make.

Help us to do our very best this day and be content with today's troubles, so that we shall not borrow the troubles of tomorrow. Save us from the sin of worrying, lest stomach ulcers be the badge of our lack of faith. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 7, 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 a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hopkins, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act 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;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. A act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

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. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate after 3 o'clock p. m. today by reason of public business.

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

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, May 8, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending or that may thereafter be offered, to the pending amendment proposed to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH) on page 54, after line 4, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 8 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota will permit me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time taken for the roll call to be divided as usual between the two sides.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

To whom does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment was explained yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It is substantially the same as the amendment which was adopted by the Senate last year as part of the so-called Case bill, which amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia. The occasion of the amendment was the demand made by the United Mine Workers of America that a tax of 10 cents a ton be levied on all coal mined, and that the tax so levied be paid into a general welfare fund to be administered by the union for practically any purpose the union considered to come within the term "welfare." Of course, the result of such a proceeding, if there is no restriction, is to build up a tremendous fund in the hands of the officers of the labor union, to be distributed for welfare, which they may use indiscriminately. There is no specific provision with respect to it. They may distribute it to members of the union whom they like or they consider proper charity cases, and they may refuse to distribute it to other members whom they do not like.

The demand originally made by Mr. Lewis was so broad that practically the fund became a war chest, if you please, for the union. The money for welfare funds is deducted from the wages of the employees. It is money earned by the employees, and certainly there should be some restriction on the right of those who bargain collectively for the employees of any company, as to how far they can take the money earned by the employees and use it for union purposes without restriction. Obviously the man who is bargaining should have no right to obtain any personal advantage.

The amendment provides first that—

> It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees.

That is, it may be said, in a case of extortion or a case where the union representative is shaking down the employer. Certain exceptions are made.

Then with regard to the check-off, which is a device by which the employer pays into the union treasury, without the consent of the particular employees who have earned the money, a certain percentage agreed to in the collective-bargaining agreement contract, the amendment provides that it is proper to make such an agreement with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization, provided that the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which shall not be irrevocable for a period of more than 1 year, or beyond the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner.

So far as the testimony shows that is the usual form of check-off. Under it the employee himself signs a slip or assignment authorizing the check-off. If he once signs such an assignment under the collective-bargaining agreement, it may continue indefinitely until revoked, and it may be irrevocable during the life of the particular contract, or for a period of 12 months. That, I think, is substantially in accord with nine-tenths of all check-off agreements, and simply prohibits a check-off made without any consent whatever by the employees.

Provision No. (5) at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the amendment deals with the question of welfare fund. It provides that the payments must be made, in the first place, as found in line 25 on page 2, "to a trust fund established by such representative"—that is by the union—"for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents, or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents."

In other words, this must be a trust fund. It cannot be the property of the union without a definite statement that it is in trust for the employees, who, after all, have earned the money.

In the second place, "such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income, or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance."

I think that covers all the welfare purposes which are contained in any of the existing welfare funds now established in a certain number of industries.

Then there is the provision under (B) that—

> The detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer.

So that the purpose of the provision is that the welfare fund shall be a perfectly definite fund, that its purposes shall be stated so that each employee can know what he is entitled to, can go to court and enforce his rights in the fund, and that it shall not be, therefore, in the sole discretion of the union or the union leaders and usable for any purpose which they may think is to the advantage of the union or the employee.

Mr. President, it seems obvious that if these funds grow rapidly, as they are growing—which is perfectly proper—they should be regulated by the Federal Government. They should be in definite terms. They should not be subject to the arbitrary discretion of the union leaders, the very ones who are making the agreements and who are making the demands for the particular funds, whether the employees want them or not.

We are saying to the employee, "You have earned $100 this month, but all you get is $95. You must put $5 into the fund." That is at the behest of the union leaders. The employee has nothing to say about it. Certainly he is entitled to have us say that the fund shall be definite, that his rights shall be determined by law, and that he shall be able to demand them.

What was actually done by the Government when it agreed with Mr. Lewis? This is the agreement with respect to the United Mine Workers' fund:

> There is hereby provided a health and welfare program in broad outline—and it is recognized that many important details remain to be filled in—such program to consist of three parts, as follows:
>
> (a) A welfare and retirement fund: A welfare and retirement fund is hereby created and there shall be paid into said fund by the operating managers 5 cents per ton on each ton of coal produced for use or for sale. This fund shall be managed by three trustees, one appointed by the Coal Mines Administrator, one appointed by the president of the United Mine Workers, and the third chosen by the other two.

In this case the Government is the employer.

> The fund shall be used for making payments to miners, and their dependents and survivors, with respect to (1) wage loss not otherwise compensated at all or adequately under the provisions of Federal or State law and resulting from sickness (temporary disability), permanent disability, death, or retirement, and (2) other related welfare purposes, as determined by the trustees. Subject to the stated purposes of the fund, the

trustees shall have full authority with respect to questions of coverage and eligibility, priorities among classes of benefits, methods of providing or arranging for provision of benefits, and all related matters.

This represents money earned by the employees, in the form of a tax of 5 cents a ton, which is turned into a fund, and two private persons, without restraint, have almost unlimited authority to determine how the money shall be spent. Whether the words "other related welfare purposes" make it unnecessary to furnish a definite statement, as required by this amendment, is a question. It is left entirely in the choice of two men, who do not have particularly at heart the interests of the public, to determine the terms under which the money shall be distributed.

The purpose of the amendment is to require that the fund shall be established in definite, detailed form, in the form of a trust fund, with respect to which the employees can determine their rights and can insist upon them.

Mr. Lewis' original demand was that the fund be solely in the administration of the union. He finally agreed to a joint administration. Unless we make such a provision there will be no requirement for a joint administration. This amendment provides that the employees and employers must be equally represented in the administration of the fund, together with such neutral persons as they may agree upon. In the event of a deadlock the agreement shall be submitted to an impartial umpire.

The purpose is to prevent the abuse of welfare funds. We have provided for a general study of welfare funds of this nature. There are a number of them in existence. I have before me a list of such funds. The amendment would not substantially affect any of those funds, except that with respect to some of them the appointment of an employer representative might be required, in order that there might be joint administration instead of single administration. Otherwise most of the existing funds already comply with this provision. The tendency at present is illustrated by the demand of the United Mine Workers and other demands. This is the demand made by the painters in Washington:

The parties to this agreement agree to set up a trust fund, to be known as the Painters' Insurance Fund of Washington, D. C., and Vicinity. The purpose of this fund is to provide life insurance, sick benefits, hospitalization, accident, surgical, and dismemberment benefits for all journeymen and apprentices of local unions 368, 890, and 797.

There are no specific terms. No one can tell what the fund may finally be used for. Painters are notorious drifters. They have something deducted from their wages, and then they drift on to some other city, where they may find no fund, and lose the money they have already contributed. The tendency is to demand a welfare fund as much in the power of the union as possible. Certainly unless we impose some restrictions we shall find that the welfare fund will become merely a war chest for the particular union, and that the employees for whose benefit it is supposed to be established, for certain definite welfare purposes, will have no legal rights and will not receive the kind of benefits to which they are entitled after such deductions from their wages.

As to the question of interest, it is questionable how far we should go in the matter of private welfare funds. We have a general social security system. We have a separate fund for the railroad employees. There is a number of other special funds. I believe that the Finance Committee should study the whole problem of social security and welfare funds. Very likely there should be further restrictions. There should be a requirement that such funds fit into and supplement the ordinary social security system. The subject calls for long and involved study.

This amendment is, in effect, a provision to prevent the abuse of the right to establish such funds by collective bargaining, pending further study of the whole problem. Otherwise I think we shall find that the welfare fund will become a racket. In many unions it is very easy for it to become a racket. It becomes, in effect, a tax. In Mr. Petrillo's union there is a tax on records. In the United Mine Workers' Union there is a tax on coal. Unless there are some restrictions, if such an agreement is forced upon an employer, in effect we make the officials of the union who collect the tax Government agents for collecting and distributing the tax. Under the proposed agreement originally demanded by Mr. Lewis he could distribute the fund for the benefit of schools, or he could operate anything he wished to operate in the nature of local government. The whole thing would become a great weapon of power, as it was in the case of Mr. Petrillo, to dominate the union, to please the members whom he wanted to please, and punish members whom he did not wish to please, or who refused to go along with the policy of the union.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that I have favored the idea of welfare funds. There is always involved the question of administration, and that is the question which gives us trouble. It seems to me that a welfare fund of this kind, which becomes part of a contract between employer and employees, should be administered by a governmental agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the pending amendment would place the fund under joint administration of employer and employees. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator believe that a better method would be to have it administered by a governmental agency?

Mr. TAFT. I think a complete study of the question ought to be made and that in the end there ought to be some governmental regulation of the character of the fund. This is, in a way, a stopgap provision until a further study can be made, in order that abuses may not arise.

There is a health benefit pamphlet issued by the United States Department of Labor which sets out a very considerable number, a dozen or so, of these funds, created by collective bargaining agreements, none of which are administered by the Government. It would require, I think, a pretty complete tearing to pieces of those funds if we tried to have every one of them established now or hereafter administered by the Government. In most cases they are jointly administered. In three important cases, I think, they are administered by the unions. I think that if we went further than this amendment and required Government administration it would cause such a complete upsetting of so many funds that I should hesitate to have it done until we have more complete knowledge. What we have to do ultimately, it seems to me, is to integrate these funds with the social security system in some way. Almost everyone has social security. On top of that we provide a particular industry with additional funds. Possibly the administration of such funds will ultimately be in the hands of the Government. In the meantime, for stopgap purposes I think joint administration should require that there be a trust fund, with a specific agreement as to its purpose—so much to provide health benefits, so much for this kind of hospital service, so much for this kind of insurance.

Incidentally, already, in addition to these funds, in many cases the employer furnishes group-insurance policies. If Government administration were required, the Government would be put into nearly every company, because nearly every company has something that falls within this general classification. So I think we had better not go further than this amendment does. I very strongly believe that it will prevent abuses. Funds can be set up, but after they are established they must cover definite services which are recognized as proper services for welfare funds.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the Senate agreed to a similar amendment last year and there was no substantial criticism of it, so far as I know, before the committee, and that the practice is a growing practice which is certainly liable to serious abuse, we ought to make some provision in this bill to take care of the matter.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator has made clear the answer to the question I wanted to ask. I have been asked by many people whether this amendment would interfere with the existing set-up of welfare funds, and I have answered them in the terms of the amendment and have told them that it would not. I should like to be sure on that point.

Mr. TAFT. I have read the pamphlets on the subject, and, so far as I know,

the amendment does not interfere with funds which are in existence, except in three instances in which the funds are administered solely by the union which must make some amendment after July 1948, with regard to joint administration, involving the appointment of a representative of the employer to participate in the administration.

Mr. SMITH. Is that the only respect?

Mr. TAFT. That is the only respect in which existing welfare funds are affected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I take the same position on this amendment at this time as I took in committee. Recognizing again in this instance the validity of the criticism of the conditions which have obtained in some instances in connection with welfare funds, as outlined by the Senator from Ohio, nevertheless, since a great deal apparently is contingent upon the establishment of welfare funds, I feel that a certain amount of delay by Congress is advisable before final action is taken, as the action about to be taken will be final, except for what may be done in conference. I recognize some violations of what we consider to be proper practices. I simply want to point out in that connection that the welfare-fund program has grown very materially in recent years. I have a table here which shows that in 1945 approximately 600,000 workers in this country presumably were covered for benefits under that type of program. Early this year there are indications that 1,250,000 are covered. The system is growing very rapidly. While we may believe we have a record of all welfare funds, I doubt very seriously whether there is such a record. I have not been able to obtain a complete record. I think that is something that needs thorough exploration.

There is one thing I want to point out in connection with the matter of welfare funds, and that is that it has been a practice in the United States for the last few years to encourage the establishment of this type of fund. This is the one thing which exists as a result of joint operations between management and labor in which labor itself—the employees—is overwhelmingly in accord.

There was a survey made not long ago which is reported in the January 1947 issue of Factory Management magazine. In the whole field of the relationship between management and labor on the question of welfare funds, or anything of that type, at least three-fourths of the employees who expressed an opinion favor such funds. That is one matter in labor relations on which the great bulk of the employees are overwhelmingly in accord. Undoubtedly it comes about because in some instances insufficient protection is guaranteed them by management, and in other instances by government. As a result of that condition which has arisen there has been a constant effort to institute more and more of this kind of protection. It has come to be a very important feature in the relationship between management and labor. It has had a great deal to do with improvement in management-labor relations.

Meritorious though the purpose of this proposal may be—and I do not question its purpose for one moment—I think it is very questionable in this connection, as it was in connection with the matter which was before us yesterday, whether we should undertake to proceed at this particular time in the way in which it is proposed in the present amendment.

I want to point out that one of the specific functions, one of the specific mandates which have been given or will be given to the joint congressional committee to be created under the bill, if it should be enacted, is to go into the welfare-fund problem, to explore the whole field, to ascertain the kind and type of fund that should exist, and to determine what kind of restrictive legal measures, if necessary, finally should be taken. Perhaps the measure proposed here may be the proper one. I happened to observe at the hearings held last winter that there was serious objection on the part of some very large employers to having any part in the administration of welfare funds. That is understandable. They feel that such funds are for the benefit of the employees; their relationship is a happy one, and they would rather leave it that way. It seems to me that these matters should be explored far more thoroughly than they have been up to the present time.

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

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out that the welfare fund which the Government has set up with John L. Lewis already contains more than $10,000,000. These funds are growing by leaps and bounds. It seems to me that they must be regulated or they will get beyond all control, and we will encounter great difficulty when we finally come to act on them.

Mr. IVES. In that connection let me point out that the UMW is an organization with a membership of 400,000 and it is not surprising that it has a welfare fund of that size.

Nor do I want it understood in any way, shape, or manner that I approve necessarily of the procedures which were followed prior to the establishment of the Government control which now exists in that connection.

The fact remains that the system of welfare funds is not going to produce anything of an ultimately serious nature in the United States if we wait until the next session of the Congress, when we should know a great deal more about it and when we should be able to act far more intelligently.

In connection with the pending amendment, there are several matters which I think have not been discussed as thoroughly as they might have been; in fact, I think they have not even been pointed out, and no one has debated them thus far.

In the first place, I should like to point to subsection (b), on page 2. I wish to inquire whether that could be construed in any way as affecting Christmas presents or birthday presents or anything of that type. The language is rather broad, and it appears to me to be vague Certainly anything of a legitimate character should not be limited by such a provision.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield, but I should like to suggest that I am speaking under a time limit, according to the time schedule.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand, and I shall be brief. I simply wish to state that I wonder whether it can be correctly assumed that the application of this provision is to be limited to representatives of unions and to contributions made to representatives of unions. Could it not be regarded as affecting contributions made to representatives of unorganized groups, and affecting, for instance, contributions provided by management for picnics or in aid of baseball teams which the employees often have, and other contributions of that character. Would not all such contributions be forbidden under the terms of this provision?

Mr. IVES. Presumably that is correct, and I think it is very dangerous to include in the bill a provision of this character, as to which there may be serious question or doubt.

In subsection (c), in line 19, there is a provision in connection with the check-off. I have no quarrel with the idea of having the check-off approved by the individual employee, if that is desirable. I do not think it is necessary, however, in view of the restrictions contained in the bill in regard to the closed shop and the union shop, to provide additional restrictions. I am sure, moreover, that many employers will not be particularly pleased with that feature of the provision as here presented, which requires each employee, at least once a year, to specify in writing that he wants the check-off continued. This would add to the bedevilment of employers, who already are overburdened by paper work, by the number of reports, and other documents they have to prepare and submit, and the numerous procedures to which they are subjected. I think that possibility should be taken into consideration in connection with this proposal.

Again, Mr. President, I think that perhaps the penalty provided in this provision is somewhat unrealistic. Presumably the penalty applies to a violation of every portion of the proposed new section 302. I do not know whether for failure to do some of the things I have indicated, persons should be subjected to a penalty of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year. It seems to me such penalties are altogether excessive for violation of some of the provisions contained in this measure; and such a condition in itself could make the entire measure unworkable.

On the whole, Mr. President, I feel that this is an extremely ill-considered proposal, and that there should be further delay before we act on it. Therefore I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes of my time to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to compel joint administration by the union and the employer of any health and welfare fund voluntarily established between the parties for the benefit of the employees. The effect of the amendment would be to strike a crippling blow at numerous welfare plans and funds which have existed and operated successfully for many years. Estimates have been made, ranging up to 1,300,000 as the number of workers now covered by such plans. A substantial percentage of those funds is administered exclusively by the unions, with the blessings of the employer. As a matter of fact, there are many employers who, having agreed to the establishment of such funds as the result of free and voluntary collective bargaining, would object strenuously to any measure compelling them to join in the administration of the funds. For them, it would mean additional record keeping, resulting in increased costs, and requiring them to devote a part of their time and energy to the supervision of activities which are not of direct concern to them. Time and energy so lost could be better applied directly to increasing production, with a consequent beneficial effect to the entire economy.

For many months I have been seeking legislation to establish a national health program. On November 19, 1945, the President of the United States in his message to the Congress strongly urged the adoption of such a program. Every person recognizes that our most precious national possession is a healthy, strong, and efficient population. But practically all students of the problem of conserving our human resources are equally agreed that we have been woefully negligent in our failure to set up even a rudimentary program for conserving those resources. The huge numbers of our young men rejected for service in the armed forces during the war was a shocking demonstration of our inadequacy, in the light of our existing and potential wealth, in this respect.

I should like to emphasize that the pending amendment constitutes a direct threat to another of our most precious heritages. The right of liberty to contract has always been regarded by us as an essential condition to the functioning of a free society. Why should we interfere with this right, when the subject of the contract is a health and welfare fund hurting no one and benefiting many? If this amendment is adopted, we shall have established a principle whereby the Government will be authorized to dictate any or all the terms of collective-bargaining agreements. Wages, hours, working conditions, and all the thousands of other aspects of the industrial relationship would then become the direct concern of the State, which, having established the precedent, would have the power to dictate the terms to the parties to the agreement. Compulsory arbitration, which my distinguished colleagues oppose because they recognize its dangerous consequences for our free society, would have been achieved indirectly, and I am sure without intention on their part.

This amendment would be a cruel provision to place in this bill, inasmuch as it is intended to strait-jacket union attempts to provide decent minimum safety and health standards for American workers and to provide some protection for the widows and children of the workers who are killed in industrial accidents.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement containing facts taken from the hearings on the Centralia disaster, before the Senate Committee on Public Lands on Thursday, April 17, 1947.

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

FACTS TAKEN FROM THE HEARINGS ON THE CENTRALIA DISASTER BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

Our country is today the only country producing coal for export. We are the only country that has a surplus. We will not have a surplus long unless we treat our mine workers better, unless we decide that we will not kill so many of them every day and every month and wound them and use them up and throw them on the scrap heap. In our country they are not being replaced.

Our young men are not going into the mines as a vocation. They do not have to any more. Child labor has been eliminated from the mines. Young men may not enter the mines underground in most States until they are 18 years of age, both by contract with the United Mine Workers and by the various State regulations. That means that many of them, most of them, receive an education equivalent to a high-school education. When they reach the age, with that background of education, they decide, and their family helps them decide, that they will not take up their father's vocation. The influence of their mothers, who are familiar with the horrors of the mines, operates to create a psychological point of view in the young man's mind so that he does not take up his father's vocation.

It is almost impossible to create an efficient miner by taking an adult person and putting him into a mine. They must be conditioned mentally to voluntarily assume the vocation of a mine worker, and they are not easily so conditioned when they reach a mature age. They cannot adapt themselves. They do not have the flexibility of physical structure that is required. They do not have all the nervous reactions that must operate mechanically so that they can protect themselves in the mines as much as may be possible. They constantly are oppressed with the horror of the mine. They work in the mines reluctantly, and they go elsewhere when they can.

From 1910 to 1945, inclusive, 66,140 men were killed outright. That is an average of 1,889 fatalities a year. Two thousand one hundred and thirty-five were permanently totally disabled annually. Two thousand and sixty-one were permanently partially disabled annually, with an average loss of 684 workdays each. There were 70,336 dead and disfigured bodies.

This is more men than are now employed in the mining States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, all of which are mining States of magnitude.

These 66,140 men left approximately 211,648 widows and orphans.

Sixty-five thousand men each year injured lost an average of 40 days each. That is in a 35-year period. That average runs through a 35-year period from 1910 to 1945.

In 1942 we had 462,000 men employed in our bituminous mining industry. We killed 1,245 of them that year, an average of 103 fatalities per month in that calendar year.

In 1943 we had 416,000 men employed, or 46,000 less than the preceding year. We still killed 1,225, which is only 20 men less than the preceding year, with 46,000 less employed.

That is an average of 102 fatalities per calendar month.

In 1944 we had 393,000 men employed in the bituminous industry, which is 23,000 less than the year before, the preceding year.

In 1944 we had 93 fatalities per calendar month. In 1945 we had a total of 383,000 men employed in the bituminous coal industry, which was 10,000 less than in 1944. There were 936 killed, which is an average of 78 per month. There is a shrinkage in 4 years of 79,000 men in the total number of men available for the operation of the industry.

From June 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947, this being 10 months that the Government has operated the mines, 841 were killed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, occupational hazards are a justified charge against the costs of production, and should be insured against, at least in part, by employer contributions.

Unless the American people want their coal smeared with the blood of miners, unless they have lost all regard for human values in our great industrial machine, they will reject this provision.

Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a very able article that was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1903. It is an article discussing the need of public health and welfare funds in the absence of broad national medical-care program such as proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

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

IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

(Extension of remarks of Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, of Rhode Island, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947)

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the April issue of the Kiplinger magazine entitled "Health Means Plans and Dollars."

This appears to me to be a most enlightening article which I believe should be available to those interested in improving the health of the people of our country.

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

"HEALTH MEANS PLANS AND DOLLARS—WE MUST FIND A WAY TO MEET OUR CHALLENGING NATIONAL MEDICAL PROBLEM

"United States medicine, which has devised brilliant treatments for many of our ills, is having a hard time prescribing for its most acute problem: how to make medical services available for all who need them.

"There is wide agreement on the diagnosis: our medical facilities are badly organized and too expensive for most people. There is no general agreement on the right treatment, despite the universal interest in working out some solution. We are all potential consumers of medical services, and we are all affected by the health of our community.

And our overburdened doctors need relief from a system under which they can't take care of all the sick, even with charity treatments.

"Although the Nation's health cannot be put on a dollars-and-cents basis, employers should be concerned with the terrific inroads, largely preventable, which illness makes on production. Before the war between four and five hundred million workdays were lost annually from sickness—about 40 times the number lost through strikes. The loss of consumption power may be even greater.

"Here is what's wrong in the judgment of the American Medical Association, individual doctors, lay experts and Government officials:

"The traditional fee system of payment for medical services is too costly. Most people can afford emergency pills and treatment, but not preventive medicine or prolonged, catastrophic illness. Some estimates say about 20 percent of the population can't pay even for minimum medical needs.

"There are not enough doctors, especially in rural regions, slums, and small communities. Many doctors are underpaid. Few have time to keep up with developments.

"Hospitals and other facilities are too few, poorly distributed, often antiquated.

"Medical research is haphazard. We spend a hundred dollars for research on infantile paralysis, which afflicts relatively few, for every 25 cents spent on mental disease, which afflicts millions and fills more than half the Nation's hospital beds.

"Many people, particularly if they have no trouble meeting their own medical bills and deal exclusively with comfortably established city physicians, find it hard to accept so sweeping a diagnosis. But the clinical facts are disturbing.

"According to the AMA, in 1940, most individuals and families with incomes under $3,000 needed help in meeting medical bills. That amounted to well over 75 percent of the population. People who borrow from small-loan companies need the money most often to pay medical bills.

"For many an ailing individual the high cost of sickness poses the question of how much medical attention he can do without, and for how long. The grim consequences of such enforced self-denial showed up in prewar medical statistics, which brutally dispose of the notion that the United States is the healthiest Nation on earth.

"This country had higher infant death rates than seven other countries; higher cancer, heart, nervous, and mental disease rates. The average life expectancy at birth was higher in 4 countries; at 20 years it was higher in 8 countries; at age 40 in 11; and at age 60 in 12. The subsequent revelation that about 40 percent of young Americans were unfit for military service for medical reasons has hushed our big talk about national health standards.

"It's not primarily the doctor's fault that protracted illness and preventive medicine are so expensive, although it is a fact that organized medicine, through the American Medical Association, has demonstrated a minimum of social awareness in facing the mounting medical crisis.

"But the individual practitioner usually is too busy with his never-ending responsibilities to think about broader medical issues. He carries an appalling load. In most cases the family doctor has fully earned the respect and affection which millions of Americans have for him. He has a habit of quietly scaling down bills for needy patients, and carrying a load of charity cases without talking about it.

"So many doctors have concentrated in the cities that demands on country and small-town doctors are proportionately higher. These small-community doctors are often the ones with poorest facilities, largest practices, and lowest incomes.

"The main effort to bridge the economic gap between patient and doctor has been through voluntary group-insurance plans as a substitute for the fee system of payment. During the last two decades, many Americans have got partial coverage against sickness through one of these plans.

"But they have three fatal defects: They don't offer adequate coverage, they have proved too expensive for lower-income groups, and they don't include enough people.

"Like most commercial health-insurance policies, group-insurance plans tend to restrict services and to neglect thorough treatment. Some group plans provide only hospitalization for limited periods, but over half our medical bills are for treatment given outside of hospitals. Less than 5.4 percent of the population has insurance for physicians' services, and about 2.5 percent have complete home, office, and hospital coverage. Only one American out of four has any kind of health insurance at all.

"Many of the people who have had experience administering group-health plans say that these are only a necessary stopgap in the absence of a national-health plan.

"There are signs that the tide is setting in the direction of such a national program as a logical extension of social security. Opinion polls show a majority in favor of pay-roll deductions to provide national-health insurance. And in the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats joined to provide Federal funds for the construction of more hospitals and clinics, and for treatment and research in mental health and other fields.

"Congress hasn't acted on the problem of providing medical services for those who can't afford them. But it may do so during the present session. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, has revised his health bill, and reintroduced it, with the support of the AMA. Given the Senator's influence and the Republican desire to win votes from those who would benefit by the measure's provisions, chances for his bill look pretty good. Its main provisions:

"Coordination of civilian Federal health functions in a new Federal Health Agency.

"Appropriation of $200,000,000 yearly to assist States in providing medical care and hospital services for individuals and families unable to pay for them.

"Cash contributions by States at least equal to the sum advanced from the Federal Treasury.

"Approval of State programs by the Surgeon General, with appeal to a national health council in event of disagreement.

"Enactment of the bill, according to its proponents, would probably make some basic medical services available to the poorest 20 to 25 percent of the population; opponents say only 10 percent.

"Critics of the bill object strongly to a provision that applicants would have to prove their inability to pay. Too many States require a means test as proof of this inability to pay. This is a throw-back from the concept of social security to that of public charity. It seems needlessly humiliating, say the critics, that sick people should have either to exhaust their savings or stigmatize themselves as paupers, to obtain emergency medical care.

"The Taft bill also minimizes basic public interest in good health for everyone. We do not maintain schools only for those who are too poor to go to private schools, nor libraries for those who are too poor to buy books. Why offer medical care to the indigent, and exclude middle-income families for whom, also, medical services are too expensive?

"Another criticism is that the Taft bill, by providing only emergency relief, forestalls any attempt to combat disease on a Nationwide scale. Some doctors think tuberculosis could be wiped out in the United States within a generation, syphilis within a shorter time. But this could be done only through a Nation-wide campaign, with services readily available to everybody.

"One major political force interested in going beyond the provisions of the Taft bill is United States labor. With hopes of big wage boosts collapsing, union negotiators are now going down the line for fuller health coverage as well as cash benefits paid for by employers. Management will be hard put to refuse this demand altogether.

"In the next few years an estimated 8,000,000 workers are likely to get new or increased health protection as a result.

"Senator TAFT's prescription, limited coverage for bottom-income groups, differs, of course, from the unions' proposal—full coverage for all union labor. But by one of the ironies of politics, both efforts may have the same long-run effect.

"Once you provide basic medical care for 35,000,000 citizens under the Taft bill and for additional millions of industrial workers under union contracts, the objection to going the whole hog diminishes. The cost would be much cheaper if it were spread over the whole population. And coverage would be more complete. The financial and administrative burden of health and welfare clauses would be taken off private enterprises and placed on official agencies.

"One proposal for such a program has been embodied in the administration-sponsored Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It is expected to be financed by a 3-percent pay-roll levy divided between employees and employers, plus a general appropriation for research and training.

"Payments from this fund would be entrusted for disbursement to the Surgeon General, who would also set standards. But day-to-day administration would be left to States, local communities, and existing medical groups. Doctors would continue, if they preferred, to practice on the present fee system, with payments made to them out of the insurance fund. Doctors who wished to practice on a full or partial salary basis could do so. Those who wished to remain completely outside the system would be free to do so.

"Patients could go to any general practitioner in the system. The doctor also would be free to accept or reject patients.

"It's worth noting that the British Medical Association once fought a national health system based on compulsory health insurance just as stubbornly as the AMA does now. After a conservative government set one up anyway, the British Medical Association swung to support. One reason—doctors' incomes went up.

"Like a number of distinguished medical men, some United States business leaders have come to regard a national-health program as a desirable extension of our present social-security laws. Executives like Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., Gerard Swope, president of General Electric, and David Sarnoff, of RCA, feel this way.

"Total cost of a national-health program has been set at $4,000,000,000 yearly. That's about what we pay now, in doctors' bills, taxation for public-health service, etc., for such medical care as we get. Socially and economically, it would seem sensible to organize medical services for faster progress toward the goal of medical science, which is not just care in sickness, but positive health for the individual and for the entire community."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take the remainder of the time myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reinforce the comments made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and invite attention to one or two additional points.

The amendment provides — under penalty, for violation, of imprisonment of not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than $10,000, and the repeal of the protection of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act—that health and welfare funds shall be set up, not in the manner in which the employer, the employees and their representatives may find most suitable to their local needs, but as directed by the Congress of the United States. They must be held in trust, and their purposes are to be limited to payment of medical and hospital care, pensions, sickness, disability, and accident insurance. There must be a written agreement between the employer and the employees, and employees and employers must be equally represented in the administration of the fund, and in the event of disagreement between them, machinery is provided for the settling of such disputes. In other words, it requires employer participation in the funds and in the administration of the funds. The best information I have been able to obtain is to the effect that there are now some million and a quarter employees covered by some form of health or welfare plan.

For many years the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in New York has sought to establish for its members vacation funds. It is notable that an effort to establish such a fund would, under the amendment, subject the leaders of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union to spend 1 year in jail or pay a $10,000 fine or both. I am not, for my own part, convinced that the garment workers of the city of New York are less in need of vacations than other persons in our life; indeed, I can go further and say that it seems to me affirmatively desirable that not only garment workers, but all workers, should have reasonable vacations provided for them. After many years of striving to gain this objective the garment workers now have a vacation plan to which the employers contribute and which is administered by the union, the employers not participating. This plan would be illegal under the amendment here proposed. I should be grateful if some Senator would explain to me why the effort to obtain what seems to me to be a thoroughly desirable objective, concerning which there has not been the slightest objection from the employers, the union, or the employees, should suddenly become a crime.

As a member of the committee I will state that no adequate exploration of this problem has been made either by the committee or, so far as I am aware, by anyone. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, it is a problem which needs exploration and study, but certainly not the passage of legislation at this time.

These plans operate in an infinite variety of ways. In the normal case they are administered jointly by the employer and union representatives. But there are certainly many cases where particular funds are administered solely by the trade unions. There has been no adequate exploration of the extent to which this problem is already covered under existing State law. I assume that the thought of the proponents of the measure is that the placing of large amounts of money in funds of this kind in the hands of trade-union officials may lead to improper use of such moneys, or their diversion to purposes other than those specified when the funds are established. Yet it would seem to me, as a lawyer, that if such funds are established the trade-union officials who administer them thereby become trustees, subject to all of the common law and State safeguards against misuse of funds by trustees. In other words, I think we should look to the laws already on the books so far as concerns protecting employees from the misuse of such funds by officers who violate their trust.

In all States the standards imposed on trustees are extremely high, any misuse of trust funds is universally subject to criminal penalties under State law, and there has been no demonstration that such laws are inadequate to handle the problem which the proponents of the measure profess exists. In any event, I suggest that it is frivolous for us to legislate on a matter of such importance to the working men and women of the country without having before us as a minimum the following information:

First. A detailed knowledge of the number and form of such plans, the number of employees covered by them, the purposes for which they are sought, and the methods by which they are operating, and then, having that knowledge, I think we are under an obligation to study them. A study even of the data which is available has not been made to date.

Second. The extent to which such funds are now subject to supervision of State authorities or subject to control under State laws.

Third. The informed opinion of industries in which such funds have been established concerning their modes of operations, the reaction of employees to them, and observations as to the way in which they have operated in the past.

For my own part, it seems to me that we should do everything in our power to encourage the voluntary establishment of such plans, rather than take any steps to discourage them. To the extent that industrial evils or abuses can be met by such funds, the State and Federal Governments will be relieved of the necessity of themselves making appropriate provisions for them.

When I say we ought to encourage the establishment of such funds, Mr. President, I speak as a critic of certain tendencies in American unions to which I have adverted on many previous occasions, namely, they should not become merely dues-collecting organizations, rather they should render service to their members, not only collective-bargaining service, but they should render the type of service which the objectives of most of these welfare funds seek to accomplish.

I think that what is attempted by way of an amendment such as the one now pending is the prevention of unions from being as effective by way of service to their members as they should be if they are to carry out what I consider to be the great objectives of the trade union movement. Many people do not want unions to obtain such objectives because they know that such programs will strengthen unions.

I feel confident that trade unions and employers working together are more competent to know the evils, and to provide adequately for their correction, than are the State or Federal Governments, yet I am equally confident that if industrial hazards or uncertainties are not handled by the principals, the Government will be called upon to step in and handle them for the members.

We cannot know the peculiar hazards of each industry when we sit here and vote upon such legislative proposals as the one before us. For example, silicosis is a disease peculiar to the mining industry, and I think the mining industry should grapple with the problem of welfare funds which may be necessary in order to check the spread of that deadly disease. Airline pilots have their own perils, in regard to which they may desire to negotiate, and I think properly, as to welfare funds. Phosphorous poisoning is one of the disease problems of the match industry, and I think it quite proper that we should encourage the present trend in the development of welfare funds, to provide service to the employees and the members of the unions in regard to such problems as that. Instead of looking to legislation to take care of such problems, it seems to me that we should in the first instance encourage private parties to handle the problems themselves.

We hear much criticism of the tendency toward having government solve all problems which may arise to confront the people, yet, in the face of the extremely healthy trend evident in the trade-union movement in the direction of performing services for the welfare of union members, we have legislative proposals made which would discourage that type of participation in a private enterprise system.

In closing, I wish to call attention to some of the things shown in the record of the hearings in regard to this worker welfare problem. For example, the witness, Harvey W. Brown, as appears at pages 1616 and 1617 of the record, points out that the limitation in the use of funds that is proposed does not include sickness; and Dubinsky, at page 1341, points out that it does not include unemployment. Why should they not be included? To the extent that they may be included it appears that they are narrowly circumscribed.

I desire to comment on the compulsory features of the amendment, so far as employers are concerned, because here again it will be found, as we found in the case of the industry-wide bargaining problem, that industry is far from being united in regard to what should be done concerning welfare funds.

There are a great many employers who do not want to have any participation in welfare funds; they certainly do not want to be required, by the compulsion of law, to take part in welfare funds; and yet, unless they do take part, by compulsion of law, under the pending amendment, such funds cannot be set up. I see no more reason in this instance

for imposing compulsion on employers than for imposing compulsion on unions in regard to group-insurance funds.

Employers in the garment industry and, for that matter, generally have expressed no interest in administering this fund. So says Dubinsky, testifying in regard to employers in the garment industry.

Where employers were given equal participation, many of them voluntarily asked to be relieved of it. That is the testimony of Potofsky, and also the testimony of the witness, Mr. Raymond H. Reiss, as found on pages 2320 and 2321 of the record.

It was pointed out by Dubinsky, in an argument which I think is very sound, that the cry for equal participation is more often an expression of opposition to the contribution itself. On pages 2203 and 1344 of the record will be found testimony bearing out that statement.

Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly upon statements made at the committee hearings by the distinguished chairman himself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], when the matter of welfare funds was under discussion. On page 1582 of the hearings, in a colloquy with Mr. Potofsky, the chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you could provide the joint management if you had to.

Mr. POTOFSKY. We have done it at the request of the employers. The employers who had other interests besides clothing did not want to be burdened with the responsibility of administration. We like their advice and cooperation. They did not want to be involved in it in the event some member of the union had a complaint and went to court.

The CHAIRMAN. I never did think the joint management proposal was very important. Of course, what we were trying to reach at the time this was set up was the demand made by the mine workers' union that a percentage be turned over to them for welfare with no specifications and no description of what it was to be used for. In fact, it could be used for almost any governmental purpose. It seemed to be necessary to prevent the extension of that sort of fund. Of course, in your case you would comply with those provisions that require the rights of the members be specified in the trust agreement. There is nothing in our law that interferes with you as far as that is concerned.

Mr. POTOFSKY. You would make honest businessmen and honest union officers subjected to prison and fines for no reason whatsoever. Here we have arrived at a plan and your law would subject——

The CHAIRMAN. I am assuming that we shall change the joint-management feature. What about the rest of it?

But the joint-management feature has not been changed in the amendment, Mr. President. I submit that the joint-management feature is opposed by a great many employers for just such reasons as I have set forth in the argument this morning.

There are basic objections to the amendment which I should like to summarize. First, I desire to comment upon employer interest in the fund. Is not the fund, Mr. President, really for the employees? Should not the employees, therefore, have the right to administer it? If in free collective bargaining with an employer they are able to obtain by negotiations which are entirely satisfactory to him the creation of such a fund, why should we, by law, say to the employer, "We compel you to be a participant in the administration of the fund"? I ask, Mr. President, has there been any convincing proof that the many union-administered funds have been badly administered? There have been many assertions about it in this debate; but, as a lawyer, I draw the distinction between assertion and proof. I say that one will look in vain in the record for any substantial proof indicating that the funds, generally speaking, are so badly administered as to justify a need at this time for the adoption of this particular amendment. Let us first get the proof, let us first get the evidence we need, before we adopt such an amendment as this.

Next, I wish to comment on the effect of the amendment upon collective bargaining. The Members of Congress sitting in the Capitol cannot possibly see all the problems affecting all the workers in every industry. It may be that harmony is really threatened in an industry, because of inadequate health or welfare provisions. If that is what has produced the great unrest in a certain industry; if that is what is causing a great many workers to leave one industry and seek employment in some other industry; if that is what is causing many "quickie" strikes—as I think will be found to be the case in certain industries in which at least allegations are made that the employer's orders are detrimental to the health and safety of the workers, and so, therefore, they do not intend to carry them out until the health and safety problem can be solved—I say the approach should not preclude handling the matter by free collective bargaining. That would be a much better approach than to say to the employer that he must handle this particular problem of collective bargaining in this very limited way, as provided for in the amendment.

I do not think problems such as this should be solved by congressional fiat.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think tha once again the Senate of the United States is being called upon to vote for an amendment which has not been carefully thought through, insofar as presenting the objective data that are needed to support it and to enable Senators to render a valid judgment. So I agree with the Senator from New York that this certainly is a matter that should be postponed, so far as the Congress is concerned, until further study can be given to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the sponsors of the amendment have never presented it as a final solution of the problem of welfare funds. It has been insisted that there has been a tremendous growth of such funds within the last few years. I cite the February issue of the Monthly Labor Review of the Department of Labor, which states that, whereas in 1945 only 600,000 workers were covered by such funds, in early 1947 approximately 1,250,000 were covered.

In speeches to their respective conventions last fall, both President Green of the A. F. of L. and President Murray of the CIO stated that the obtaining of welfare funds would be a major objective of the whole labor movement; and in practically every negotiation of which I have knowledge this year, one of the demands presented to employers has been a demand for a welfare fund, created by a percentage deduction from the pay roll.

All that is sought to be done by the amendment is to protect the rights of employees. After all, on any reasonable basis, payments by an employer to such a fund are in effect compensation to his employees. All that is sought to be done in the amendment is to see to it that the rights of employees in the fund are protected. The heart of the amendment is subsection (A), on page 3, which reads:

Provided, That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance.

It covers sickness insurance, contrary to the statement by the Senator from Oregon. All it will do, Mr. President, is to keep so-called welfare funds from becoming the subject of a racket, and to see that the rights of employees who, after all, earned the compensation represented by the funds are protected.

The argument has been made that the business agent of a union negotiating a welfare fund has been selected by the employees, and the Congress has no right to go back of that and question the authenticity of his agency, or question anything he does pursuant to it.

What are the facts, Mr. President, in most of the unions? Bargaining agents are selected by majority vote; not by all the employees in the unit, but by all the employees who vote in an election. Union meetings are admittedly very often attended by only a small minority of the members. As a matter of fact, I have in my hand a letter from a member of local No. 1486 of the United Steelworkers, CIO, who points out that a quorum at a meeting of that local, which includes some 350 members, is only 25 members, whereas there are 69 officers and members of the various committees. Obviously a meeting of that union might take action by the barest minority—5 or 10 percent of the members. Yet the business agent of that union, under the present procedure, on motion in that kind of a meeting, with that kind of authority, to negotiate respecting the welfare fund which is the result of the work for the employer of all the employees. I think it is a violation of section 8 (2) of the Wagner Act, which prohibits an employer's support of a union. But no complaints have been brought on that point, and it has never been decided.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I know he has very little time left, and if he does not desire to yield, very well.

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon what the Senator from Minnesota said in a previous sentence, is it his contention and

is it the contention of the sponsors of the amendment that the employees for whose benefit this fund is established cannot be trusted to administer it in their own behalf, and that they must be protected against themselves by the amendment which has been offered and is now before the Senate?

Mr. BALL. It is the contention of the sponsors of the amendment that the rights of the employees need to be protected against the absolute control of this fund by the officers, agents, and leaders of unions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who are selected by the employees themselves.

Mr. BALL. Who, it has been frequently alleged, and it has been proved in the courts, are not above mishandling union funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator really means, then, is that the employees who have the right to select the business agent, ought to be protected against their own right to select the business agent on the theory that he may not represent their interest, and may not properly administer their funds, although he is chosen by them to do so, and therefore the employer ought to be permitted to take it over.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a union can become a representative of all the employees in a unit by obtaining in an election a bare majority of the votes cast in that election, which may be far less than a majority of all the employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. So with a Member——

Mr. BALL. I do not yield further.

Mr. BARKLEY. So with a Member of the Senate. He can come here if elected by a bare majority.

Mr. BALL. The business agent to represent them may be selected by much less than the majority of all the employees who are members of the union. The action authorizing the business agent to negotiate with respect to the question of a welfare fund may be taken at a union meeting at which only 10 or even 5 percent of the members are present.

The amendment covers not only union members who presumably have some voice in the selection of the business agent, but all employees.

I have a copy of the plan of group insurance for members of the retail clerks welfare fund, local 1049 (AFL) and the first point is that—

> By motion of our union, members of the fund consist of only those people who are regular members of the Union whose employer has signed for the welfare fund. As a further condition precedent each member must be approved by the Trustees

What kind of control over the membership does such a provision affecting a welfare fund give to the leadership of the union? Obviously members who get out of line in a meeting are likely to be disapproved by the trustees. If they fall behind in their dues they lose their rights to the benefits which, after all, they have earned by their own labor. All we are trying to do is to protect their rights in the fund.

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

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, I cannot do so. I should like to finish, and after I have finished I shall be glad to yield.

I have a letter from a sportswear dealer in Philadelphia who says that he pays 4½ percent of his gross pay roll to the International Garment Workers' Union. In return they are supposed to benefit the employees with a week's vacation and a health center. He says that—

> Each employee gets less than one full week's vacation, and when they are sick they are supposed to get $10 each week. When the employee's sickness runs over two or three weeks, they have a hard time getting the sick benefit money due them. I know this as a fact, as I had this experience happen to my employees in my factory.

In regard to the fund which is set up to provide for paid vacations for the employees, the same correspondent writes that—

> When a union member does not pay his dues or his assessments, the first thing that is attached is the 4½-percent fund. For an illustration, if an employee is to get $40 for vacation out of this fund, and if they are $6 behind in dues and assessments they only get $34.

In other words, when the union has complete control of this fund, when there is no detailed provision in the agreement creating the fund respecting the benefits which are to go to employees, the union and its leadership will always come first in the administration of the fund, and the benefits to which the employees supposedly are entitled will come second.

Mr. President, all we seek to do by the amendment is to make sure that the employees whose labor builds this fund and who are really entitled to benefits under it shall receive the benefits; that it is a trust fund, and that, if necessary, they can go into court and obtain the benefits to which they are entitled.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply wanted to inquire whether all these funds were not trust funds, and if so, does not the court of chancery of the State have full jurisdiction to do practically what the amendment proposes to do?

Mr. BALL. No; they are not trust funds. They are not set up in the agreements as trust funds.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The answer is that the amendment requires that there be specified in the agreement the exact terms under which benefits are to be received. The complete terms with respect to benefits must be set out in the agreement. If it is only a trust fund for welfare purposes, with no specific terms or regulations, a court of chancery cannot write a welfare fund system into it. The court has no power to do that. No single employee can bring suit under such a general fund provision and prove that he personally has any rights whatever in the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had in mind that at least he could require an accounting under the terms of the fund.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; he could require an accounting, but the accounting may show that the money has been spent to establish a school in some district, or provide an advantage to a certain number of individuals to whom the union wanted to give money, and not to others. He would have no individual rights unless there were provision in law for the inclusion of specific terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. BALL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is necessarily absent on public business. If the Senator from Rhode Island were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine, if present, would vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and the Senator from Maine is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would

vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is absent by leave of the Senate on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—48

Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Fulbright	Overton
Bricker	George	Reed
Bridges	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo
Buck	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bushfield	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Jenner	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	McCarthy	Thye
Capehart	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McKellar	Umstead
Cordon	Martin	Vandenberg
Donnell	Millikin	Watkins
Dworshak	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	O'Conor	Williams

NAYS—40

Aiken	Kilgore	Myers
Barkley	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lodge	Revercomb
Cooper	Lucas	Saltonstall
Downey	McCarran	Sparkman
Ecton	McFarland	Taylor
Ellender	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Magnuson	Wagner
Hill	Malone	Wilson
Ives	Maybank	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	

NOT VOTING—7

Baldwin	Holland	Wiley
Green	Tobey	
Hatch	White	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL, for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORARY DEGREE RECEIVED BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on yesterday one of the distinguished Members of this body received a very signal honor in his own city of New York. The distinguished and brilliant senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] was given an honorary degree by the College of the City of New York, in his own home town. I cannot resist congratulating him at this time, and I know that many other Senators also wish to do so. I am sure that the Senate of the United States is as proud as he is that that degree has been conferred on one of its Members.

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 letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 53)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Post Office Department, amounting to $10,924,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CHECKS

A letter signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were 853,450 men on active duty on March 31, 1947, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

OFFICES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the housing laws in such manner as to allow the occupancy of housing units by families other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families

"Whereas present Federal legislation covering the subject of housing, particularly with reference to occupancy, as set forth in title V of Public Law 849 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, specifically restricts occupants of dwelling units constructed thereto to distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families; and

"Whereas, in addition to distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families, there are many other classes of distressed persons in the Territory of Hawaii who are unable to obtain dwelling accommodations; and

"Whereas these conditions cause an increase in and spread of disease, infant mortality, juvenile delinquency and crime, and constitute a danger and menace to the health and welfare of the inhabitants of the communities of the Territory generally; and

"Whereas about 45 percent of the applicants for such housing are such distressed persons, other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families for whom the Territory of Hawaii and the Hawaii Housing Authority have no housing available: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation amending the above-mentioned title V of Public Law 849 of the Seventy-sixth Congress in such manner as to except housing in the Territory of Hawaii, developed and administered thereunder, from the mentioned provisions relating to the occupancy of such housing, and to permit such housing to be occupied by other classes of distressed persons, in addition to distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families, in the proportion that the number of such other distressed applicants bears to the total number of applicants for such housing; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority of the United States, and to the director of region 6 of the Federal Public Housing Authority."

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring action by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the plan proposed by the United States in dealing with the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit the use of at least six live-duck decoys to each blind in the central zone or migratory States while continuing the present prohibition in the Northern and Southern States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BROOKS on May 5, 1947, p. 4482, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. THYE:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing certain pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II

"Whereas the primary obligation to assist veterans who have served their country in time of war rests upon the Federal Government; and

"Whereas more than 28 years have elapsed since the cease-fire order was given on November 11, 1918, bringing to an end actual combat in World War I; and

"Whereas there survive 3,752,600 veterans of World I ranging in age from 44 years to 90 years, with an average age of 54 years; and

"Whereas the death rate of these veterans exceeds by 12 percent the death rate of nonveterans of corresponding age, resulting in 49,511 deaths among them in 1946, and the deaths of 1,011,469 since the end of World War I; and

"Whereas, many of the survivors suffer from disabilities related to their war service which they have never been able to establish, and many others are acquiring disabilities relating to their age; and

"Whereas their service to their country in a time of peril should be recognized by their Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for veterans of World War I and World War II pensions in the sum of $75 per month at age 60; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the Minnesota Territorial Centennial in 1949

"Whereas the organic act of Congress to establish the Territory of Minnesota was enacted March 3, 1849; and

"Whereas plans are being made for a Statewide celebration of this centennial in 1949; and

"Whereas in other State observances commemorative coins have been issued by the United States Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That Congress be requested to enact such legislation as is necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half-dollar coins, dated 1949; and be it further

"Resolved, That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Historical Society upon payment therefor and that said society be, and it hereby is, authorized to arrange for the sale and distribution thereof; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of State, and Congress of the United States to direct our representatives in the United Nations to support the long-established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration

"Whereas at the 1945 general session of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota a joint resolution was adopted approving the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national home as called for by the Balfour Declaration and the mandate entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations, and calling for the abrogation of the white paper restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine and limiting the purchase of land in Palestine by Jews; and

"Whereas, since the adoption of said resolution, said restrictions have continued, and the displaced Jewish persons of Europe have been prevented from finding in Palestine the home which had been promised to them by 52 nations of the world, including the United States of America; and

"Whereas the attainment of a just peace and the maintenance of a peaceful world requires a righteous and equitable settlement of the Palestine question, to the end that the hundreds of thousands of homeless Jews of Europe may, as of right, be afforded the opportunity to enter Palestine and there reestablish the Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the United Nations, at the request of Great Britain as the mandatory power, is convening a special session of its General Assembly to consider the Palestine matter on April 28, 1947: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring therein), That the Government of the United States, through the State Department and the President, direct our representatives in the United Nations to support the long-established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation, be now enacted permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States

"Whereas an inequity exists between the citizens and residents of the several States of the United States in that residents of nine States having community-property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income-tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of the 39 States not having community-property laws; and

"Whereas, by reason of the premises, legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States, which fact gives rise to a discrimination in respect of income taxes which should be removed; and

"Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequity by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized now to enact into law, as a part of the Internal Revenue Code, H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; and be it

"Resolved, That the attention of the Congress of the United States be invited to other bills now pending in the United States Senate and in the United States House of Representatives embodying the principle of the aforesaid Reeves bill (H. R. 1759), among which bills are the following: Amendment to H. R. 1 (Knutson bill), introduced by Mr. BUTLER; S. 626, introduced by Mr. CORDON; S. 649, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS; S. 550, introduced by Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2219, introduced by Mr. ANGELL; H. R. 2002, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON; which principle is hereby approved and recommended for enactment by the Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 122 citizens of Garnett, Kans., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 1,721 citizens and voters of Kent and Sussex Counties, Del., praying for the enactment of S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The petition calls attention to the pernicious effect of this advertising in that it is a constant invitation and enticement to drink. It furthermore points out that the American people expended $7,707,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942, and that during this period there has been a corresponding increase each year in crime.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 512. A bill to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; with amendments (Rept. No. 158); and

S. 597. A bill to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 159); and

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture: with amendments (Rept. No. 160), and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of March 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

APRIL 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; amount $7,102.20.

Walter E. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; amount, $5,905.20; to March 25, 1947.

O. BREWSTER,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1246. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the actual

or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1247. A bill to rescind Executive Order No. 7868, April 15, 1938; and

S. 1248. A bill to provide that moneys received from certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1249. A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 1250. A bill for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WILSON) introduced Senate bill 1251, to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program, to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and other plants on a Nation-wide scale, to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1252. A bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL SOIL-FERTILITY POLICY AND PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and my colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program. I suggest that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1251) to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program, to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and other plants on a Nation-wide scale, to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WILSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPRESENTATION OF SMALL BUSINESSMEN ON GOVERNMENT POLICY-MAKING BODIES

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the 3,650,000 small business concerns in the United States are owned and operated, on the average, by 2½ persons or a total of 9,125,000 persons, constituting 92 percent of our entire economy; and

Whereas these concerns employ about 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners and produce about 45 percent of our entire output of commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small businessman of America to equal representation as an entity, with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be and hereby are respectfully urged to accord the small businesman of America representation on such Government agencies including particularly policy-making bodies created by executive appointment.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, WELFARE, AND EDUCATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1239, to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The latter committee now has before it a bill dealing with the general question of the reorganization of the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, and Senate bill 1239 comes within the scope of that bill.

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

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 the nomination of Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter concerning the portal-to-portal pay bill, addressed to the President of the United States, and signed by various persons, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF REV. DR. JOSEPH TISO—EDITORIAL FROM THE MESSENGER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Victim," dealing with the execution of Rev. Joseph Tiso, wartime President of Slovakia, published in the Messenger, official publication of the diocese of Belleville, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

PUTTING THE PRESSURE ON CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STROUT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Putting the Pressure on Congress," written by Richard L. Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor, May 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Washington Post of May 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW A LOBBY TRICKS—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How A Lobby Tricks," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?—POEM BY HAROLD C. PATCH

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an original poem entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" written by Harold C. Patch, of Perkinsville, Vt., which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS OF EUROPE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "People Without Countries," published in the New York Times of May 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STORY OF NEW HAVEN'S INDUSTRIES—BY HENRY H. TOWNSHEND

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Story of New Haven's Industries," written by Henry H. Townshend, and published in the Journal of the Union and New Haven Trust Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

LUCAS OFFERS A TAX PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lucas Offers a Tax Plan," from the Chicago Sun for Sunday, May 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION—ATTITUDE OF ALEXANDER WHITNEY TOWARD CLOSED SHOP

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement at this time because I must go to a committee meeting. On May 1, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4362, in regard to an interview I had with Mr. Alexander Whitney some 5 or 6 years ago, at which time he told me of an incident which had occurred in a convention of railway employees held many years ago. A delegate to the convention offered a resolution which provided that no man should be permitted to work on a railroad unless he belonged to a union, whereupon, the president of the railroad brotherhood, stepping to the front of the platform, said, "I urge the gentleman who offered this resolution to withdraw it; and, in the event of his failure to withdraw it, I urge the delegates to defeat it, because in my opinion the people of the United

States do not want anyone to be forced to join a union in order to work."

I went on to say further that the president of the union said, "Let us make our union so good and so efficient in the service they render that the workers will want to join them in order to obtain the benefits they will receive as members of the union."

I do not want to leave any false impression. Mr. Whitney seemed to feel that I left the impression with the Senate that he was opposed to the closed shop, and he telegraphed me, asking me to make a correction or statement so there would be no misunderstanding in the minds of Senators.

I simply wish to say that Mr. Whitney, at that meeting in my office, 5 or 6 years ago, definitely told me he thought there should not be an enforced closed shop, but that he believed, where an employer and the employees voluntarily agreed that a closed shop was in the interest of all, it should be permissible.

I had no intention of leaving with the Senate, and I do not believe I did, the impression that Mr. Whitney was against the closed shop, because I knew that Mr. Whitney had appeared at the House hearings and had offered amendments which clearly showed hat he now believes that a closed shop should be admissible if the employer and the employees are in favor of it.

I make this statement on the floor of the Senate in order that there may be no misunderstanding of anything I may have said regarding Mr. Whitney.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any person to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction in proceedings instituted by or on behalf of the United States, or by any party suffering loss or damage or threatened with loss or damage by reason of any violation of subsection (a), to prevent and restrain violations of such subsection. It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to prevent and restrain violations of such subsection.

(c) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover the damages by him sustained, and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

(d) The provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and the provisions (except sec. 7, exclusive of clauses (c) and (e) and secs. 11 and 12) of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, shall not be applicable in respect of violations of subsection (a), or in respect of any contract, combination, or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce, to which a labor organization is a party, if one of the purposes of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, distribution, or competition, or impose restrictions or conditions upon the purchase, sale, or use of any material, machines, or equipment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not want to unnecessarily take up the time of the Senate, and I have no intention of making a long speech, nor is it my intention to go into any detailed discussion of the pending bill, because I feel that the subject has been fully covered from all angles.

As I see it, the big issue upon which the Senate is called upon to vote at this time is the fundamental question of whether we shall or shall not pass legislation the purpose of which is to establish fair and equitable laws governing the relationship between employer and employee.

In many statements carried by the press recently and in some discussions here on the floor of the Senate, question has been brought out as to whether the Senate in passing legislation should attempt to so "tailor" that legislation as to meet the desires of the executive department of Government. I should like to make my position on that point very clear. I have always contended that the Constitution of the United States established three separate branches of government: The legislative, the executive, and the judicial. I have always contended that good government required a definite and clear recognition of that constitutional provision, and that there should be no disposition on the part of any branch of government to interfere with another branch of government. I am persuaded that the question for us to determine is what is the best labor legislation to pass, and then it will be up to the President of the United States to determine, when the bill reaches his desk, whether he desires to sign it.

If you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, you will find that when I entered the United States Senate about 5 years ago I stated at that time, in the first speech I made on the floor of the United States Senate, that as a Senator it would be my purpose to study carefully all matters of legislation presented, and to decide about it on a basis of what was best for the general welfare of the country, and that when I did that I would not be concerned about whether my vote received the blessings of the gentleman who then occupied the White House. That was my position at that time, when the New Deal was flowering in full bloom. It has been my position since and it is still my position.

When I first entered the United States Senate, I came to the office of Senator from that of Governor of the State of Texas. We were at that time about to enter a World War. I then thought that I could foresee grave danger to the war effort and grave danger to the welfare of this Nation if Congress did not act promptly to curb the unbridled power which had been placed in the hands of irresponsible labor leaders. I then urged amendments to the wage-hour law, and if those changes had been made, they would have discouraged wartime strikes which retarded the war effort, and would have prevented the mass of portal-to-portal suits which later engulfed this Nation.

I recommended that, both by constitutional amendment and by statute, the open shop be established as the principle of employer-employee relations throughout this Nation. I advocated the enactment of legislation which would protect the honest workman of this Nation, who sought to follow a lawful vocation, from the assaults of the goon squads and the labor racketeers. I urged the enactment of legislation that would prevent racketeers from collecting fees from honest workmen, solely for granting to them a permit to work on essential production necessary to the war effort.

I urged then that the National Labor Relations Act be so amended as not only to protect employees from coercion by employers, but also to protect employees from coercion by labor-union agents. I urged the enactment of legislation that would make labor unions responsible under the law, in the same way that all other citizens are responsible under the law. I introduced specific measures designed to accomplish these objectives. Those things I did about 5 years ago, Mr. President.

I offer no criticism for the delay of Congress in finally getting around to action on those suggestions. I am glad to be able finally to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and lend my support to legislation today which is designed to accomplish those broad objectives.

The only objection I can offer to the legislation which we are about to vote on, is based on the fact that in my humble opinion, although I regard is as highly constructive, I do not believe it goes as far as such legislation should go. Frankly, I should like very much to have an opportunity to vote for the labor bill which passed the House of Representatives, but I realize that in the passage of all legislation in the end there must be a meeting of the minds of at least a majority of those charged with the responsibility of enacting laws. I am persuaded that we shall enact some constructive labor legislation at this session of the Congress.

If anyone has any doubt about the need for amending the National Labor Relations Act, all on earth it would be necessary to do would be to read the report of the Smith committee which investigated the National Labor Relations Board several years ago.

Mr. President, I think all of my colleagues in the Senate know that I am not exceedingly fond of any Government bureaucrats, but I do want to state for the RECORD, here and now, that I think the present National Labor Relations Act is the worst piece of legislation ever enacted by the Congress of the United States. Furthermore, I think it has been the worst administered of any single piece of legislation ever enacted in the United States. I think the welfare of this country demands that the proposed revision of that law be made, and that it be made at the earliest possible date. I am fully persuaded that the amendment of that law would in no sense damage the welfare and the progress of legitimate labor organizations. I think it would serve to protect the workingman. I think it would serve to protect the rights of the employer, and at the same time protect the interest of the general public.

Mr. President, I think no other Member of the United States Senate is more sympathetic than I am toward the cause of the laboring people. When I say "laboring people," I mean the honest men and women who toil; I do not mean the communistic labor-leader racketeers who do not toil, but who live in luxury at the expense of those who are honest and who toil to make an honest living. I believe firmly in the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and I believe in the right of labor to strike during peacetime, when necessary. I think these are fundamental rights which should be, and which are in the proposed legislation, adequately protected.

I believe that labor unions, as such, should be granted the same protection that other citizens are granted.

I believe that labor unions should be made responsible under the laws with which other citizens must comply. I do not think anyone is justified in giving labor unions legal immunity when they practice coercion, or when they seek to exercise the secondary boycott, or when they engage in violence, or when they seek to evade their responsibility for damages with which they may rightly be charged. There is no reason on earth why we should allow labor unions special exemption from laws with which all other citizens must comply.

Without going into a detailed discussion of the pending legislation, Mr. President, I express it as my opinion that it is a fair summarization of this legislation to say that its broad general purpose is to make some progress toward making these vast organizations of labor responsible under the law of the land, at least approximately as responsible as other people are.

The trouble with this Nation today is that for many years the fundamental purpose of government was prostituted by the New Deal, and legislation was enacted to curry favor with the big labor bosses in order that at election time the votes of those mass organizations would be available. I hope we have reached the end of that road. I believe that when the people on November 5, of last year, voted a change in the power of the Congress of the United States, they had two things fundamentally in mind.

One was that they wanted to see the Congress enact labor legislation which would make those labor bosses responsible under the law, the same as other citizens are. I think the people voted for a new Congress in the belief that this Congress would break the stranglehold which those labor racketeers had on the throat of the American people. So far as I am concerned, I expect to cast my vote to carry out that purpose.

There is another thing the people had in mind last November.

Mr. President, I believe the people of this Nation at that time voted for a change in the Congress because they believed the time had come when we should move constructively to reestablish free enterprise in this country, and that we should so amend our tax laws as to give the average citizen of this Nation not only an opportunity to make money, but to keep part of what he makes. If I correctly analyze the thinking of the American people, it was the desire and the determination to achieve these two major reforms which brought about a change in the parties controlling the Congress of the United States.

I have never been exceeding concerned when I cast my ballot about whether I was voting with Republicans or voting with Democrats, but I have been concerned about whether or not I was voting right, and at this time I am positive that in voting for constructive labor legislation I am voting right, and I am equally certain I am voting for what the American people want. I believe that if either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party falters in achieving these two major objectives—constructive labor legislation and constructive tax reduction—the people when they get a chance to vote on the issue again will reemphasize the position which they have already taken.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is anything seriously wrong with either our domestic or foreign affairs that another good national election cannot cure. I have implicit faith in the rank and file of the people of our Nation after they finally catch up with their public servants and learn the whole truth about what has been going on.

If the republican form of government is to be continued in this Nation, if free private enterprise is to be continued, if the right of individuals are to be protected, as the framers of the Constitution of the United States believed they would be protected, then constructive labor legislation, at least going as far as we are proposing to go at this time, becomes absolutely essential. There is only one thing that would give me more satisfaction than that which I will derive from supporting the legislation now proposed, and that would be to vote for even stronger labor legislation.

When I refer to stronger labor legislation, Mr. President, I mean legislation that will free the honest laboring men and women of this Nation, and the honest consumers of this Nation, from domination by the iron rule of the ruthless communistic labor-leader racketeers who have enslaved the working people to such an extent that they cannot work on any job without first buying a work-permit card, and then taxing the consumers hundreds of millions of dollars annually to support their racket.

Mr. President, I was born in poverty, and reared by hard-working parents. I have performed hard manual labor much of my life. I understand the problems and hardships of the laboring people, and my sympathies are with the sons and daughters of toil. I never have advocated or supported any legislation except that which I considered to be beneficial to the working class of people. I am one who believes that the rank and file of the working people of this Nation are possessed of abundant brains and common sense, and that they do not need any big-time fat-headed bosses to tell them when to work, when not to work, where to work, and where not to work, and what their own talents and services are worth.

The honest laboring men and women of America built this country into the mightiest Nation on earth, and they did it without the aid of any communistic racketeers to mislead them. I am in favor of giving back to the working people the freedom and liberty to which they are entitled and which they once enjoyed, so that America can turn from the left and continue to the right on the road to a greater and greater America of tomorrow.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. President, that while the pending legislation is not nearly as good as it should be, I

yet consider it to be the nearest thing to a laboring man's bill of rights that has passed the Senate during the past 14 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am loath to mention again what I have said several times, that I think the wise procedure for the Senate to follow would be to drop the amendments and proceed to vote on the bill as reported by the committee, and leave the matter of final consideration of the bill with the conference committee. There seems to be a disposition not to follow such a course, but a definite disposition on the part of those who have offered amendments to carry the amendment program through, and attempt to make the bill as strong as it was originally written, before the committee took it under consideration and made several changes.

Mr. President, in the amendment which has just been adopted there is reference again to the injunctive process. In the amendment which is before us now there is reference to that process. In the portal-to-portal pay bill as agreed to in conference and now awaiting the signature of the President of the United States there is another reference to the injunctive process.

It seems to me there is a disposition on the part of individuals and organizations that for years had access to the courts in an effort to settle labor disputes, to reintroduce into our country's practice once more all the confusion, all the unfairness, and all the injustice, which grew up under the use of the injunctive process as practiced before the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law.

I am fearful about a return to the conditions of those times, because it would mean absolutely no justice at all to the laboring man who undertook to strike. Time in its simple essence means everything to those who are striking. Any kind of a slowing up process, of course, makes a strike all the harder to endure, and makes it all the harder for a strike to succeed. I cannot see but that we are taking a step about as backward as any step we have taken in the history of our country when not merely in one amendment but in two amendments, and in two major bills, if the pending bill shall become the law of the land, we offer an open invitation to the courts to interfere and an open invitation to the attorneys who want to take advantage of the law to interfere in labor disputes.

Mr. President, I am not the only one who fears a return to the use of the injunctive process in labor disputes. In a report of the case against John W. Lewis, in the Supreme Court of the United States, there is recited a bit of Senate history in regard to the reintroduction of the injunctive process, with emphasis on the fact that as late as the date of passage of the Smith-Connally Act, the Senate, and, therefore, the Congress, refused to act upon an amendment designed to do what will be done by the pending amendments, if adopted—that is, to return to the situation that existed prior to the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

For the purpose of the record, so as to make the point clear, and to bring home to Senators the complete reversal of policy within the course of 3 or 4 years, I want to read from the concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter. I am happy to read from this opinion because it emphasizes the fact that the Senate understood the danger, and that it avoided stepping into the position which Senators seemingly bid fair to step into today. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, at page 62 of the report, said:

By the War Labor Disputes Act, Congress created a new relationship among the Government, the plant owners, the employees. The rights, duties, remedies incident to that relation are those given by the act. Congress naturally addressed itself to possible interferences with the Government's operation of seized plants. It dealt specifically with this subject. It gave the Government specific remedies which it might invoke against such interference. Remedy by injunction was not given. It was not merely omitted. A fair reading of the legislative history shows that it was expressly and definitively denied. As reported out of the Senate committee, S. 796 provided for plant seizure. It did not include the injunction among the remedies for interference with Government operation. But when the bill reached the floor of the Senate, Senator CONNALLY, sponsor of the bill, offered and urged an amendment giving the district courts jurisdiction to restrain violations of the measure.

Set forth in a footnote to the opinion are the remarks made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in the course of the discussion, as follows:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. * * *

"I am very anxious that there shall be additional statutory protection to the uninterrupted production of war necessities, but I am wondering whether, in order to achieve that purpose, it is necessary for me to impinge upon a very profound hostility I have always had to the use of injunctions in labor disputes. I voted for the original Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I have always felt that one of the most useful things we ever did, not only as a matter of fair play but in respect to the status of the courts, was substantially to separate from court jurisdiction the responsibility of in effect umpiring labor disputes.

"What I wish to ask the able Senator from Texas, if I may, is this: In his proposal, on page 4, it is provided that any person who willfully violates any provision of the act is to be guilty of a felony and subject to a fine or imprisonment. Is not that a conclusive penalty? Is it necessary, in addition, to go back into all the old injunctive process in connection with labor disputes?"

Mr. President, note how fearful the Senate was that the amendment might become an invitation to return to the injunctive process. The recently enacted portal-to-portal pay legislation is such an invitation. The amendment which was adopted by the Senate a few moments ago constitutes another invitation. The pending amendment is a third invitation. To any fair-minded person, it would seem to me to be apparent that Senators, by their vote on the amendment just agreed to, have repudiated the philosophy of the Senator from Michigan; they not only want to extend an invitation to the courts to employ the injunctive process in labor disputes, but they are almost making it compulsory.

"Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a legal inquiry really. Of course, it might be that we could get along without the provision. Like the Senator, I voted for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I favored the policy embodied therein. This provision, however, applies only to plants taken over by the Government. It seems to me that if the Government is to operate a plant, it should have the widest and the fullest authority to operate it as it wants to do and to prevent interruption. Therefore, because of the attitude of some who were interested in the bill, I inserted section 5. I do not think the bill would be very seriously crippled if it were eliminated, but I think it is improved by its remaining in. I do not think it would be fatal to strike out that provision, but I hope that will not be done.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his frank statement. When the Government has taken over the operation of a plant and it becomes in essence a Government operation, it is rather difficult to resist the argument that the Government should not be deprived of any instrumentality in the enforcement, virtually of its sovereignty.

"Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. Nevertheless, I apprehend that the very fact that the injunctive process is restored in the Senator's bill is the reason why it appears in the additional amendment offered by the able Senator from Ohio, where, it seems to me, it becomes decidedly more offensive, using that word in the sense in which I have used it."

The reference is to an amendment proposed by Senator TAFT authorizing injunctions in any circuit court of appeals at the request of the Attorney General in case of failure to obey orders of the War Labor Board, or whenever "operations are hindered or reduced by lock-out, strike, or otherwise." This applied apparently to plants in private operation.

That ends the footnote. Mr. Justice Frankfurter continues:

He accepted, somewhat reluctantly, the amendment of Senator WAGNER to limit the proposed amendment to an injunction at the behest of the Attorney General, precisely as was here sought and granted. On motion of Senator Danaher, this proposal was rejected by the Senate after full debate, participated in by Senators especially conversant with the history and scope of the existing remedies available to the Government. With this remedy denied to the Government, the bill was passed and sent to the House. The House did not like the bill. Its version did not see fit specifically to add to the limited-seizure provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940, although apparently it assumed that there could be seizure under existing law in the case of failure by defense plants to produce as a result of labor troubles. Instead, the House version provided stringent antistrike and antilockout provisions as to plants in private operation, and by specific amendment to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the district courts were authorized to restrain violations of such provisions. But this pro tanto repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia Act was not made available to the United States as a remedy against interference with operation of plants seized under the earlier 1940 act.

The bill then went to conference. What came out was, so far as here material, the bill that had passed the Senate. The United States was granted power to seize and operate defense plants whose production was hampered by labor disputes. Specific remedies were formulated by Congress against interference with the Government's operation. The injunction was not included. In neither House was further attempt made to reintroduce the Connally proposal giving the Government relief by injunction. Nor was it suggested that the Government had such redress under existing law. On the floor of the Senate, Senator THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, said:

"Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Danaher], and the Senator

from Texas [Mr. Connally], the sponsor of the bill, whether there is a unanimous opinion on the part of those three great lawyers that there will not be a reopening of the district courts to industry-labor disputes? * * * I should like that point to be made so firmly and so strongly that no lawyer in the land who would like to take advantage of the situation created by the mere mention of the words 'district court' will resort to the court in order to confuse our industry-labor relations."

Mr. CONNALLY answered:

"Mr. President, * * * I think I speak for the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut and also the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Van Nuys], although he is not present, when I say that there is no jurisdiction whatever conferred by this bill providing for resort to the United States district court, except the one mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut, which is merely the right to go there for a civil action for damages, and no jurisdiction whatever is given over labor disputes. Does that answer the Senator?"

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making that statement and I hope it will satisfy the lawyers of the country.

"Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it will."

Under these circumstances the bill became law, and the seizure giving rise to this controversy was made under that law. The separate items of this legislative history cannot be judged in isolation. They must be considered together, and as part of the course of legislation dealing with injunctions in labor disputes. To find that the Government has the right which Senator CONNALLY's amendment sought to confer but which the Congress withheld is to say that voting down the amendment had the same effect as voting it up.

Events since the passage of the act underscore what would appear to be the controlling legislative history of the War Labor Disputes Act, and prove that Congress saw fit not to authorize district courts to issue an injunction in cases like this. To meet the grave crisis growing out of the strike on the railroads last May, Congress, upon the recommendation of the President and the Attorney General, deemed additional legislation necessary for dealing with labor disputes. The proposals in each House carried a provision which authorized an injunction to issue for violation of the War Labor Disputes Act. Senator Mead proposed an amendment to delete the provisions for injunctions. In the debates that followed no one suggested that the new proposal was unnecessary, that the jurisdiction proposed to be conferred already existed, or that if granted, as requested by the Attorney General, it would not, as Senator Mead claimed, repeal pro tanto the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The debates show clearly that what was contemplated was a change in the War Labor Disputes Act, whereby a new and an additional remedy would be authorized.

Mr. President, there is a footnote at this point which I should like to read:

See, particularly, the statements of Senator Mead (p. 6023), Senator Morse (pp. 6021, 6022), Senator Pepper (pp. 6022, 6023), Senator Wagner (p. 6022), Senator Wheeler (p. 6025), Senator Barkley (p. 6028), Senator Fulbright (p. 6024).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter continued:

The bill never became law. As is well known, as the debates clearly shows, as Senator CONNALLY admitted, the War Labor Disputes Act was directed primarily against stoppage in the coal mines.

At this point I read another footnote:

Senator CONNALLY said, "Mr. Lewis appeared before the Truman Committee 3 or 4 weeks ago. I happen to be a member of that committee, and when he said he did not regard his no-strike agreement as binding * * * I determined then that if I could get this bill before the Senate, I was going to bring it up and press it in order that if he did disregard the agreement, the President or the Government of the United States would have a weapon with which to meet the threat and the danger" (89 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3886).

I continue to read from Justice Frankfurter's opinion:

The situation that Congress feared was exactly that which has occurred and which underlies this controversy. To deal with the situation, Congress gave the United States the power to seize the mines. To effectuate this power, the Government was given authority to invoke criminal penalties for interferences with the operation of the mines. Senator CONNALLY sought more. He wanted Congress to empower the district courts to enjoin interference. The Senate did not want an injunction to issue and voted the proposal down. The Senate's position was adopted by the conference committee. The House of Representatives yielded its view and approved the conference report. The whole course of legislation indicates that Congress withheld the remedy of injunction. This Court now holds that Congress authorized the injunction.

I concur in the Court's opinion insofar as it is not inconsistent with these views, and, under the compulsion of the ruling of the majority that the court below had jurisdiction to issue its orders, I join in the Court's judgment.

Mr. President, I, of course, do not want to pass judgment upon the decision of the Supreme Court. I am not interested here in taking sides in the controversy in regard to that issue. I am interested merely in the one simple fact, which is that what the Congress of the United States feared, and what especially the Senate of the United States feared when it discussed the problem, was of so great importance at the time that the Senate decided to leave the invitation to use the injunctive process out of the bill, and it was never included in it. Now come these invitations one after another, so that by the time the bill receives the President's signature and becomes law, in addition to the portal-to-portal legislation, the injunctive process in labor disputes will have been restored into the practice and the law of the land to such extent that the Norris-LaGuardia Act will have become absolutely and completely a dead letter. If that is what Senators want to do, that is exactly what they are going to accomplish. If they feel that the restoration of that unjust process is going to bring labor peace to our country I think they are mistaken beyond words, and I think that anyone who knows the history of our country knows what the result will be.

Mr. President, I wish to turn to some of the other provisions of the bill. I want to repeat what I said in regard to the sensible handling of the bill, and show, by a rather formal statement, that the bill was handled in a very remarkable way by our committee. In this connection I wish to speak of the Reorganization Act, and commend what those of us who were on the Reorganization Committee did. One of our anticipations has been realized, because day after day and week after week there was a full attendance of all 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the consideration of the bill. No bill in my experience in Congress has received better consideration in committee than did this bill. I believe that the committee, regardless of any feelings about the outcome, regardless of how individual Senators may vote, deserves the commendation of the Senate for the serious way in which it discussed and debated the provisions of the bill. Literally we debated for hours many of its provisions.

I start with the observation that, practically speaking, the field of debate necessarily runs the entire range from the President's recommendations, up through S. 1126 as amended and reported, S. 1126 as was hoped it might be reported, and the amendments intended to be adopted to S. 1126. All of these lie in the long shadow of the House bill, which has passed the House and is the very next bill on the Senate Calendar to S. 1126. So any consideration of labor amendments and acts which would ignore the entire range of possibilities would be optimistic to say the least. In this instance, with anything on the calendar, everything is on the calendar, the sky is the limit, and the nonvigilant stands to lose his shirt. Indeed, the amendments intended to be proposed, as printed, indicate the buoyancy felt by some members of this committee toward matters on which they were outvoted in committee. They frankly hope for better going on the floor. So far in this debate they have had better going in every particular except one.

S. 1126 as reported has been carefully analyzed in the reports, parts 1 and 2, and in the latter a record has been made of the objections thereto. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have discussed at some length the points contained in the minority report filed by me on behalf of the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Florida, and myself. This report, too, has anticipated some of the amendments and met them critically. In view of these facts, I shall not be over-analytical with respect to the pending bill as it lies on the calendar before us, and as it was reported from committee.

Instead, I shall deal simply, and I hope clearly, with the very real threats to our liberty, as we have come to enjoy it, that could eventuate through a radical and careless treatment of labor amendments influenced by passion or pique. Any return to the shameful conditions of the early thirties when labor had its charter would be so palpably brutal as to be fraught with danger. Because coal has been so much in people's minds let us take coal, and recall the reign of terror in an important coal-mining area of Kentucky, brought about by oppression of workingmen and their families in almost every known and conceivable form. I sat through hearing after hearing. The return to a combination of cruel management interlocked with abusive local government is a frightening prospect, the more so in the face of the fact that a little taste of freedom has been enjoyed.

Surely the minority report to accompany S. 1126 suggests a better way out

than simply to open up to management the opportunities to conquer labor in the old associated-industries manner, so that again company police, company jails, company commissaries, and company scrip, backed by Federal law and by local government iniquities, might combine to picture to the workingman the true hopelessness of being born to do honest toil.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have called attention to this fact, and I know the Senate will forgive me; but the civil-liberties hearings did not continue merely for months. They continued for years. The abuses which were disclosed during the course of those hearings will stay in my mind as long as I live.

Furthermore, I think it is not out of place to call attention to the fact that during the great coal strike of 1922 all the coal mines in my State were under martial law. I was sent by the governor to administer martial law at the mines, and to command the troops there. I know what these things mean from first-hand knowlege. I know the feeling of terror on the part of those engaged in the coal strike, and their conviction that no such thing as justice existed for them.

In my separate opinion I credited the present Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the ability and the capacity necessary to a thorough and useful consideration of this subject. The 13 members of this committee locked themselves in a room, juror fashion, for many hours. I honestly believe that its 13 members could not, if they were permitted to stay at the controls, bring themselves to be punitive toward labor, or to become overemotional about our problem, to vitiate any of our important acts, or to destroy the hope of those who have emerged from a long class struggle. I say this for the simple reason that rubbing elbows with the unions either actually or from hard study of their activities is good for the soul. Many an individual who might not otherwise have been at all liberal has become partly so, through intimate contacts with his fellowman. I believe that when men of intelligence make an honest study, one need not worry too much about the result. I will say by way of bouquet, that the 13 individuals on this committee are men of heart and men of study. Labor law now is incapable of being digested in a few minutes or even in a year's course of study at a university. We on the committee appreciate that fact. Most of us have been in the labor field, in one way or another, for many years. Even though some elements or even whole segments of the public might wish it, Senators should not sit down with a grouch and a few hours' reading, and react with a tough labor bill—so tough, in fact, that they might innocently be doing a thing not less reckless than if they were to repeal the Anti-narcotics Act, or carelessly let the Post Office out by contract.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has suggested it would be very useful if those who are interested in the problems of labor and management had closer contact with such problems in life before they came to consider the problems in the Congress or in committees. For instance, if a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had been employed in the coal mines for a short period or in the copper mines of the West, had observed the operations of those properties, and had been closely in contact with the workers and management he would have a very much better understanding and appreciation of their problems.

I recall that when I first went to Montana I had the opportunity of having that kind of experience. I worked for 3 or 4 months in one of the copper mines at Butte and belonged to the union there in that early period of my life. Shortly before I reached Montana my understanding was that the miners were working 10 or 12 hours a day in the copper mines of Butte. Those mines, as they become deeper, grow increasingly more dangerous to those who work in them. Because of the increased depth and by reason of the dust and gases that originate in the mines the conditions are very unhealthful for the miners. They may become affected by what is known as silicosis, which is a very deadly disease. In my early days in Montana I knew a great many miners who were suffering from silicosis. They were walking up and down the streets and dying on their feet. Of course I naturally gained a sympathy for them in their condition, and as a Member of Congress it has always been my desire to be of assistance to them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Montana. I know that what he says is true. Neither of us has lived a full lifetime, but in our lives we have seen a complete transition in law and in practice from the good old days when any kind of an organization was considered a conspiracy and when labor was definitely a commodity. We have seen some freedoms granted, and we have seen the right of majority rule extended under our labor laws.

Both the Senator from Montana and I know that if this bill becomes the law of the land, and if the portal-to-portal pay bill becomes the law of the land, we shall revert to the good old days and once again labor organizations may be considered a conspiracy. Men may not be free to join a labor organization; they may be without any redress at all, and may again become a commodity, and as such become subject to the laws governing property.

Mr. MURRAY. That expresses my fear very clearly. It seems to me that by legislation of this kind we are running into the danger of returning the conditions which prevailed in those days. I recall that in the early history of the operation of the mines in Montana the local management was there on the ground to deal with the problems of the miners. It was a very simple matter for the miners to have their grievances adjusted and be able to get along with management. But after the great consolidations became established and the offices were removed to New York City and there was nothing but absentee management, the situation was entirely different. The management built tall fences around the properties, and placed big searchlights on top of their hoists. They established a detective system and defied the unions in their efforts to improve their conditions. When the employees became unruly the management would call in the militia. I do not want to see those conditions return in this country. I think we are taking a very dangerous step if we enact legislation of the character which we are considering.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I again thank the Senator. I am as fearful as is he that an invitation to use one old process means an invitation to use all the old processes.

My gratitude may be limited as to some, but it is given in abundance to those earnest colleagues of mine on the committee who helped temper the most ambitious of the antilabor bills. And I am everlastingly grateful, of course, for the wisdom of the founding fathers in providing for a two-house legislature.

As Senators know, members of this committee in some cases would go further than the bill which was reported. Their attitude is reflected through their amendments and their honest admissions. I myself do not want to adopt the bill which was reported. Certainly the whole Senate is entitled to consider a labor bill, and certainly, according to my lights, those of us who would have preferred to follow the President's recommendations nonetheless were able to prevail upon those who wanted strong measures, or to outvote them, or to bring to bear at least the tempering result of compromise, so that what we produced on the Senate floor, considering the times, was a relatively wonderful product, inasmuch, if nothing else, as it would not, if enacted, emasculate labor. But these amendments will. If one wishes to have his imagination run a bit, let him look at the next number on this Senate Calendar and he will see what I mean. But this does not mean that I am happy. It means simply that I am not terrified.

Moreover, the Senate committee, a group of men who seriously do know their subject, with all its learning, came out with a $150,000 proposal to learn more. I say this to their credit. I cannot repeat in too many ways the danger of reaction on one of these rights-of-man subjects undertaken lightly and in ignorance of facts other than that there are occasional strikes and that the people do not like to be inconvenienced. One does not cut off his leg because of his corns.

It would be a simple matter, in every sense of the word, to annul the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Unfortunately I can imagine an assembly becoming so inflamed as to take the achievements of a century and a half and destroy them in a moment of whimsy. The Social Security Act is younger in time, but no one in his excitement would take away that act. What, then, is the difference? In the former case we overcame some of the evils of government by injunction. But

the average person does not know what that is, so he will not be very angry if it is taken away, because he will not know what was taken away, and he will not hold anyone responsible. That is why it is easy to take away one of the more technical applications of the abundant life and not have it noticed that anything important was stolen.

In Labor and the Law, Professor Gregory, of the University of Chicago, has done a remarkable work in bringing legal matters within the understanding of the layman. In this way he reduces the injunction racket to the following terms. After describing the difference between a law court and an equity court, he states of the latter:

> Their judgments usually consisted of orders either to do or undo some acts or to refrain from entering upon or continuing a threatened or already undertaken course of action. They did not have to use juries in reaching their judgments. They could fulfill their functions of preventive justice by issuing a temporary restraining order or injunction, pending the actual trial, in order to be sure that the harm threatened could effectually be avoided. * * * And if the order of an equity court was not obeyed scrupulously, this disobedience was an offense which could be punished summarily as a contempt of court by the court itself, acting without a jury—such punishment being immediate imprisonment for as long as the occasion warranted.

Gregory proceeds then to show how in 1880 from a railroad strike this very fashionable restraint to be was opened up and became widespread.

> As soon as the labor injunction became established in the late 1880's, almost anyone with an interest in obstructing the activities of labor unions could promptly secure temporary restraining orders for the asking. Continuance of a strike or boycott, after a restraining order or injunction was issued against it, brought down on the heads of the offenders the vengeance of the court, through the exercise of its contempt power, unrelieved by the tender mercies of a jury. Hence, strikes, picket lines, and boycotts were easily broken up almost before they were begun.
>
> An employer with a strike or union pressure on his hands went to a judge, regardless of whether he was actually sitting on the bench at the time, submitted to him affidavits made out by his own agents to the effect that the strikers or other union folk were about to commit or were committing, and would continue to commit, alleged unlawful acts at his plants, all of which would cause irreparable damage to his property, and prayed for a restraining order pending suit for a permanent injunction. Judges usually issued such orders on request, frequently in the absence of anyone representing the persons to be enjoined—

A barber, according to the author—

> usually patronized by railroad men, was held in contempt for violation of the broad injunction issued in the 1922 railroad workers' strike because he had hung in his window a sign to the effect that no scabs or strikebreakers were wanted as customers.

At this time I do not wish to engage in a lawyer's discussion of the cases under the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the little Norris-LaGuardia Acts. I do want to point out that the House bill virtually would repeal the act. Repeal of the act would leave conditions as described above. I offer the example only to show how reckless treatment of one important subject may result. Certainly we can do better; I pass, at least for time being, from the injunction—I may say the deadly injunction—with the statement that the Norris-LaGuardia act was enacted in 1932 and was signed by President Hoover.

I started to say that had laws of this type, including, of course, the National Labor Relations Act, jelled as long or as understandingly as our older laws, one would as readily abolish the amendments ratified after the Civil War, or the sixteenth and the nineteenth amendments to our Constitution, as to return to government by labor injunction, or to invite the return of labor spies and hooded men either by making the open shop mandatory or by providing some equally loose relaxation. I have heard remarks which might lead one to believe that the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments are all wrong. But no one would take seriously any effort to amend them, because they are concerned with the progress of a nation and its victory over weakness. No one in his right mind would repeal the amendment granting women suffrage. Occasionally a Hitler will bully, browbeat, and hypnotize a nation into a reversion to twelfth century living for a limited period; but as a rule peoples go forward, not backward.

I believe that even the most conservative members of the committee recognize that there is no turning back. One risks his neck in consenting to refinements of law, because that opens the door. In the minority report, we have suggested some refinements. Nonetheless, the risk of opening the whole subject would not be great were everyone as certain as is the committee in its recognition that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act are as fundamental to American life as are the measure against narcotics and the laws for the protection of our specie and currency. Unhappily, we had to have a Lindbergh baby incident to bring forth the Lindbergh law. But we will not turn back. Outrages against whole populations brought about the types of laws we are defending.

As an ex-chairman of the committee, I naturally was interested in following the tenor of the hearings. This committee has another ex-chairman, who also was greatly interested. I think I dare say for our side of the table that neither of us suggested that Ludwig Teller testify. Ludwig Teller is a labor lawyer of some recognition, but I am sure that he was suggested as a witness in view of the feeling shared by some that some steps have to be taken in regard to labor.

Yet Mr. Teller stated that the Ball proposal on industry-wide bargaining is—

> administratively unworkable because I do not think you can stop one affiliated local union from getting into contact with another affiliated union and making certain arrangements or adopting a common front.

In the Los Angeles area there was, as I recall, a fictitious third party, so that managements could get together and talk illegally. But that is another story. However, the present proposals invite the return of such conditions, and would do so in three ways.

Mr. Teller added the happy prophecy that—

> as we get back to normal bargaining, we shall find that the unions, even the steel union, are going to be more amenable to local settlements. There is a going back, I believe, to local bargaining that I think is discernible.

Mr. Teller did not exactly foresee that the steel business would, in a trice, reach a state of happy satisfaction, evidently, for all concerned, and with no satisfaction to those who would bait labor. But Mr. Teller, indeed, was in a foreseeing mood. He said, with some truth:

> I still recall the glee of the General Motors employees as they ran out of the plant when the strike was called. Now, that was partially, I believe, war fatigue.

A little later on he declared:

> So the war did come to an end and a lot of abnormal practices were indulged in. * * * I will say that if we use that crisis as a basis for things, then we might as well give up hope of continuing under the democratic process.

The same restraints were evidenced in Mr. Teller's testimony with respect to secondary boycotts. Any proposal to sweep away all secondary boycotts would be ruthless and ill-conceived, as the following testimony would indicate:

> The so-called secondary boycott should be regulated. Labor unions should have a right to engage in concerted activity against those who aid employers involved in labor disputes, but third parties innocent of participation in the primary dispute should be protected from such concerted activity. * * *
>
> In discussing this problem from a legislative point of view I think we have got to recognize that labor unions have a legitimate interest in furtherance of their economic activity to proceed against the company which is helping the person primarily engaged, and there are scores of judicial decisions so holding. I do not think those judicial decisions which have so held so many years should be overturned in the face of the fact that we recognize the desirability of labor unions. On the other hand, there are many cases where labor unions go outside the purview of their legitimate right to engage in secondary boycotts, going against third people so as to exert some kind of influence against them to affect the primary person or calling a city-wide strike, for example, because of a dispute with one employer in the city. Those all should be outlawed. But the legitimate interest in going against a company which aids another company which is engaged in a labor dispute, with knowledge thereof, I do not think should be outlawed.

I hold no brief for Mr. Teller, or for Mr. Teller's brief, which was filed in full, and I do not agree with all of his conclusions; but I do wish to stress the point that men of his wide experience and study in and of labor matters do not go mad. They do not conceive or support all of these wild schemes to rebuke, chastise, and destroy. Their expressions are continent and their ideas are worth reading and hearing. I did not summon Mr. Teller. I do not know who requested his appearance before our committee. But he added some distinction to our meetings, and I am grateful for the arrangement which included his testimony. I asked that a Negro girl be permitted to file a brief, and my request was granted in a moment. I requested that the Reverend Toner testify, and that request was immediately granted. If any request to

make the hearing full and fair was denied, I know nothing of it. I repeat that the committee's considerations were serious, and to some extent microscopic. That is the kind of study the Senate is entitled to. As a corollary, the restraints exercised by the committee should be a guide to Senators, and let me say that, if I dared hope this body would outcommittee the committee in that trend, I should be greatly pleased.

Mr. President, in the remarks which I am about to make concerning Senate bill 1126, to rewrite the Federal law dealing with labor relations and labor disputes, I do not intend to discuss its provisions in detail. That has been done and will be done by many other distinguished Members of this body. I have little doubt that the discussion pro and con on each of the bill's provisions will be important and enlightening. I propose, however, to confine myself to the significance of the bill in the light of the national labor policy which we in Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government have developed during the past 15 years.

On Wednesday, April 23, in opening the debate on this bill, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], told us that the problems dealt with in S. 1126 are "infinitely complicated." He said:

> I suppose there are at least 50 amendments to the present law in the pending bill. Wherever we found an injustice we tried to correct it; and, of course, the net result of correcting a number of injustices is incidentally to decrease some of the power of the labor-union leaders. It seems to me that our aim should be to get back to the point where, when an employer meets with his employees, they have substantially equal bargaining power, so that neither side feels that it can make an unreasonable demand and get away with it. If neither side feels that it can get away with certain demands, I do not believe that the demands will ever be made. If there is reasonable equality at the bargaining table, I believe that there is much more hope for labor peace. That is the method pursued by the bill which is now before the Senate. It is not an antilabor bill. It is not a bill inspired by a desire to wreak vengeance on anyone because of what he may have done. It simply proposes to deal with the causes of labor trouble and the injustices and inequities of the present law.
>
> Basically, I believe that the committee feels, almost unanimously, that the solution of our labor problems must rest on a free economy and on free collective bargaining. The bill is certainly based upon that proposition.

This is a very interesting statement on behalf of the proponents of the measure now before us. I should like to discuss point by point the philosophy behind the bill, as so ably stated by the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Certainly, few of us would disagree with the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee that the bill is "infinitely complicated." That is not surprising, for in legislating in the field of labor relations we are inevitably faced with complications. Labor relations involve something more than the play of economic conflicts and adjustments; there are involved in every case and every situation in this field complex problems of individuals and groups of individuals. In the solution of these problems vital interests are ordinarily at stake, with the result that situations which should, because of their complexity, receive the most calm and dispassionate study and appraisal possible, are frequently highly charged with feeling and emotion.

The debate which has been going on since VJ-day over the need and desirability of new labor legislation is proof itself of the truth of what I have said. The air, the press, and the Halls of Congress and the legislatures of the States have been filled with charges and countercharges, with threats and counterthreats, with calls to action against allegedly irresponsible union leadership and calls from union leadership to maintain the status quo.

In the atmosphere which has been generated it is difficult for us here in Congress to be able to see clearly and to understand the problems which should be dealt with by Federal legislation and what measures should be adopted for dealing with these problems. It is difficult for us to escape the emotionalism which characterizes discussions of these matters elsewhere. Yet, if we are to legislate as the Congress of the United States representing all the people of this Nation, we must attempt to disentangle the subject matter from its emotional trappings, and study and deal with the problems which are now before us calmly and dispassionately.

It is fortunate that as we consider the bill we do so at a time when industrial conditions are more peaceful than at any time since VJ-day. According to figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on April 29, 1947, work stoppages in the first quarter of 1947 were at their lowest levels since VJ-day. The time lost in establishments directly affected by such stoppages was less than one-sixteenth as great as in the first quarter of 1946. It would be no less important, however, to deal with this matter calmly and dispassionately even if this were not the case. The interests involved in the legislation are too vital to allow us to take hasty or ill-considered action. I applaud the statement of the chairman of the committee that the bill does not "wreak vengeance on anyone because of what he may have done." I hope that our consideration and action on the bill will be undertaken throughout in the spirit of that declaration.

In recent years a tendency has grown up of seeing labor relations primarily in terms of clashes in a quest for power between ambitious labor leaders and the managers of giant corporations, with the public caught squarely and helplessly in the middle of every controversy. Under this view, the rank and file of union members are regarded as mere pawns who are maneuvered into and out of the shops in which they work to suit the interests, or sometimes merely the whims, of their leaders. It is easy, if one accepts this view, to justify legislation which operates "incidentally to decrease some of the power of the labor union leaders" as promoting not only the general welfare of the majority of the people but also as advancing the welfare of the great mass of rank-and-file working people in the unions. It is easy to believe that as we decrease the power of labor union leaders we increase the freedoms of the rank-and-file members. We should be aware, however, lest the result of the legislation we adopt may be the restoration of old tyrannies, not the development and expansion of freedoms for the common man which we all seek.

We have heard the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, which recently passed the House and is now pending on the Senate Calendar, described as a new "Magna Carta" of the individual worker. As we consider this bill, it seems to me we will do well to bear in mind a few salient facts of labor history. We will do well to consider the laws which the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare now asks us to amend in the light of the conditions which gave rise to their enactment, the evils they were designed to remedy, the national policies of which they are expressions and implementations. Only if we bear in mind these facts will we be able clearly to understand the needs out of which our present national labor policies have developed, the essential elements of these policies, and the manner in which the bill now before us will affect these policies.

I referred a moment ago to the attitude which many persons today, including Members of Congress, appear to take toward the relations between unions and their leaders, on the one hand, and the rank and file of union members, on the other. In the past we have had a more realistic viewpoint expressed by experts in the field and by authoritative organs of Government. The reasons why individual workers are willing to surrender some of their freedoms by joining unions, as all persons do when they join organizations or associations, were very well described by Chief Justice Taft in the opinion of the Supreme Court delivered by him in the case of *American Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U. S. 184, 209), in which he said, and I quote:

> Labor unions * * * were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employer.

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary of this body, which was submitted on February 4, 1932, by our respected and courageous former colleague, the then senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris, recommending favorable action on the bill which was shortly thereafter enacted and has become known as the Norris-LaGuardia Act (Rept. No. 163, 72d Cong., 1st sess.) had this to say on the subject of the reasons why workers join unions and why their right to do so must be protected and implemented by safeguarding legislation:

> The right of wage earners to organize and to act jointly in questions affecting wages,

conditions of labor, and the welfare of labor generally is conceded and recognized by all students of the subject. An increasing necessity for the organization of labor has been brought about by modern economic conditions and methods of doing business, which have in the main been developed by the aid of governmental authority.

It is obvious that existing conditions under which large employers of labor possess unprecedented power to dictate contracts and conditions of employment have been developed through governmental grants of authority to form corporations and organizations of corporations, whereby thousands of owners of property are enabled to combine hundreds of millions of dollars of capital and, in this way, substantially to control and sometimes to monopolize opportunities for employment. Such a power, unrestrained by the organization of labor, would permit employers arbitrarily to fix the wages and conditions of labor under which millions of men and women would find their only opportunity to earn a living.

A single laborer, standing alone, confronted with such far-reaching, overwhelming concentration of employer power, and compelled to labor for the support of himself and family, is absolutely helpless to negotiate or to exert any influence over the fixing of his wages or the hours and conditions of his labor. A man must work in order to live. If he can exercise no control over his conditions of employment, he is subjected to involuntary servitude.

The efforts of the workers to preserve their freedom of association and their freedom in association to influence the fixing of wages and working conditions present questions which are unique and demand specific legislative action.

I call to the Senate's attention the fact that this report was submitted, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted, before the present administration, which has played such a large part in shaping our modern national labor policies, came into office on March 4, 1933. These policies are often thought of as the work of this administration exclusively. It is well to recall at this point that these policies were not initiated by this administration but received their first formulation during the Republican administration of President Hoover. The policies which have been developed by the present administration have in actuality merely been extensions of legislative safeguards of the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing which were first erected in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Since some of the provisions of the bill now before us would operate to waive the safeguards of the right to organize and bargain collectively, which are written into that act, it is not amiss, I believe, to recall to the Senate at this time the public policy of the United States set forth in section 2 of the act. That section reads:

In the interpretation of this act and in determining the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States, as such jurisdiction and authority are herein defined and limited, the public policy of the United States is hereby declared as follows:

Whereas under prevailing economic conditions, developed with the aid of governmental authority for owners of property to organize in the corporate and other forms of ownership association, the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment; wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; therefore, the following definitions of, and limitations upon, the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States are hereby enacted.

Mr. President, I pause to repeat what I said at the beginning of my remarks, relative to my strong reasons for opposing the pending amendment. It makes possible the return of all the evil practices attempted to be eradicated by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It represents a turning back of the clock, a return to the time when a lawyer, wishing to take advantage of the law, might, through the aid of the courts and the power of the Government, work against associations which the Chief Justice of the United States said were so essential to a man's liberty, and which the Congress said were so important, in order that workers might in some way or other preserve their rights.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act did not purport to cover the entire field of labor-management relations. It dealt only with an abuse of governmental power which had come to be regarded as intolerable and which had been used to destroy labor organizations and virtually all types of concerted activities to secure improvements in the wages, hours, and working conditions of wage earners. The act ended the period which the Democratic Party in its platform as long ago as 1896 described as "government by injunction."

The Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawed the so-called yellow-dog contract and prohibited the issuance of restraining orders or injunctions by any court of the United States against (a) strikes, (b) membership in unions, (c) payment of strike or unemployment benefits, (d) lawful assistance to persons involved in a labor dispute in any court proceeding, (e) publicizing the facts concerning labor disputes, (f) peaceful assembly to promote the interests of labor in a labor dispute, (g) advising, agreeing with, or urging others to do or not to do any of the foregoing. Mr. President, do we here in the Senate want to change those elements of our national labor policies which are written into the Norris-LaGuardia Act? Do we want to sanction for any reason or in any situation a return of the "yellow-dog" contract? If we do, we may be sure that it will not be labor peace that we are promoting, but labor warfare, discord, and confusion. Do we want to say that there are situations where injunctions against strikes or joining unions should be permitted? If we do that, we will be reversing the whole trend of our national labor policy beginning with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. For the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively and to engage in other concerted activities for mutual aid or protection we will be substituting Government compulsion and judge-made law once more. Yes, Mr. President, this is what we do when we authorize injunctive remedies without regard to the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932—the Norris-LaGuardia Act—entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, except in the particulars I have mentioned, does not prohibit the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. It merely limits the conditions under which such injunctions may be issued and the manner in which such suits are to be handled by the Federal courts.

Doubtless there are few today who would challenge the basic policy contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That act was not passed hurriedly. Senator Norris' report, to which I have made reference, recites the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary had been considering the subject of injunctions in labor disputes for several years and that the subject received active study either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate in the Seventieth and Seventy-first Congresses, as well as the Seventy-second Congress which finally enacted the measure into law. The committee had the benefit of the advice and assistance of eminent economists and attorneys who made a special study of this particular subject. I mention this fact, Mr. President, at this time because I believe that we cannot in dealing with the subject matter in the bill now before us, act intelligently without the benefit of the advice of experts in the field of labor relations and labor disputes. In preparing the Norris-LaGuardia Act the Judiciary Committee under Senator Norris recognized this fact. Unfortunately in the preparation of the pending bill the assumption seems to have been that the way to proceed is to legislate first and study afterwards.

At this point I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the hearings before the committee, in part 4 of which is set forth a lettter signed by teachers and professors of economics urging the committee to study the problems which it had before it for consideration before attempting to legislate in this field. Those teachers and professors are from every State and section of the country. I believe the committee has made a serious mistake in ignoring the advice of these experts and the advice of the President of the United States, and in failing to call upon disinterested experts to assist them in studying the problems in the field of labor relations and labor disputes. I think it would be well for the record of this debate to contain the letter to which I have referred. It reads as follows (hearings, part 4, pages 2402–2403):

AMHERST, MASS., *March 1, 1947.*

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at

once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that instead you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

We write you as a group of economists, political scientists, and other educators who have taken a keen interest in the problem of labor-management relations. We are convinced that no adequate solution to the problems of industrial unrest, which have disturbed the Nation's economic life since the end of the war, will be forthcoming except as the result of a careful, patient investigation of the present structure of collective bargaining, the problems on which it is most difficult to reach agreement in negotiations, and the present operation of the Wagner Act.

We are glad that your committee has announced a comprehensive and lengthy schedule of hearings. We do not believe, however, that committee hearings, valuable as they are as a forum for the expression of public opinion, can produce the objective record of factual material which is needed at the present time. Your committee hearings, as scheduled, must necessarily take place against the background of pending wage negotiations between several major industries and the unions representing their workers, and cannot help reflecting the pressures arising from this situation. Furthermore, the testimony heard will be directed at the bills under consideration by your committee and many of them seem to us to be punitive legislation designed to destroy many successful collective-bargaining practices and to jeopardize the rights of workers rather than to find solutions to existing problems.

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which propose now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problem of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Sincerely,

COLSTON E. WARNE,
Secretary for the Signers.

In saying that the committee should have undertaken careful study of the field of labor-management relations, with the aid of competent and expert students in this field, before attempting to legislate on the many problems dealt with in the bill before us, I do not want any Member of the Senate to infer that I am opposed to the enactment of any labor legislation at this session of the Congress. In the statement of minority views, in which I have been joined by the senior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from Florida, we have made specific reference to those provisions of the bill which we regard as acceptable, either in their present form or with modifications. Our primary concern is not that Congress shall not enact any labor legislation but that it shall not enact any antilabor legislation. It is our belief that there are provisions in the bill which are antilabor in their effects. It is my belief that the inclusion of such provisions in the bill has occurred not because any member of the committee wishes to saddle labor unions and their leaders with unjust or unfair restrictions, but because the committee has not had either the time or the expert assistance in studying the problems dealt with in the bill and the provisions which are necessary for the development of sound labor legislation consistent with the basic purposes of our national labor policy which will promote real industrial stability and peace.

I have already referred to some of the policy considerations which prompted Congress to enact the Norris-LaGuardia Act. We should not be unmindful today of the conditions which prevailed at the time this act was made a part of the law of the land. In an article in the Washington Post of January 5, 1947, Post Reporter Alfred Friendly tells the story of one labor injunction which graphically illustrates the nature and effect of judicial intervention in labor disputes during the era of "Government by injunction." The story is as follows:

The time was September, 1927, and the period was one which is known as the age of "Government by injunction."

The United Mine Workers were striking certain collieries in Pennsylvania. As was the custom, the companies fought the union with injunctions.

One concern procured an order from Judge Langham, of the Pennsylvania State Court, which, among other prohibitions, forbade the striking miners from "congregating on the Magyar Presbyterian Church lot, or any other lot, lots, place or places," at the time the nonstrikers were entering or leaving the mine, and "from singing song or songs in hearing of the employees * * * of a threatening or hostile nature."

The vice president and general manager of the corporation explained why the injunction was sought:

The church lot was the only place, he said, which the company did not itself own, on which the strikers could gather and from which point—with the aid of field glasses to be sure—they could observe operations at the pit head. By their singing, the strikers had "intended to intimidate our men."

How far was the church from the place the workers had to pass to go into the mines? More than a quarter of a mile. Could the words of the songs be heard by the workers? A Senate investigating committee considered it "very doubtful * * * unless the winds were very favorable."

And what were the intimidating songs which had been sung and which, under injunction, could no longer be chanted? Well, there was Hymn No. 166, entitled "The Victory May Depend on You"; No. 66, "Sound the Battle Cry"; No. 266, "Nearer My God to Thee"; and No. 44, "Stand Up for Jesus," with which the strikers had really played dirty pool. They had changed the words to "We Are on the Winning Side."

That injunction, if not typical, is at least illustrative of the type of court order which American corporations procured from 1880 to 1932 to smash union organization and wage drives. Hundreds upon hundreds of such injunctions were obtained in what, it now is clear, was one of the most grievous perversions of the law in its long and perverted history.

The Committee on the Judiciary in its favorable report on the bill which became the Norris-LaGuardia Act dealt with another problem which is raised by the provisions of the bill now before us which seek to "decrease some of the power of the labor-union leaders." It is provided in the Norris-LaGuardia Act that—

No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association and no organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

The Judiciary Committee in its 1932 report pointed out that—

In most cases where strikes occur involving a great many employers and employees and covering a comparatively large territory, there are often unlawful acts committed in the way of injury to property or to persons. It is not the intention of the bill to protect anybody, whether he be employer or employee, from punishment for the commission of unlawful acts either as against property or persons. But no person or organization should be held thus liable unless he or it caused the unlawful act or participated in it or ratified it. It has often occurred that employers themselves have secured the services of detectives who, under the guise of labor men, had gained admission into labor unions. When this happens, these detectives are usually doing everything within their power to incite employees who are on strike to commit acts of violence, and such detectives, contrary to the definite instructions of labor-union leaders, sometimes commit unlawful acts for the express and only purpose of laying the foundation for injunctive process, of bringing discredit upon the union, and of making its officers and members liable for damages.

In case of a strike, where the officers of the labor union are doing everything within their power to prevent acts of violence from being committed by any person, the law should fully protect them and save them and the members of their organization who are following their advice from liability in damages because of unlawful acts of persons who are either directly or indirectly connected with those who are trying to defeat the purposes of the strike.

In the bill before us we have provisions defining certain unfair labor practices by labor organizations and providing for suits for violations of collective bargaining contracts. Without the safeguarding clause which is contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act providing that unions shall be liable only upon clear actual proof of authorization, participation in, or ratification of such unfair labor practices or contract violations, these provisions may well, in the language of the 1932 report, "go far toward the destruction of organized labor." The chairman of the committee in his explanation of the bill has stated that one of the major objectives of the bill is to insure "reasonable equality at the bargaining table." He expressed his belief that if this were accomplished there would be much more hope for labor peace.

Parenthetically it may be pointed out that equality at the bargaining table does not necessarily insure labor peace. The major controversy and conflicts in the field of management which have occurred since VJ-day do not, in my judgment, grow out of difficulties in the structure of collective bargaining established by the National Labor Relations Act. These conflicts and controversies

arose because of basic conflicts of interests which have accompanied the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

It was inevitable that following the termination of active hostilities in the war with Japan major shifts in our economy should take place. It was inevitable that there should be major changes in opportunities for employment and in the wage structure of industry. The result of these changes has been that after VJ-day there was an immediate downward pressure on take-home pay—the money that the worker took home in his pay envelope at the end of the week or month, as the case may be. This pressure took the form of loss of overtime, down grading of jobs, reconversion lay-offs, and other direct reductions in the worker's income. Beginning with the temporary holiday in price controls in the summer of 1946, the worker's income was also pushed downward from another direction; namely, increased prices. Confronted with these twin pressures on his income, it was not surprising that the workers through their unions fought with every means at their disposal to protect the standards of living which they had attained during the war years.

Let us look at some of the facts. According to BLS data, take-home pay in terms of 1939 dollars for the average worker in manufacturing with a family of four decreased from $31.11 per week in August of 1945 to $29.69 per week in February 1947. This may not appear to be a substantial decline. However, during this same period average hourly earnings for manufacturing rose from $1.02 to $1.17. On a weekly basis, this amounts to about $5 a week. If these wage concessions won by the workers during that period had not occurred, the worker would have faced a decline in take-home pay of about $6.50 per week, instead of the $1.50 that actually occurred.

Unless this Congress takes action to enact into law the sound program of social legislation which the President has recommended, including the extension and broadening of our Social Security System, better housing, a comprehensive national program to reduce the incidence of the high cost of medical care, and provision for a fair minimum wage, it will, in my judgment, do little toward eliminating the basic causes of labor disputes and assuring labor peace. As has been said in the minority views which I and the senior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from Florida have submitted in opposition to the enactment of S. 1126 in its present form:

> The problems involved in attempting to deal with the difficult and complicated labor controversies of this time are not merely matters of governmental machinery. We cannot approach these problems solely on the basis of prohibitions and restrictions on the activities of private citizens, whether they be employers, labor organizations, or their members. The causes of labor-management controversy lie deep in the complex industrial and financial structure.
>
> Without attention to the problems to which the President directed attention in his message on the state of the Union, such legislation as the Congress may enact may well take on unwittingly the character of vindictive, punitive legislation, against which the Congress has frequently been warned. Measures to extend and broaden the Social Security System, to provide for better housing, to establish a comprehensive national health program, and to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to a level commensurate with present-day conditions are pending before the Congress. In the absence of action on these measures by this Congress, the proposal of the majority may well promote, instead of resolve, the industrial discord and strife which they, like we, wish to avoid.

Leaving aside, however, the question of whether improvement of the machinery of collective bargaining will go very far toward promoting labor peace, how is it proposed in the bill now before us to assure "reasonable equality at the bargaining table"?

In his explanation of the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act during debate on the measure in the Senate on May 15, 1935, the distinguished senior Senator from New York whose name has become so closely associated with this act that it is normally known as the Wagner Act, told this body:

> The national labor relations bill does not break with our traditions. It is the next step in the logical unfolding of man's eternal quest for freedom. For 25 centuries of recorded time before the machine age he sought relief from nature's cruel and relentless tyranny. Only 150 years ago did this country cast off the shackles of political despotism. And today, with economic problems occupying the center of the stage, we strive to liberate the common man from destitution, from insecurity, and from human exploitation.
>
> In this modern aspect of a time-worn problem the isolated worker is a plaything of fate. Caught in the labyrinth of modern industrialism and dwarfed by the size of corporate enterprise, he can attain freedom and dignity only by cooperation with others of his group. This truism has been paid at least the lip service of universal opinion. It is on the page of every treatise and in the platform of every political party.

Just as the Norris-LaGuardia Act had for its purpose the ending of the era of "government by injunction" when judge-made law rather than free collective bargaining was the method of settling labor controversies, so the National Labor Relations Act put an end to practices by employers which impede the process of free collective bargaining. The Wagner Act is frankly designed to protect workers and their unions from employer practices which make a mockery of collective bargaining. Thereby it assured more equitable distribution of the Nation's goods among the people of this country and more harmonious relations between those in industry, employers and workers alike, who produce those goods.

How does the Wagner Act accomplish these results? As I have said, that act sets up procedure whereby certain unfair labor practices may be prohibited by the National Labor Relations Board. Each of these unfair labor practices is specifically designed to assure free collective bargaining between an employer and his employees through representatives of their own choosing. The act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to interfere with or coerce employees in the exercise of their right to form, join, or assist labor unions to bargain collectively through the representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. Just as the employer is to be free to organize his business in the manner he chooses consistent with the laws of the United States so his employees are to be free to form unions without interference from their employer.

The act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor union or to contribute financial or other support to it. This provision, too, is designed to assure that unions shall be freely organized by employees and that the employer shall not be allowed to evade his collective-bargaining responsibilities through the mechanism of employer-dominated unions. It is obvious that there can be no bargaining if the same party sits on both sides of the bargaining table. This provision assures that there shall be two parties to collective bargaining—the workers through their union and the employer through his representatives.

The act also makes it an unfair labor practice for employers to adopt employment practices which discriminate against employees because of membership in a labor union. It is obvious that unless employees are free from "yellow dog" contracts and other devices to discourage union membership free collective bargaining between unions and employers is impossible.

The act also makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board under the act. This provision is designed to make certain that employees may utilize the procedures to assure collective bargaining which the act provides without danger of reprisals from employers.

Finally, the act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees. There is no need to labor the point that this provision is specifically designed to promote and assure free collective bargaining.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is nothing in any of these provisions which in any way gives to labor a bargaining power superior to that of the employer. There is nothing in this act which requires amendment in order to assure reasonable equality at the bargaining table.

How does the bill attempt to assure equality at the bargaining table? It defines certain unfair labor practices by labor organizations as well as by employers.

Does making it an unfair labor practice for a union to interfere with or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances assure equality of bargaining? If this provision is designed, as the chairman of the committee has suggested, to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to insist on bargaining on an area or industry-wide basis, then it may have, in effect, the exact opposite of that intended. This

section then deals not with the procedure of bargaining but with the scope of bargaining itself. Limiting the subjects of collective bargaining does not make for free collective bargaining. On the contrary, it restricts collective bargaining and promotes industrial strife and confusion.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to enter into a union shop or maintenance-of-management agreement an unfair labor practice assure equality of bargaining? This provision deals with the administration of collective-bargaining agreements, not with the procedure of collective bargaining.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to engage in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts assure equality of bargaining? Admittedly, there are abuses in labor's resort to unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes which are proper subjects of Federal legislation. We have indicated in our statement of minority views that it would be reasonable to proscribe unjustified secondary boycotts as unfair labor practices and to set up machinery for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes. This problem, however, has nothing to do with assuring equality of bargaining. It makes no contribution toward establishing a relationship of equality at the bargaining table.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for either an employer or for a labor organization to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement assure equality of bargaining? This provision, like the provision relating to the administration of union shop and the maintenance-of-membership agreements, relates to the operation of collective-bargaining agreements, not to the procedure of collective bargaining.

In only one particular does the definition of unfair labor practices by labor organizations have any bearing upon the question of how equality at the bargaining table is to be assured. It is proposed that, just as it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, so it would be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to refuse to bargain collectively with the employer. Another provision of the bill, for the first time, attempts to define collective bargaining. The bill provides that failure by the employer to follow the procedures set forth in the definition of collective bargaining is to be regarded merely as an unfair labor practice subject to a cease and desist order from the Board. Violation of these procedures by a union, however, subjects the employees not only to such a cease-and-desist order, but also to loss of status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act. This additional penalty discriminates unfairly against the employees. Its effect is very far from assuring equality at the bargaining table. Under this provision, the act would operate to force employees to resort to economic self-help upon the failure of the officers of their union to perform in every detail the procedural requirements of collective bargaining, and would, in effect, destroy collective bargaining.

Mr. President, the multiplicity of new definitions in the law which the enactment of the pending measure would bring about, together with the right and invitation to resort once more to the courts, would constitute, of course, an invitation to a return to confusion and to the days when men actually lost their rights through the action of the courts and through the action of other branches of government.

The National Labor Relations Act was adopted, to use the words of the chairman of the committee, "for the one purpose of equalizing or permitting a large number of employees to act as one; in effect, to compel them to act as one if the majority desired such action." He concedes that giving workers that power of collective action was justified because of the undoubted advantage previously possessed by employers in dealing with their employees, and that making provision for concerted employee action resulted in placing workers on a sound and equal basis. He further asserts that much of what he calls the injustices and inequities of the present act are the result of its biased administration by the original Board, and that the present Board, fair as he concedes it to be, is so hampered by the inequitable precedents established by its earliest predecessor that it is impossible to rectify the situation without legislation.

But Senate bill 1126 contains many provisions which are wholly irrelevant to the problem of remedying injustices and inequities to employers. For example, the bill outlaws the closed shop. But the act neither created nor imposed the closed shop, it merely recognized it. In fact, the Wagner Act even limited the union shop, as well as the closed shop, by permitting it only where it resulted from an agreement with a union which was not employer-dominated or assisted, and which was the recognized bargaining representative of a majority of the employees in the unit. Hence it would be more accurate to say that if the closed shop resulted in injustices or inequities, the Wagner Act eliminated those abuses by imposing the democratic principles of free choice and majority rule.

It is likewise far from clear how protecting the rights of professional employees, as this measure professes to do, helps in any way to restore the employer to a position of equality. Professional employees, as such, cannot be regarded as representatives of management. They are employees in exactly the same fashion as are all other workers. Separate or special treatment for that group, if it is to benefit the employer, can only do so by dividing his employees and emphasizing their conflicting, rather than their common, interests, thereby defeating the very purpose of the act. The same considerations apply with equal force to the special treatment Senate bill 1126 proposes to give to craft unions.

The chairman of the committee acknowledges that the Supreme Court has held that the Wagner Act does not deprive the employer of free speech. Would an injustice be corrected by providing by legislation that employers be given a right they already enjoy under the strongest of all guaranties—the protection of our Constitution?

Many of the so-called inequities to which reference has been made in the course of this debate are conceded by him to have existed only during the early days of the Board. If these abuses no longer exist—and from the necessary implications of the chairman's statement, it must be presumed that he, too, believes they no longer exist—then why legislate against nonexistent injustices? Why abolish the Board's Review Section? Why destroy the Board's discretion to order elections for certification of bargaining representatives? Those provisions of Senate bill 1126 seem to me to be instances of legislating for the mere sake of writing legislation.

This measure compels labor organizations to file detailed annual financial statements and reports with the Secretary of Labor as a necessary prerequisite to resort to the Board to invoke any of the remedies or procedures provided by the act. I have exercised both my mind and imagination to their limits, and I cannot for the life of me see how these provisions in any way aid the employer to escape from his allegedly unequal status under the present act. The chairman of the committee admits that today many unions do keep their members informed of the union's financial activities. No abuse exists which these provisions will remedy. As a matter of fact, compelling unions by law to file such reports is the very acme of inequality, because no other form of voluntary association today is compelled to do the same.

In his state of the Union message, the President of the United States recommended legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act. Those recommendations manifested a clear-sighted recognition on the part of the President that the activities he advocated outlawing were not activities whereby labor organizations achieved the purposes of the Wagner Act; but he was careful not to recommend a total ban of the secondary boycott.

It is unmistakably obvious that the secondary boycott used in aid of an attempt to secure the legitimate goals of trade unions, such as higher wages, shorter hours, more favorable terms and conditions of employment, and the maintenance of hard-won working standards, is not only morally defensible, but in many instances utterly essential. Deprived of the use of this economic weapon for the purposes I have mentioned, labor unions would frequently find it difficult, indeed impossible, to attain that position of equality of bargaining power with their employers which the Wagner Act was designed to confer upon American workers. Is this what is meant by restoring equality of bargaining strength as between employer and employees? Does the Wagner Act legalize the secondary boycott used in aid of legitimate union goals? Clearly the answer must be "No."

In passing the Wagner Act, Congress wished to provide a means for reducing and eliminating inequality of bargaining

power between employees and their employer which leads to wage cutting and depressed purchasing power and to intolerable industrial strife. Congress could have attempted to develop minute and detailed regulations of every aspect of industrial relations. It chose, instead, to adopt a legislative scheme designed to establish a parity of bargaining power which would enable employees by their own voluntary associated action to negotiate for the elimination of the evils of low wages, long hours, and substandard working conditions. In choosing this course of action Congress took a long step forward toward the realization of a free American way of life by the workers of this country. Genuine freedom of contract was secured, genuine freedom of contract which can exist only where the bargaining is between parties of equal strength, that genuine freedom of contract which constitutes the backbone of our tradition and the secret of our unrivaled freedoms and our unparalleled development and economic well-being.

S. 1126 represents a marked retreat from the philosophy of labor-management relations embodied in the Wagner Act. It goes far beyond the correction of abuses, and weakens organized labor and restores the imbalance which prevailed prior to the Wagner Act's adoption. It drives a wedge through the legislative rampart which has thus far protected us against Government regimentation. For if the unions of free American workingmen are weakened, as is proposed in the bill before us, Government regulation of every detail of the relations between workers and employers and of the internal conduct of each will follow as the night follows the day.

The chairman of the committee has told us that S. 1126 represents a return to the principles of free enterprise and free, collective bargaining. In fact, this measure increases manyfold the amount of governmental intervention and interference both in the collective bargaining process and in the internal affairs of labor unions. Instead of returning to free and voluntary relations between labor and management, S. 1126 takes a radical departure from these principles, as an examination of what it does will readily reveal.

Let us take, for example, the various provisions of the bill which waive the requirements of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in the obtaining of injunctions in certain types of labor disputes. In jurisdictional disputes, the National Labor Relations Board would be required to get an injunction from the Federal courts before proceeding with its responsibilities in connection with determining the dispute. The Board would be permitted to seek an injunction in cases where unfair labor practice proceedings were brought on the basis of alleged breach of a collective bargaining agreement. The emergency provisions of the bill allow the Attorney General to apply to the Federal courts for an injunction against a threatened or actual strike which he considers imperils the national health or safety. The effect of these provisions is that the Government becomes a party to many labor disputes, and would undoubtedly be a party to all major labor disputes. It is easy to forget that when the injunctive process is authorized in labor disputes the Government is necessarily brought into such disputes. In this connection, I think it will be well for the Senate to weigh carefully the words of the 1932 report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in recommending favorable action on the Norris-LaGuardia Act:

> It has long been recognized by students of law and government that the power to make law and the power to enforce law should be separated as a protection against tyranny. To prevent executive tyranny, the legislative power has been carefully separated from the executive power in our scheme of Government and to prevent judicial tyranny it is equally necessary to preserve the separation of the legislative power from the judicial power.
>
> A warning against the growing exercise of legislative power by the courts in injunction cases was uttered long ago by the great commentator, Blackstone, in the following language:
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is amazing to realize that in the last 40 years there has developed in the American courts the practice of writing a special law to fit the individual case by judges in issuing labor injunctions; and that thereupon the judge, who himself wrote the law, has undertaken to prescribe the penalty for its violation and to punish the violator without permitting the accused to enjoy a trial by jury or even to insist upon a trial before another judge. It cannot be successfully claimed that the courts have not written into these injunction cases a new law of labor dispute, fitting the law to each particular case, and then enforcing this new law made by the court.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is difficult to see how any civilized people could indefinitely submit to such tyrannical procedure. It is not difficult to understand how such cruel laws, made not by any legislature but by a judge upon the bench, should bring our Federal courts into disrepute. Neither is it difficult to see how such injunctions, violating the conscience of civilization, should frighten persons against whom such injunctions are issued into desperation. What free American citizen is willing to submit to the violation of his sacred rights of human liberty and freedom?

Under the bill, the law would be made by the judiciary at the suit of the executive branch. What is this but an increase in governmental control of labor-management relations and Government intervention in the collective-bargaining process beyond anything we have ever known in the history of the United States?

Or let us take the provision for elections to be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the question of union security arrangements—and I might say that it is perfectly clear to me that removing the question of union security from the area of free collective bargaining, and subjecting it to statutory conditions, is in itself an instance of increased rather than decreased Government intervention. In requiring Government-supervised elections in such cases we have more, not less, Government control and regulation. I should have thought that it would be more consistent with less Government control to let the membership decide for itself whether it wanted union security, without compelling resort to a Government agency, and to encourage employers voluntarily to bargain collectively on any issue with the freely chosen representative of their employees, without requiring a Government agency to step in first and give that representative its imprimatur.

Or consider the provisions which open the Federal courts to damage suits for breach of collective bargaining agreements. Not content with the unfair labor practice provisions relative to breaches of collective-bargaining agreements, the authors of S. 1126 now propose to give the Government two bites at the cherry. It must be remembered that these provisions do not, in fact, give a remedy where none previously existed, although some care has been taken to create the impression that they do. What these provisions really do is to invite the Federal district courts to police the parties in their adherence to their collective-bargaining agreements by dispensing with the sensible statutory requirement of a jurisdictional amount of $3,000 and the constitutional requirement of diversity of citizenship. I am firmly convinced that this is a vain effort, because I am sure that the suits contemplated by these provisions will not be regarded by the courts as presenting any Federal question. But this is beside the point I am making—that the cry of free enterprise and voluntary collective bargaining is not based on fact, and that S. 1126 will actually vastly increase the number and the complexity of Federal controls.

Another instance of increased Government controls which would result from the bill is the provision which would allow an employer to ask the National Labor Relations Board to decertify a union as collective bargaining representative when he thinks it may no longer have the majority which would entitle it to represent his employees. This section would place the might of the Federal Government behind an employer who simply did not wish to bargain. As I understand the law now, when the employer doubts the union's majority, he need only refuse to bargain, and the law will protect him should it be determined that his doubts were justified. But under this bill, he could call in the Federal Government to certify him in that refusal. Apart from the obvious usefulness of this provision as a delaying device, to be used in bad faith as well as in good, I can see no sense in bringing in the Federal Government to do for an employer what he can do for himself under the law as it stands.

But it would require the most fantastic reasoning of all to square with the concept of free collective bargaining and less government controls the emergency provisions of the bill. I suppose there is virtually unanimous agreement that close attention must be given to the problem of strikes which tie up the economy of the entire Nation or endanger the health or safety of a substantial proportion of its population. The President recognized this in his state of the Union message, and we have pending in this body a resolution which would carry out his recommendation that particular study be given to this problem and to

finding a solution which will not endanger our basic democratic freedoms.

Senate bill 1126, however, with fine disregard for democratic freedoms, purports to have the solution. In the course of working it out in practice under the provisions of the bill, it would involve intervention by the Attorney General, the Federal courts, the Federal Mediation Service, the President, Congress, and the National Labor Relations Board. Indeed, it would appear that the entire Federal Government must drop whatever it is doing and go to work on such a strike. The role of the parties themselves is practically negligible, and the role of the employees most insignificant of all, since they would be required to submit to an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the issue whether they wish to accept the employer's final offer. If, as has been so often said, "labor unions have come of age," it would not seem that it is necessary to have them speak to employers through an agency of the Government. I confess I am unable to see how the vast labyrinth of governmental machinery through which these disputes would be processed can possibly be termed a decrease of governmental controls or a device for promoting free enterprise and voluntary collective bargaining.

Mr. President, of course I cannot look into the future. Senators know the past; and they are aware that in the matter of labor relations it was bad. In a case arising under a State statute enacted in 1898, the Supreme Court of the United States for the first time upheld a law protecting an employer in the matter of hours of labor, and diminishing, as claimed by those who were seeking to overturn the law, a man's freedom to bargain as he wished, to contract as he wished, and to work as he wished. With that decision, a new period began in industrial relations.

The Supreme Court decision recognized a public interest in the length of time that miners could work. It recognized in the second place, that a man's right to work is not absolute, without reference to the rights of other men to work. It recognized that the conditions under which a man works may be either beneficial or detrimental to his fellow workers, that his right is a relative right.

There came into existence a theory of attempting to improve labor standards by law of protecting the worker in his rights. As a result of this, two laws were enacted, the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. By the enactment of those two laws the Federal Government moved into a sphere supposedly belonging exclusively to the States. As a result of decisions by the United States Supreme Court on the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Eight-Hour-Day Act, in 1938, attention turned to the Congress. The Supreme Court repudiated earlier decisions holding that manufacturing, agriculture, and mining were of purely local concern, and declared that no commercial activity within the United States could be considered as of purely local concern. The Court began to share with the people a recognition of the fact that, once a surplus is produced in any community, that surplus becomes of national concern and ceases to be a matter merely of local concern. Under later decisions by the Court, that principle has become established in the fundamental law of the land.

The pending measure does not imply that the laws enacted in 1898, 1935, and 1938 were wrong; on its face, it approves them. It reenacts certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, with a modification of the right to strike. The rights of the laboring man are recognized, and he is assured that Congress will not take away those rights. The pending measure then proceeds, not in 10 pages or 20 pages, but in 40 pages, to lay down new definitions, extending an invitation to those who wish to take advantage of the law to make use once more of the power of government to bring about a return to the labor conditions of the early thirties.

Mr. President, not a single speaker has advocated such retrogression. No one supporting the pending measure has favored wiping the National Labor Relations Act from the statute books. In fact, provision is made in the bill to increase the functions of the National Labor Relations Board. But the new definitions, the new invitations to use of the injunctive process in labor disputes, and the recently enacted portal-to-portal pay legislation indicate a complete right-about-face in labor legislation.

It is said, Mr. President, that that is because of dissatisfaction over strikes and other industrial disturbances. When the Full Employment Act became a part of the law of the land provision was made not only for a fiscal budget each year, but also for an economic budget, giving some idea of the expenditures required of the Government in order to insure full employment.

Now, Mr. President, we are not only forgetting that philosophy, but we are proposing to return to the conditions of a period when punitive legislation was indulged in. We are again proposing to invoke vindictive measures; we are trying once again to make use of the hate process and the advantage-taking process in order to restore to one side, which had all the advantage in the 150 years of our history until 1935, the advantage it previously had. Is there anyone in the legal profession so pure that when hired by a client he will not work for the advantage of the client and use every advantageous means the law allows him to use? A lawyer who would not avail himself of all the legal advantages would be an unfair lawyer, an unfair advocate. When we invite a return to the methods and practices of the past we may rest assured that they will be indulged in, not for the benefit of the American people, not for the benefit of the American workers, not for the benefit of industry in the long run, but for the benefit of the advantage takers, and the result will be chaos, unemployment, and a return to those "good old days" when men stood entirely for property rights, and when the individual rights were quite forgotten.

For one I do not wish to return to those days, Mr. President. I, for one, am not the least bit interested in seeing the new freedoms which have come to the American workmen wiped out, no matter how much I may disapprove some things which some American workmen have done. I have seen these things at close hand. I have seem them in England and in many other countries. I know the spirit of peoples. I know the boycott from living in the land where the boycott had its origin, and where it was the most exacting instrument to keep a government from imposing unjust taxes upon the people. I have seen the great British Government brought to its knees inside of 12 hours by the power of the boycott among the money-changers in the British Colony of Hong Kong. I know the force of the boycott. I know how it works, and I know its purposes. I know that it is only through the use of such methods that the under-dog has had any kind of chance at all in the world.

Mr. President, I do not want to see a return to the time when, in the name of justice for everyone, there was in reality justice for no one, when, in the name of equalizing conditions, conditions were made more unequal.

Mr. President, the enactment of the pending bill into law and the enactment into law of the portal-to-portal bill will mean an open invitation for return to the "good old days." In considering those measures Congress has not taken into consideration the simple facts of our present economic system. The facts are simply told and easily digested. I read from an editorial published in the La Follette Progressive, as follows:

> The facts are simply told and easily digested: Fact No. 1. Corporation profits have soared 34 percent in a single year and are now at the highest peak in the war or peacetime history of the United States. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)
>
> Fact No. 2. Prices for consumers during that same year have soared 19 percent. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)
>
> Fact No. 3. Wages for labor advanced only 14 percent during the same year—and in some fields much less or not at all. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.)
>
> Fact No. 4. Savings of American individuals during the same year have dropped to the lowest level since 1941 and to half the amount saved in 1945. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission.)
>
> The whole story is right there. American labor, at the peak of its productivity, finds more and more of the wealth it creates going out in profits. Meanwhile, its own cost of staying alive is shooting skyward. At the same time it is being cut off from its financial and psychological anchor—security in the form of savings.

Mr. President, those are economic facts. In considering the measures to which I have referred no one described the conditions up to the last war and the strikes which took place then. No one pointed out how prices went up and how prices came down; how there were minor depressions and major depressions, until finally there was the great depression. No one took into consideration the whole economic field in spite of the fact that we passed the Full Employment Act. No one in the Government has given us the real facts about these conditions.

Can we have anything but unrest in a time when insecurity exists? There is one little town in the United States where one branch, one activity of the United States Government is located. Due to the action of the Congress in cutting down expenses 69 persons have been taken from the pay roll in that single office. That means undoubtedly that 69 families in that small town are without income, because the breadwinning members of the families are out of employment. Do we not have gumption enough, do we not have knowledge enough to look back to what happened after the last war and try to learn from past experience? A movement is now underway to cut down expenses, and deprive people of their work. Is it not time for us to change our philosophy of government in that regard and not produce unemployment? If the Federal Government continues in the course it has begun to follow the State governments will follow suit; then big industry will follow suit; thereupon little industry will have to follow suit, and we will have self-imposed unemployment at a time when production is the greatest, when demand is the greatest, when purchasing power is at its highest. We will actually and willfully be paying no attention to economic facts, but will deliberately be bringing about a condition which cannot help but end in a mighty wave of unemployment and another depression.

Mr. President, I have been connected all my life with a business, and have lived through good times, bad times, panics, rich men's panics, money panics, actual depressions. I do not have to go outside the experience of my own family to know how terrible such things are. I do not want to see panic and depression times come back. But, Mr. President once we begin breaking down the very foundations on which the habits of our citizens are built, and on which they have learned to depend, we shall find that uncertainty, lack of confidence, and fear, will bring about a dangerous economic condition. If we continue to cut away these foundations, the end will not be far off.

I predict that if the portal-to-portal measure becomes law, that if the House labor bill becomes law, or if the bill now pending in the Senate becomes law, and we ask the Government of the United States and the courts of the United States to interpret all the new definitions which are written in those measures, we will be compelled to go through a period as long as the one we have heretofore gone through in attempting to discover what is the basic law of the land in regard to industry-labor relations; we will have to do all that over again, and the new interpretations will cover page after page of the law reports.

Mr. President, that is not the American way of establishing stability. That is not the way in which during the past 150 years we worked out the best and most stable government on earth, a government of law. When once great fundamentals have been established it is better to build on those fundamentals, and have them reinterpreted, than to invite the courts to move into the field of law which for 50 years the courts have been told to stay away from. Such action on the part of Congress will not bring about industrial peace, labor peace, or governmental stability. It will result in bringing into American life confusion, uncertainty, and in the end such confusion and uncertainty cannot help but promote evil in our body politic, in our social system, and in our economic life.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a substitute for the pending amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment offered by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE), it is proposed on page 54, between lines 4 and 5, to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any person to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the promises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relation Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

SEGREGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which House bill 1098, to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation was ordered to a third reading and passed on May 6, be reconsidered.

The object in asking for reconsideration is to correct the language. The Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, has pointed out to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee [Mr. BUTLER] that by the language of the bill interest is charged on interest in the funds of those tribes. The Comptroller suggests that the language be changed so that only the principal, and not the interest, would be subject to interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Wyoming know of any objection to the amendments which have been suggested by the Comptroller General?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I know of no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator intend to ask for consideration of the amendments and repassage of the bill at this time?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Subject to the right to resume the unfinished business, I have no objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The amendments are very brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which House bill 1098 was ordered to a third reading and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 1, on page 1, line 10, after the word "amount", it is proposed to strike out "to a trust fund" and insert "in the principal"; in the same line, after the word "account", it is proposed to strike out "for" and insert "to a principal trust fund account and one-half of the total amount in the interest account to an interest trust account for."

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, on page 2, line 5, after the word "The", it is proposed to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Comptroller General of the United States"; in line 7, after the word "and", it is proposed to

strike out "to" and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury shall"; in line 10, after the word "interest", it is proposed to strike out "earned" and insert "shall accrue on the principal fund only"; in line 11, after the words "per annum", it is proposed to insert a comma and the word "and"; in the same line, after the words "credited to the", it is proposed to strike out "principal" and insert "interest"; and in line 15, after the words "credited to the", it is proposed to insert "principal."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 8, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross;

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when the proposed compact between the United States and the Dominion of Canada with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway was presented to the Senate, the bill undertaking to improve it and implement it, together with the compact—or treaty, as I prefer to call it—was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Since then another bill has been introduced and has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

When the St. Lawrence seaway treaty was before the Senate, together with the first bill, known as the Aiken bill, and was under the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Commerce, that committee was headed by the late Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina. Blessed be his memory. The late Senator Bailey was not only a great student, a man of profound knowledge, and great ability, but was very thorough in any undertaking to which he applied himself. He wanted all the information he could obtain with reference to the treaties which existed between Canada and the United States regarding boundary lines and boundary waters, and also all the information he could obtain with respect to the proposed compact. Therefore, among other things, he addressed a letter to each of the American-flag steamship lines operating from Atlantic and Gulf ports and on the Great Lakes asking the various steamship lines whether they expected to utilize the seaway if constructed, and to what extent, and requesting their views generally on the subject matter of the proposed treaty. He received replies from practically all the steamship companies to which he addressed letters. He addressed them to the American lines operating along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast and to quite a number of steamship companies operating on the Great Lakes.

He received 32 replies. He was anxious prior to his death that those replies be laid before the United States Senate. That task has been assigned to me. I regard it as a very solemn obligation. I am proposing now to discharge the duty which I owe to the late Senator Bailey.

I shall not at this time enter upon a discussion of the treaty. I merely wish to read these letters in order that they may appear in the body of the RECORD. I ask that I may proceed without interruption until the reading of the letters has been concluded.

The first letter which I shall read is from the Robin Line, Seas Shipping Co., Inc., 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y. It is dated April 12, 1946, addressed to Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, and reads as follows:

SEA SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 12, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12, 1946, in which you requested my views on the proposal to construct a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and install power production facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. You asked whether we have any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with our own ships.

At this time, we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with any of our vessels. The vessels which we own and will operate in commercial service are all large and could not safely navigate the proposed 27-foot channel when fully laden. This condition is true of a very great majority of commercial vessels under the American flag today.

The proposed seaway might be helpful to foreign shipowners who have vessels of medium size and with comparatively shallow draft. The majority of American shipowners seem to be opposed to the proposition since they anticipate that the seaway would be used by foreign-flag vessels with a consequent reduction in freight available to American-flag vessels using the major seaports of the United States.

It does not appear to me that the proposed seaway would offer any very great savings to shippers. Water transportation via the Great Lakes and New York State Barge Canal is available to Midwest shippers and I doubt that the savings afforded by direct steamer service from the Great Lakes ports would be of any great consequence.

Leaving aside any power production or national defense considerations which may or may not be sufficient to justify its construction, I consider the proposed seaway to be economically and commercially unjustifiable. It does not appear to me that there is any possibility that it would ever be a self-liquidating project, since I understand it is to be free of toll.

There have been widely varying estimates of its cost, and even if the most optimistic view is taken, it appears to me that the savings which might be effected would redound to the benefit of one section of the country and one segment of its economy to the prejudice of other very important regions and industries.

There are also, as you know, very conflicting views as to the volume of freight which might move on such a waterway. It would be open to navigation at best for only about 7 months of the year. If it should be used to the extent which its advocates visualize, other forms of transportation would undoubtedly suffer and the shippers using the waterway might find themselves unable to secure adequate transportation for their products during the months in which the proposed seaway would be closed to navigation.

Another consideration which seems to have been overlooked by many of the proponents of the seaway is that in order to accommodate the volume of oceangoing traffic which is contemplated, it would be necessary to construct very extensive and costly harbor improvements at ports on the Great Lakes. This would add very greatly to the over-all cost of the seaway and no doubt impose a burden on States and/or municipalities along the Great Lakes.

I have seen no figures which convince me that the proposed seaway would not constitute a direct drain on the Treasury of the United States, nor that the gains to the national economy would in any degree offset this drain. Consequently, the expense would come from the pockets of the taxpayers, and, in my opinion, it is most necessary that efforts be made to reduce governmental expenditures, reduce our public debt instead of increasing it, and reduce taxes, in order to stimulate business, industry, and employment.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR R. LAWES, Jr.,
President.

The next letter is from the Colonial Navigation Co. of New York City, dated April 4, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, and reads as follows:

COLONIAL NAVIGATION CO.,
New York City, April 4, 1946.

Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Since our operations have been confined to the coastwise trade we have not given detailed study to the project, but from my knowledge of the characteristics of American ships operating in the foreign trade, it would appear that the 27-foot depth of the channel would not be sufficient and, further, that because of the fact that for a large portion of the year the waterway will be closed because of ice conditions, it would not seem to warrant the large expenditure of money necessary to carry the project to completion. There are, I understand from statements submitted, a great many other objections, but I think the shallow draught—plus the very great cost—should be sufficient to dispose of the project unfavorably.

Very truly yours,
J. B. DUNBAUGH,
President.

The next letter, which is from the American Petroleum Transport Corp. of

New York City, dated April 2, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, reads as follows:

AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12, relative to the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

I have always felt that this seaway is not justified, that the expense would be totally unwarranted for the traffic involved, and that the present waterway can handle all of the traffic that is required from the ocean to the Great Lakes and return.

It is my firm belief that this seaway would be of very little benefit, if any, to American steamship owners, and I see no possibility of this St. Lawrence seaway being used by our ships.

Very truly yours,
AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.

Mr. President, the next letter is from Cargo Carriers, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and is dated April 1, 1946. It reads as follows:

CARGO CARRIERS, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 1, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We appreciate your letter of the 12th asking for our opinion with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway.

We have no plans for the use of this seaway, although we move large amounts of freight from points on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan to the seaboard, both for export and for domestic use, and we also forward substantial quantities of this freight from the seaboard to foreign destinations, principally Europe. Our business is the transportation of bulk commodities, principally grain.

Further it is our belief that the amount of goods moved direct from Great Lakes points to foreign countries over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, if constructed, will be disappointingly small, very much less than claimed by the proponents of the seaway.

In order to bring about a movement of goods directly between foreign countries and points on the Great Lakes, or between points on the Atlantic seaboard, and points on the Great Lakes by way of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, it would be necessary that ships built for operation on the Great Lakes also operate on the ocean and that ships built for ocean operation also operate on the Great Lakes. We do not feel that either of these operations would be practical or economical for the better classes of ships now in operation.

Practically all of the ships operating on the Great Lakes are a special type of construction, built for operation only on the Great Lakes. It is our opinion, and we believe the opinion of all other operators, that these ships could not operate successfully on the ocean. They carry large cargoes at comparatively shallow drafts because of their length in proportion to their other dimensions. Because of this greater length in proportion to the other dimensions than is used in ocean boats, these Lake boats would not be safe for ocean operation.

Just before the war, and during the war, there have been built a great number of new cargo vessels, enough to carry a large part of the commerce of the important maritime nations. These new boats, such as our country's Liberty ships and Victory ships, require a channel much deeper than 27 feet when they are fully loaded; many of them requiring channels as deep as 35 feet. Inasmuch as the plans for the proposed seaway appear to provide a channel of no more than 27 feet, we cannot conceive of these newer, better, and more economical ocean ships going into the Great Lakes with cargoes or to get cargoes.

It may be said that these ships can go to a port on the Great Lakes, such as Duluth or Chicago, and load enough cargo to put them down to a draft of 26 feet or 27 feet, and then complete their cargo by loading to their full draft at Montreal or some such port as that. No doubt that could be done, but it is our opinion it is not economical for ships, especially those with heavy operating costs, to travel more than 2,200 miles with only a part cargo one way, or even both ways.

It may be possible to make changes in the plans for the seaway which would provide a channel as deep as 35 feet. However, if this were done, we would think it would increase the cost to a point which would be considered prohibitive even by those who now favor the seaway. In the case of grain, we do not see how the cost of the transportation alone between a Great Lakes port and a foreign country would be reduced by shipping direct under the cost of the transportation which is now in use. The saving, if any, would be the saving due to the elimination of the cost of transfer from lake ships to ocean ships. At most, this involves two transfers between Duluth and the foreign country at an aggregate cost of no more than 2 cents per bushel. It is our opinion that the greatest possible amount of grain exports over the proposed seaway would be an average of 50,000,000 bushels per year. Assuming the maximum possible saving of 2 cents per bushel, the total possible saving on grain would be $1,000,000 per year.

It is our belief that should the seaway be completed, it would be found that very few large ships, and therefore a comparatively small amount of freight, would make the trip direct between our Great Lakes ports and foreign countries. It occurs to us that there may follow a demand for some encouragement for such business to use the seaway. No doubt it would be suggested that some sort of Government subsidies be provided to encourage the through transportation and use of the seaway. We may be needlessly concerned about this, but such a demand seems to arise whenever any new vessel operation is found to be unprofitable and uneconomical.

In this letter we have tried to confine ourselves to approaching the matter from our own point of view as a vessel operator. A number of other thoughts and comments which we have with respect to the proposed seaway have been reported in the newspapers and news letters as having been well covered in Senate committee hearings. In case more detailed information, or a statement of our views at greater length is desired, we shall be glad to furnish them.

Yours very truly,
F. J. HAYS.

The next letter is from the Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., of New York City, and is dated March 30, 1946. It reads as follows:

MOORE-MCCORMACK LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 30, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, in which you have asked for our views with regard to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, with vessels which would be adaptable to operation on the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, the Welland Canal section, and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the high seas.

We are operating the following overseas routes:

1. North Atlantic ports and South Atlantic ports of the U. S. A. to the east coast South American ports.

2. North Atlantic ports of the U. S. A. to the Scandinavian and Baltic ports.

3. Pacific coast ports of the U. S. A. and Canada, to the north coast and east coast South American ports via the Panama Canal.

Of the 16 vessels which were taken over by the Government (only a part of which have been thus far returned to us for private operation) and seven additional C3 vessels which are now in the course of construction, and three other vessels which we plan to build in the immediate future, there is but one—a C1 vessel—which could navigate safely the 27-foot channel of the proposed seaway.

Of course, all these ships could load to a depth which would permit them to traverse this seaway, but it would mean they would have to complete this loading at Montreal and other St. Lawrence ports, in order to give them full cargoes, thereby further building up Canadian commerce and commercial activities.

As ship operators, we are opposed to the construction of this proposed St. Lawrence seaway, for we do not believe the construction of such a seaway would be to our interest or to the interest of the country. It is our opinion that such a seaway, if constructed, would be of particular value to foreign operators of small vessels. The diversion of traffic between the interior points and the Atlantic seaboard ports would militate against the maintenance of a strong and efficient American merchant marine.

No plans have been made by the company to utilize the St. Lawrence seaway. The position of the American steamship operators has been ably presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee by the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and from the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, copies of which statements are attached for your convenience. We endorse the position taken by these two associations.

Very truly yours,
ALBERT V. MOORE,
President.

I next read a letter from the United States Lines Co.:

UNITED STATES LINES CO.,
New York, March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: You were kind enough to ask me in a letter received a few days ago my opinion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as authorized in the joint resolution pending before Congress.

You inquire as to the "feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway." Answering this, and speaking out of my long experience as a steamship operator, I must say that the waterway would be too shallow. The proposed 27-foot channel between Montreal and Lake Ontario would, in reality, be only a 24-foot channel because only ships of that or lesser draft could use it. Remember that a vessel should have a clearance of about 2 feet, 6 inches, and that in addition a ship will draw 6 inches more in fresh than in salt water. Our Maritime Commission insists that owners and operators shall sail their ships "full and down." This is the answer to proponents of the seaway who are already arguing that ships using the seaway take abroad smaller loads to keep within the 24-foot draft.

Another reason why the project is unfeasible is that for about 7 months in each year it would be closed by winter. In addition, the canalized section at many points would be dangerous. Navigation would be extremely hazardous. Ships would menace each

other when passing, and the rocky shores of the canalized area would mean sinkings and in many instances total losses in case of collision. Then, too, fogs are prevalent and there would be few spots where the channel is narrow for ships to anchor with safety. All in all, from the point of feasibility, the proposal to spend hundreds of millions to provide this seaway is a fantastic one.

As to economy of navigation, there can be none because in its broader aspects, the seaway discriminates against this Nation's merchant fleet. Into the merchant ships constituting this, our American taxpayers have poured more than $50,000,000,000. It is plain that the seaway would help reverse the American policy of "fostering" an American Merchant Marine. You might ask why, and my answer would be because only about eight percent of our merchant ships could use it and many of those ships are already obsolete. We have a war-built merchant marine of more than 5,000 vessels. Only about 400 of these have a draft of 24 feet or less. And remember, a small vessel such as might navigate the seaway is relatively as costly to operate as a large one and will carry only about one-third the cargo and earn only about one-third the money that its big brother will. The preponderance of ships able to navigate the canalized river would be foreign (more than 70 percent). Most of the traffic would move in tramp ships, none of American register, and to the great detriment of our regularly operated American lines. Moreover, hazards encountered in the canalized section, due to narrow channels, currents and fog, would send the insurance rates soaring.

Another thing: Nearly 100,000,000 tons of iron ore are lifted by America's tremendous lake fleet annually. The presence of this fleet in time of war is a national necessity. But if the seaway is constructed, this fleet now carrying ore to the American railroads will languish and ultimately become dissipated.

And what of the domestic carriers which now give regular and satisfactory service from the Great Lakes to our American eastern seaboard? Will the railroads be satisfied (and keep rates down) if permitted to serve lake traffic only 5 months in the year?

In turn, how can the American steamship companies on the east coast afford to give virtually daily sailings to Europe during 12 months in the year when for 7 months cargo would be diverted from the east coast and carried in foreign tramp ships paying crews subnormal wages? Rate structures, built up through the years, would be shattered.

I shall not attempt to quote statistics to demonstrate that our port of New York, the greatest in the world, will inevitably suffer if the St. Lawrence seaway is built. The loss of commerce here will run into the hundreds of millions. Proponents of the canal have indicated their belief that the traffic diverted from New York would amount to only about 8 percent of the amount which goes through this port normally. They fail to emphasize that this 8 percent by value would amount to almost 25 percent. As an example, may I quote the following:

"Custom figures for 1938 fixing $413 a ton for passenger cars foreshadow an annual loss to the port of New York of $20[illegible],937,000 in value should automobile carryings be diverted to the seaway. What would be the loss to New York City, suffered by longshoremen, shipowners, brokers, truckers, warehouses, and pier rentals, cannot be estimated."

Concluding your letter, you ask me to say:

1. Whether the seaway as proposed would provide a saving to shippers and would prove attractive to shipowners.

2. Whether our company, the United States Lines, plans to navigate the seaway.

The answer to these questions is a blunt "No." Need I add that I am irrevocably opposed to the construction of this project?

Thanking you for providing me with this opportunity to express my views, and with kindest personal regards and warmest wishes,

Most cordially,

BASIL HARRIS.

Mr. President, I now read a letter from A. B. Sharp, president of the Eastern Steamship Lines:

EASTERN STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
Boston, Mass., March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: This refers to your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

I cannot add anything to the mass of information that has been submitted to Congress on this subject during recent years, except my personal opinion.

New England is largely against the project, but I think I am not particularly biased on account of being located in this area, as I grew up on the shores of Lake Michigan and have been here only a few years.

From the standpoint of the seaway operation, I see nothing whatever in it for a company in domestic steamship service, as the length of the haul as compared with the land haul from any American port on the Great Lakes to any American port elsewhere, would positively prevent successful steamship operation. I believe that anyone familiar with present day steamship costs and rates, and land transportation rates, must necessarily reach this unequivocal conclusion. Any studies that I know of that have been made in the past in this connection must now be thrown into the waste basket, as steamship operating costs are so much higher than they were when private steamship operations ceased almost entirely because of the war—increases in steamship labor nearly 100 percent; repairs and maintenance probably more than 100 percent; fuel over 50 percent.

With respect to use of the seaway for foreign commerce, there is no possibility of its use in competition with foreign-flag ships unless the Government pays large subsidies. This would appear to accomplish only the elimination of income for the labor and capital now engaged in competitive land transportation, transfer a large part of the income to foreign labor and capital, and place a heavy burden on all the taxpayers of the country.

With respect to both domestic and foreign trade, it must be borne in mind that a preponderant majority of American ships in the enormous fleet which has been built and is now available for ocean operations, consists of large vessels which could not sail the seaway with more than about 60 percent of their carrying capacity in tons of cargo. The 27-foot proposed depth of water simply would not permit it. Smaller foreign craft now in existence, and many more building, would surely have an overwhelming advantage in foreign trade, and again there is no way to overcome this advantage unless the Government builds another fleet for use in the seaway, and provides it with subsidies sufficient to make competition possible.

To me this proposal is a wild, uneconomical scheme which will cost vast sums of money to place in operation, and will impose a never ending additional great burden upon the people of our Nation.

Very truly yours,

A. B. SHARP,
President.

The following is a letter from Arnold Bernstein, of 17 Battery Place, New York:

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Chairman
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Responding to your letter of March 12, I would say that generally speaking I favor the development of natural waterways and installation of power facilities made possible thereby.

I can give no opinion with regard to any specific development, except perhaps to comment on the effect that a new seaway from the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River would have on changing the movement of ocean cargo.

If such a seaway could be operated throughout the whole year and not be closed by ice through the winter months, I would favor this project, despite losses and inconveniences that may be anticipated during the initial period of readjustment and adaptation. Since this new seaway could be used for 6 months of the year only, however, I should think—

(a) Assuming that export and import will reach the prewar level, a substantial percentage of the traffic of the whole lake area will use the new seaway instead of going overseas from New York;

(b) Water transportation does not involve only supplying ships and shipping needs, but railroad yards, warehouse facilities, piers, bunker facilities, and many other installations run by experienced organizations;

(c) Deviation of a great percentage of cargo means proportionate idleness of such installations in New York, and at the same time the construction in the new loading and discharge ports of the same kind of facilities;

(d) The lines serving the various world routes from New York and out ports will either lose the traffic diverted to the new seaway to new lines founded for this purpose, or will have to open branches of their service, allocating part of their tonnage to the traffic carried directly from the Lakes. Since the most important lines combine passenger and cargo service, and since the passenger service can hardly be transferred from New York, in many cases the provision of additional cargo steamers will be involved, creating quite a serious problem for the established lines.

Without careful study, I do not feel qualified to give an opinion in regard to the benefit industry and agriculture may gain from the project. However, for the reasons indicated above, it seems to me doubtful, at least as far as shipping and port facilities are concerned, if the gain reasonably to be expected from the new seaway would justify the new investment, and at the same time, losses that New York as a world harbor must expect from the loss of part of its traffic.

Respectfully,

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN.

I now read letters from 23 other steamship companies whose names appear on the headings of the letters:

MARINE TRANSPORT LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have endeavored to keep informed concerning the proposed seaway to the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and the construction of power facilities contemplated by pending legislation before the Congress, and about which you deal in your letter of March 12.

After careful examination into the possibilities of use of the improved waterway facilities projected, and after considering the

information gathered as to present and prospective traffic, we arrived at the conclusion that, so far as transportation is concerned, the expense for the seaway project would be unwarranted. We accordingly felt that there was no justification, insofar as our company is concerned, for extending our operations into the Great Lakes area via the St. Lawrence, other than in small ships which from time to time have been suitable for such trade under existing conditions. Our considerations lead us to believe that no substantial savings to shippers would result from the development proposed.

From the standpoint of the American merchant marine, it seems to me that the project might prove to be disadvantageous, altogether aside from the matter of initial and recurring costs for the development, both construction and maintenance.

Yours very truly,

W. N. WESTERLUND,
President.

ALCOA STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.

The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In you letter of March 12 you ask for our views regarding the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and inquire whether we plan to navigate the seaway with our ships.

We have no plans for using the proposed seaway. If the seaway is used to any considerable extent for overseas shipping the vessel operators, port facilities, and the railroads serving the United States north Atlantic ports will suffer the disadvantage of a peak during about 5 months of the year and a slump during the balance of the year, resulting in higher costs and less efficiency. Conceivably, an increase in ocean and rail rates would follow. Such a prospect would certainly discourage modernization and improvement of the facilities at Atlantic ports.

Considering the capital required for construction of the canal, the handicaps of seasonal operation, and the adverse effects on the railroads and north Atlantic ports, we doubt very much whether the project can be considered an economic one.

Yours very truly,

HERMAN LEWIS,
President.

GRACE LINE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Committee on Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12 asking for our views in respect to the proposed construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River. This project has been under consideration for a long time and has received careful thought and study by the shipping industry of the country. I believe it entirely correct to say that the shipping companies are practically unanimous in their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway plan insofar as that plan would contemplate the development of oceangoing traffic as contrasted with that part of the proposal relating to the development of electric power. The American Merchant Marine Institute, whose members own and operate the major portion of the American flag merchant fleet engaged in foreign and domestic deep-sea trade, and of which we are a member, has expressed its opinion on the subject with our entire concurrence in a letter to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, under date of February 26, 1946.

Replying more specifically to the questions raised in your letter regarding this company's possible interest in operating its vessels through the proposed seaway if it is constructed, I have to advise you that Grace Line has nearly completed a construction program of 18 new vessels, not one of which could safely navigate the proposed seaway without leaving unfilled some 15 to 20 percent of their cargo capacity. Your familiarity with shipping matters will enable you to understand without further explanation that no vessel can compete in international trade unless it is able to take full advantage of its size and capacity.

The normal peacetime operations of the Grace Line are between the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports of the United States, and the countries to the south of us in Central and South America. Such of the cargo normally carried in our ships as originates from or is destined to the Great Lakes area is moved to and from seaboard by existing transportation systems such as railroads, canals, and trucks. Particularly as to our ships servicing the United States Gulf area, the Mississippi Barge Canal System has offered cheap and efficient transportation of export and import cargo to the manufacturing centers of the Middle West. Insofar as trade with Central and South America is concerned, it is inconceivable to us that there would be any economy in the transportation of goods originating in and destined to the Great Lakes area via the circuitous route of the St. Lawrence waterway and thence along the entire Atlantic seaboard on the water routes leading to the south.

It is conceivable that there might be some economies for shippers from the Great Lakes area to northern Europe by the use of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, but it is our considered judgment and that of the entire shipping industry that such economies would, in the aggregate, be insignificant as compared with the cost of construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed seaway.

I trust that these individual views may be of some value and would be delighted to reply to any further questions which you may have.

Respectfully,

R. R. ADAMS,
President.

CALMAR STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12 in which you advise that there is pending before the Congress a joint resolution to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own vessels and are unalterably opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway for the following reasons:

1. Vessels that may use this proposed seaway will only be able to load up to a draft of 24 feet. At the present time the vessels we are operating, fully loaded, have a draft of 28 feet 6 inches, and the vessels we propose to operate will have a draft of 27 feet 8 inches. Due to the lesser density of fresh water, a vessel will draw 6 inches more than in salt water. The port rules of Montreal require 2 feet 6 inches bottom clearance for the issuance of a sailing permit. Therefore, our vessels could never load full cargoes if we were to use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

2. We load our vessels at Baltimore, Md., and Philadelphia, Pa., and discharge them at Boston, Mass., New York, Philadelphia, Pa., and Baltimore, Md. The time for safe navigation on the Great Lakes and through the proposed seaway will be limited to about 7 months a year, depending on weather conditions. To retain dock facilities for only 5 months out of a year at the ports mentioned, such facilities to be idle during the 7 months of open navigation on the proposed seaway and Great Lakes, is economically unsound.

3. The suggestion has been made that American operators could use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway by only partially loading their vessels instead of bringing them down to their legal load marks. In our opinion, the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would provide little, if no savings to shippers, because of necessity vessels that load such part cargoes and must incur 8,238 miles of extra steaming, would have to secure a great deal higher rate for cargo loading at lake ports.

4. The proposed St. Lawrence seaway has no attraction to the ship operator, both from the standpoint of economy and from the standpoint of business.

The proposal for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is in our opinion economically unsound and highly detrimental to the best interests of the American merchant marine.

Very truly yours,

H. W. WARLEY, *President.*

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM & TRANSPORT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to your letter of March 12 regarding the joint resolution which is now pending before the Congress to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, we have no plans to navigate the proposed seaway with our ships if and when such legislation should be approved.

Our company operates along the Atlantic coast and points adjacent thereto in the 17 States from Maine to Florida. The seaway would therefore be of no benefit to us. From an oil-tanker angle, it would be rather difficult for any company to utilize the seaway as at present outlined. As you are aware, the large quantity of T-2 and T-3 tankers built by the United States Government, and which were necessary for the successful prosecution of the recent war, will make these tankers practically the standard for the carriage of oil on ocean waterways for a large number of years to come. These boats have a 30-foot draft when fully loaded in salt water and would have a draft of very close to 31 feet in fresh water. The proposed channel for the seaway being limited to 27 feet would absolutely eliminate the use of the T-2 or T-3 type of tanker.

Inasmuch as the normal movement of oil by tanker is from the Gulf coast, the distance to be covered to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, which is approximately latitude 50° north, and then the long southwest movement through the seaway and the Great Lakes, would increase the cost of the movement of products to such an extent that the writer does not see how it would be possible to compete with the more efficient pipe-line movement of crude and products from the Gulf to the central and northern portion of the United States which now obtains.

From the standpoint of the petroleum industry, there certainly can be no justification for the tremendous expenditure which would be required of our Government to make this artificial waterway, and also the heavy annual upkeep which would be necessitated by its use.

Very truly yours,

JAMES PATTERSON,
Vice President.

MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have your inquiry of March 12 concerning the probability of navigation between the ocean and the Great Lakes through the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The commercial interests in the Mississippi Valley have generally opposed the seaway. The ground of opposition has been that it would divert import and export traffic from the Mississippi system which has already been improved by the National Government at heavy expense.

I have not actively opposed the project, personally, because I have grave doubt that a large two-way traffic could be practically developed. The Great Lakes can and do handle the exportable surplus of grain at costs as low as anything known in ocean transportation under the United States flag.

If the seaway were constructed as planned, it would enable lake boats to carry both American and Canadian grain down to Montreal and shift the transfer point from Buffalo 500 miles farther toward the sea. That would be the big exportable surplus which might attract ocean ships into the Great Lakes. However, in the reverse direction, the canal would be available to merchandise from western Europe and little else and I doubt whether Middle West distributors of this limited type of freight, when divorced from the great distribution through Atlantic and Gulf ports, would give a paying two-way traffic for many ocean-going ships. Furthermore, while the depth of 27 feet is adequate for Great Lakes boats and most Great Lakes harbors are hardly dredged to this depth, 27 feet would necessarily prove a very definite limitation which would bar the newer and better ships which are now being built for ocean traffic. For example, the standard C-2 and C-3 vessels, the Libertys and Victorys, cannot safely be loaded to full draft and navigate this channel and certainly 30 feet over the miter sills of the 15 locks would put a very definite limitation upon the seaway's future value.

At New Orleans, we have a lock 75 feet by 600 feet with 30 feet 6 inches over the miter sills which leads from the Mississippi River into the newer inner harbor. This is proving such a limitation upon our harbor development that we are presently urging the United States Government to give us a direct seaway from inner harbor to the Gulf with a depth of 40 feet and a bottom width of 600 feet. It is our belief that any port served by a channel of lesser dimensions will be greatly limited in its future expansion.

The fleet of the Delta Line is made up of standard C-2 and C-3 ships. We operate between Gulf ports and the east coast of South America. The St. Lawrence seaway would offer no inducement to us.

The barge rates on the Mississippi River from New Orleans, offer the cheapest entrance to the port of Chicago of any we know. It is our judgment that the cost of operating deep-sea ships through inland passages of 2,250 miles with the time spent in passing through 15 locks, would be more expensive than the single cost of one transfer from ship to barge at New Orleans in view of the existing barge rates for a 1,500-mile haul from New Orleans to Chicago.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE BRENT,
President.

AMERICAN SOUTH AFRICAN LINE, INC.,
New York, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Thank you for your letter of March 12, asking my views on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

I have given this subject detailed study and consideration and have reached the conclusion that, whether or not such a project is completed, it is not economically feasible for American South African Line to use it. In the following paragraphs I shall try to set forth my explanation for this belief in greater detail.

The first question to be considered is the draft of the channel. The proposed draft is 27 feet. American ships are expensive to construct and expensive to operate. To enable some degree of competition with foreign lines, we have increased the draft of our ships so as to carry more cargo per voyage. The new fleet of American South African Line is composed of United States Maritime Commission C-3-type vessels. These ships have a draft, when down to their marks, of 29 feet 1 inch. Minimum navigation requirements of the St. Lawrence seaway require 2 feet 6 inches between the bottom of the hull of the vessel and the river bed. Another 6 inches of draft would be lost by reason of the fact that these ships would be operating in fresh water rather than in salt water.

Homeward cargo from South and East Africa is mainly manganese and chrome ore, that is weight cargo. If our ships were to use the St. Lawrence seaway, instead of loading them to the marks, 29 feet 1 inch, they could only be loaded to a draft of 24 feet. For a ship of the C-3 type, approximately 58 tons of cargo are required to change the draft 1 inch. This means that, if one of our ships were to be loaded for the passage through the St. Lawrence, she would carry 3,498 tons of cargo less than her capacity. This is not economically justified.

With the high cost of American ship construction and operation, as opposed to foreign-flag lines, I do not believe it would be sound policy to construct smaller ships specifically for this trade. The St. Lawrence is considered safe for navigation only 7 months of the year. If special ships were designed and constructed for this trade, they would not be able to compete with our present vessels during the balance of the year, inasmuch as their cost of operation would be about the same but carrying capacity would be so much less. It would not be sound economic policy to leave these ships idle for the 5-month period the St. Lawrence is not navigable. On the other hand, their presence in other routes, during the off season, would only cause great confusion and disorganization in the shipping industry.

If our ships were to go to the Great Lakes ports, we should have to add a considerable sum to our cost per voyage, resulting in a greatly increased cost to the shipper. This increase would consist not only of the expense of vessel operation for a longer time per voyage than at present, but we should also have to include the cost of maintaining branch offices or agencies at each of the ports of call for the entire year. I do not consider it advisable to open and close these offices for only a part of each year or to shift the personnel to various other offices at off seasons. The operation of a ship requires too much detailed knowledge of a port to make such shifting of personnel sound policy.

Another question of vital importance is the question of safe navigation. It is understood many parts of the St. Lawrence seaway will be blasted out of solid rock—that, in parts, the channel will be suitable for one-way passage only.

This area is noted for the frequent occurrence of fog and mist. If one of our ships were to be caught in a narrow stretch of this channel, in a fog or mist, it is considered the ship would be in extreme danger, and this danger would be greatly aggravated by the possibility of the current of the river swinging the vessel onto the rocks. I do not believe a conscientious steamship operator is justified in jeopardizing a large oceangoing vessel by sending her on such a voyage, with its attending risks of loss of life, cargo, and vessel.

These added risks would contribute substantially to an increase in insurance rates. This too, would be reflected in increased rates to the shipper.

In view of the foregoing, I wish to repeat most emphatically, the St. Lawrence project would not be attractive to American South African Line, nor do I believe it would be attractive to the vast majority of American ship operators. Further, considering their long-range interests, I do not believe it would provide a real saving to shippers. On the contrary, I believe it would seriously disorganize present services from North Atlantic ports and would react to the detriment of both shippers and ship operators.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to set forth my views on the St. Lawrence project and hope that they will be of assistance in determining your own actions with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 104.

Yours very truly,

JAMES A. FARRELL, Jr.,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 12, addressed to Mr. John A. Werner, president of the Fruit Dispatch Co. and asking his opinion as to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, has been referred to the undersigned. The Fruit Dispatch Co., a subsidiary of the United Fruit Co., handles the distribution of our principal product, but the operation of the vessels is under the control of the parent company and for this reason Mr. Werner has turned your letter over to me.

For the past several years we have followed rather closely the arguments for and against this project and it is my considered opinion that the rather doubtful gains of a few sections of the country do not warrant the vast expenditure involved. I have read varying estimates of the cost of this project, ranging from $300,000,000 to almost $1,000,000,000, a large portion of which would be assumed by Canada. Is it not possible that Canada might find it difficult to meet this huge expenditure, thereby further increasing the portion that would have to be paid by United States funds?

First of all, it appears that the proposed 27-foot channel would preclude something over 90 percent of the American merchant marine, a good part of which was constructed during the war period, and over 80 percent of the world's tonnage, from using the seaway. In any event, because of the winter freeze the St. Lawrence would be navigable for only about 7 months of the year, and the same holds true to a lesser extent for the Great Lakes.

So far as this company's normal peacetime operations are concerned, it is imperative that the banana, a perishable commodity, reaches its markets with the least possible delay after the fruit is cut in the Tropics,

and even though the fruit is carried in refrigerated vessels it would be decidedly unwise to expose it to the extended additional distance that would be necessary in transit to Great Lakes ports; not only from the point of view of the additional mileage involved but also the necessarily reduced speed of the vessels in transiting the proposed seaway. It would be much more economical to discharge the fruit at United States Atlantic and Gulf ports and rail it to the interior markets.

Under these circumstances, even if the seaway project should become a reality in the future, it is most unlikely that this company's vessels will ever make any use of it.

I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded us to express our views in this matter.

Yours very truly,

J. J. KELLEHER.

STRACHAN SHIPPING CO.,
Savannah, Ga., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: Your letter of March 12 has been received.

Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, and Milwaukee, and perhaps other outports of the Great Lakes, have for some time been served by relatively small vessels capable of navigating the present locks and crossing the Atlantic Ocean, this service having been initiated and operated by Scandinavian owners.

It has been my understanding that these vessels have been able to select freight which gave the highest revenue and the operation must have been profitable because I understand now that the war has ended it is about to be resumed.

A very large volume of traffic originates in the Middle West and it appears that the contemplated seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River would be utilized, but I am incapable of expressing an opinion as to whether the projected channel for larger and deeper draft vessels would justify the enormous construction cost.

Again, I seriously doubt if the large, fast, expensive American flagships would be able to compete successfully in this trade when their cargoes on regular runs would likely be made up of a large percentage of low-paying freight. There must be a considerable slow-down in negotiating 15 locks, and I am sure these vessels would not be able to run at full speed in the canal.

It also seems to me that vessels with slower speed, and perhaps these would be largely under foreign flags, would get the greatest benefit from this seaway development, because of their cheaper cost of construction and operation.

One thing that impresses me is that at present ships that are operating in the Atlantic and in the Gulf are compelled to make a number of ports of call in order to fill, and if this traffic from the Great Lakes area, which now largely moves to the eastern ports and to the Gulf, is withdrawn, it would make it all the more difficult for the ships serving the eastern and Gulf ports to fill, and would perhaps mean either curtailing of service or additional ports of call.

This proposed direct service from the Lakes, would unquestionably provide some savings to shippers during the open season.

While we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own ships, and have made no careful study of the possibilities, it does not appear to me that this trade route will prove very attractive to American ship operators.

RONI W. GROVES,
Partner.

SEATRAIN LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

We wish to advise that we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway and we have been very skeptical that the additional cost over and above that required for power development would be warranted from a transportation standpoint. We doubt if the difference in cost between rail transportation through the seaway for only portions of the year is so great as to warrant any large expenditure for such a seaway.

Very truly yours,

GRAHAM M. BRUSH,
President.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, 1946, relative to the projected St. Lawrence seaway, have to advise you that we are opposed to it.

Most of the reasons for our opposition are set forth in the statement made in behalf of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York by Mr. Cornelius H. Callaghan, executive vice president of said association, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on February 28, 1946, which statement has our full endorsement.

Thanking you for having written us, we are,

Yours very truly,

MORRIS MALKIN,
President.

MERCHANTS & MINERS
TRANSPORTATION CO.,
Baltimore, March 16, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of March 12 regarding the seaway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic and regret that my experience and knowledge of that particular section and business is not sufficient to warrant me to express any view on the subject.

Regretting my inability to be of any help in this matter and with kindest regards,

Very truly yours,

A. D. STEBBINS,
President.

PLANT SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of 12 March about the St. Lawrence seaway.

My observation is that, aside from every other consideration, sending vessels through 15 locks would be a most hazardous undertaking at any time, and it strikes me that the cost of insurance on vessels navigating such waterways would be greatly increased. Accordingly, from the standpoint of risk and increased cost of insurance, the seaway would not be attractive to ship operators.

From the standpoint of savings to shippers, I believe that any cheaper inland freight rate to shipside would be greatly offset by the higher freight rate that the ship owner would have to ask for the increased risk and expense just mentioned.

I have no plans to use the St. Lawrence seaway at all, and, as far as I am concerned, I earnestly hope it will never materialize.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE PLANT,
President.

WILSON LINE, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In reply to yours of March 12, the Wilson Line is not interested in operating steamboats on the Great Lakes or through the proposed new locks and channel.

However, I am greatly opposed to the joint resolution before Congress to authorize these improvements, inasmuch as the railroads would be adversely affected, and I believe that they will have a hard enough time in the next 10 years without this competition.

Very truly yours,

GEO. B. JUNKIN,
President.

STOCKARD STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of March 12 asking my opinion with respect to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, it is my opinion that this seaway is of no practical value. I do not question the feasibility of constructing this seaway, but purely from the point of view of a shipping facility the seaway is absolutely unsound. In the first place it can only be used for 8 months out of the year because of ice conditions. The present shipping facilities available to Montreal and to New York are just as economical to operate as would be the case should ocean-going vessels proceed to load at Chicago and/or other Great Lakes ports.

The seaway would provide no savings to shippers nor would it prove attractive to ship operators except possibly to a few foreign flag lines that presently operate from the Great Lakes to the United Kingdom, European Continent, and Scandinavia during the summer season. Ship operations between ports other than those mentioned in the preceding sentence are more economical via the eastern seaboard of the United States. This can be accounted for by the fact that the earth is round, and if you calculate distances from Chicago to places other than northern Europe, including the United Kingdom, you will find the excess steaming distances too great (say, from Chicago) to make it economical.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway, and sincerely hope the taxpayers' money will not be wasted on this venture.

Yours faithfully,

L. N. STOCKARD,
President.

BARBER STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 14, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have received your letter of March 12, with reference to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, and I am enclosing herewith a statement which I made

a short time ago, which will acquaint you with my views as to this project.

For the many reasons advanced in my memorandum, I consider the project unsound economically and o no practical value commercially, and to specifically answer your question, my company has no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own ships.

In closing, might I express the hope that the replies which you will receive from the steamship owners, whom I gather you have circularized, will be such as to lead you to the conclusion that you should vote against this proposed bill?

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. BARBER.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., April 8, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Your letter of March 1[illegible] to Mr. Zemurray, president of the United Fruit Co., relative to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, has been referred to me for reply.

As indicated in your letter, the project calls for a usable channel of 27 feet deep. This will prevent the use of vessels drawing more than 24½ feet. It is my understanding that less than 8 percent of the total American merchant marine has this light a draft, and, of course, practically all of this light-draft tonnage is already in use in other trade routes. It, therefore, seems highly doubtful that the St. Lawrence seaway project can have any material advantage to the American merchant marine. It seems more likely that any ships using the seaway would be foreign-flag ships. The operation of small ships under the American flag because of the highly increased cost of wages and other costs is becoming more difficult. The St. Lawrence seaway, in my opinion, would be wholly unattractive to American flag operators.

* * * * *

One of the principal arguments in favor of the waterway is that it might reduce the ocean rates on grains and other bulk commodities moving from the Great Lakes area into foreign commerce, and that this would be of benefit to the farmers of the Middle West. I suggest that the freight on these commodities is paid by the foreign purchasers and it is doubtful whether a slightly lower freight rate to these foreign purchasers would be of any value to the shippers of the Middle West.

This company does not plan to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM JACKSON,
Vice President.

LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., April 26, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Apology is made for delay in answering your letter of March 12 re the effect of proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway on United States flagships and asking if we have any plans to send our vessels into the Great Lakes.

Because of the high cost of building American ships and operating them, they cannot compete with foreign flagships unless subsidized. For American ships to enter the Great Lakes trade, they would need to be subsidized just as they are on the high seas. Would Congress authorize such a subsidy when the Great Lakes seaway would be in fact a competitor of the domestic transportation lines in the United States?

Then there are 15 ship locks to pass through

Foreign flagships would go into the Great Lakes during the open-water season. For the most part, these would probably be tramp ships which do not, as a rule, conform with the rules and regulations applying to regular liners, which would mean disturbance to the economy of the regular liners and to the domestic carriers.

Thus the opening of the Great Lakes seaway would in fact be a subsidy in favor of foreign flagships and against the United States merchant marine.

The transportation system of the United States is organized to use existing and developed seaports and domestic transportation, which would be disturbed by the Great Lakes seaway.

The railroads which would compete with the seaway would need to lower their rates not only for the 7 months of navigation but year around, thus again giving the east and west drift of commerce an advantage over the north and south drift, on which much money is being spent.

The Great Lakes region now enjoys low import-export freight rates and has an advantage over most of the country.

It is felt the proposed seaway would be decidedly detrimental to southern ports, from which our company exclusively operates.

We are attaching hereto pamphlet prepared by the Mississippi Valley Association, also copy of letter from American Merchant Marine Institute, dated February 26, to Senator HATCH.

We have no plans to send our ships into the Great Lakes.

Very truly yours,

J. T. LYKES,
President.

CHICAGO, DULUTH & GEORGIAN BAY TRANSIT CO.,
Detroit, Mich., April 11, 1946.

Hon. Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please do accept our apology for delayed acknowledgment of your letter of March 12 to our Mr. D. Dwight Douglas, president, regarding Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

We note the contemplated plans and data for this project, and we have endeavored to keep in touch with the progress of this proposal.

As to our own service, we are an exclusive passenger line, operating the steamers *North American* and *South American*, between the ports of Chicago, Duluth, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo, in regular service during the period May 15 to September 15.

The probability of operating our present ships outside of the Great Lakes area is most remote, as our company has been built on service on the Lakes. There is a definite demand for such service, and we hope to continue it and improve upon it as time goes on.

Passenger lines on the Great Lakes, as you are aware, are restricted by legislation, permitting capacity operation only during 4 months of the year—May 15 to September 15. During the other 8 months of the year capacity is reduced to such an extent that we cannot operate.

The proposed seaway, therefore, would have no direct benefits insofar as our operation as presently set up is concerned.

We appeciate having this opportunity to express our views.

Very respectfully,

EMERY B. HATCH,
Vice President and General Manager.

DETROIT & CLEVELAND NAVIGATION CO.,
Detroit, Mich., March 18, 1946.

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12, 1946, in connection with the proposed changes in the St. Lawrence River.

So far as the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. is concerned, we would have no use for the St. Lawrence waterway, however we do feel that the locks should all be the same size as the Welland locks for national security. We believe that the present depths of the locks would suffice.

Yours very truly,

JAMES T. MCMILLAN,
President.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *March 20, 1946.*

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 12th has remained unanswered owing to the writer being absent from the city.

We do not feel that there is any transportation by water that is cheaper than that which prevails on the Great Lakes. We therefore feel that there is no economy in the proposed seaway, as we do not feel that the boats that are adapted for the Lakes and ocean navigation, can compete with our Lake boats for the long water haul from the head of the Lakes—Lake Superior—and Chicago, to the St. Lawrence Gulf. It is only at times, when there is a bigger demand than we have boats, that the rate between the head of Lake Superior to the gulf ports would be of any interest to ocean-borne traffic.

We have had the practical experience in the movement of large tonnages of grain from the Northwest to Montreal, and the majority of years in which we have been in business, there is no ocean ship which could compete with the rates which prevail for the movement of this grain from Duluth and to Fort William to Montreal, and also from Chicago.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN STEAMSHIP CO.
JOHN J. BOLAND.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 20, 1946.*

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Referring to your letter of March 12, 1946, we have given careful consideration to your inquiries concerning the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as a navigation project. In treating with your letter, we have rephrased the inquiries in question form and have added, under a new heading, additional comments in which we believe you will be interested. The questions, answers, and additional comments are:

"Would it be feasible and economical to navigate the proposed seaway with vessels which would be adapted to the Great Lakes and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the Atlantic Ocean?"

Typical ocean-going cargo ships are not equipped to navigate locks. Great Lakes vessels are equipped with mooring engines and chocks of special type for passage through locks. Ocean ships have smaller rudders than Great Lakes ships and are not designed for navigating canals and narrow channels with swift and changing currents. Great Lakes ships are not designed or suitable for ocean navigation, nor could they be loaded or unloaded expeditiously in ocean ports. Loading and unloading machinery in

Great Lakes ports is highly specialized and the design of the ships is such that they are coordinated with the dock machinery. To our knowledge there are not now in existence ships which embody both Great Lakes and ocean characteristics. While such a ship might be designed, it could not be operated as economically as the vessels built for special service in one or the other trade.

"What are the distances from Duluth, at the head of Lake Superior, on the one hand, and Chicago, on the other, to the Gulf of St. Lawrence?"

The distances stated in your letter refer to Cabot Strait lying between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic. The distances from upper Great Lakes ports to the Gulf of St. Lawrence would be about 300 miles shorter. The distance from Duluth to New York via the St. Lawrence is 3,014 miles and via the New York State Barge Canal, 1,477 miles. The distance from Cleveland to New York via the St. Lawrence is 2,204 miles and via the New York Barge Canal, 667 miles.

"From the viewpoint of a ship operator, do you believe this seaway, as proposed, would provide savings to shippers and prove attractive to ship operators?"

The savings claimed for traffic on the waterway are based on the carrying of full loads in ships of the largest class able to navigate a 27-foot channel, or, in some cases, on the assumption that the rates to or from Great Lakes ports would be the same or only slightly higher than rates to Atlantic coast ports.

It seems doubtful that full cargoes could be often assembled on the Great Lakes for transport to one or two foreign ports. Failure to obtain such cargoes would militate against any great amount of traffic in manufactured products. The passage by ocean vessels through a distance of some 2,000 miles and return, including the navigation of several locks and many miles of restricted channels, would add appreciably to the cost of operation, although the distance from Chicago to Liverpool is only about 836 miles farther than from New York to Liverpool.

There is a possibility of some savings in the transport of grain from the Canadian Lake Superior ports, Fort William, and Port Arthur, because of saving in transshipment. The saving might amount to 3 cents a bushel or $1 per ton. The cost of capital charges, operation, and maintenance of the St. Lawrence, however, would mean a United States subsidy of some two or three dollars per ton for the amount of traffic likely to develop, while the savings would relate mainly to Canadian grain.

The maximum draft of a ship navigating the seaway could probably not exceed 24 feet. It was determined in 1941 that only about 13 percent of American ocean ships would be able to traverse the proposed St. Lawrence seaway at full draft. Doubtless there were built during the war many American ships which could navigate the proposed seaway. However, when fully loaded, those ships draw in excess of the maximum draft which the seaway would furnish. Thus their economy in the Great Lakes trade would be impaired. Our opinion is that seaway commerce would be carried mainly in foreign-owned tramp ships operating on much lower costs as to capital charges and crew wages than American vessels. Such vessels, entering the Lakes for grain, would be at liberty to bring foreign coal to Canada at ballast rates replacing our exports of coal to Canada. These export shipments by lake vessels in 1944 exceeded 12,000,000 tons.

"Have you any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with your own ships; if so, how many?"

This company owns and operates 18 ships of the Great Lakes bulk-cargo type, having an aggregate trip capacity of about 165,000 tons on a 20-foot draft. The largest is 621 feet length over-all and carries in excess of 15,500 gross tons at a full draft of 24 feet. We have no plans for navigating the St. Lawrence seaway. The passage is more hazardous than the routes of our present traffic. Our ships are not fitted for ocean navaigation. The expense of operation due to initial costs and wage rates, as compared with foreign tramp ships would make competition impracticable without a subsidy, which has never been required or requested for the Great Lakes industry, although transportation rates on the Lakes are only about 1 mill per ton-mile.

COMMENTS CONCERNING OTHER ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED SEAWAY

Since the hearings before your committee in 1944 on the Aiken bill, you are thoroughly familiar with the manner in which the 1941 agreement deals with navigation rights. We venture, however, to review this subject from the standpoint of the Great Lakes ship operator. Navigation rights of American ships in Canadian waters, and of British ships in American waters, are secured through existing treaties. By the treaty of 1871, American ships are given the right of free navigation in the St. Lawrence River from the place where the international boundary leaves the river to the sea. The Treaty provides that this right of free navigation is subject to local laws and regulations not inconsistent with that right. Reciprocal rights of navigation are secured to the ships of both countries, in boundary waters, by the treaty of 1909. For purposes of navigation, Lake Michigan, which lies wholly within the United States, is considered part of the boundary waters. The 1909 treaty contains two conditions not found in the 1871 treaty. Those conditions are (1) any restrictive laws or regulations imposed by either country upon the ships of the other, shall operate with equal effect upon its own ships and (2) any tolls imposed for the sale of canals and locks by one country upon the ships of the other, likewise must be applied with equal force to its own ships.

Since the greater portion of the navigation project would lie in the lower St. Lawrence River, the protection afforded by the 1909 treaty, with respect to the equal applicability of tolls and other restrictions, would not be applicable. It seems most unfortunate that the United States should be committed to a reciprocal policy for the Great Lakes, and that the same policy is not expressly extended to waters which lie wholly within Canada. The opportunity for discrimination, if not an actual temptation to place burdens upon the American ships for competitive purposes, would seem too great to permit a disparity of this kind to remain.

We are advised that by article IV, paragraph (d) of the 1941 agreement, Canada would be assured sufficient waters from the Great Lakes to maintain her own channels, at and below Montreal, at such depths as she might choose to improve them. There is some opinion that in the event the navigation project is completed, Montreal would grow as a port of transshipment.

Because of the navigation hazards of the St. Lawrence River, it would be uneconomical to operate large ships between Great Lakes and ocean ports. It has been suggested that a special Great Lakes type ship could be developed so that cargoes moving from Great Lakes ports for export, could be transported to Montreal for transshipment in ocean vessels. There is very definite trend toward deeper draft for ocean ships. To enable such ships to operate profitably as far inland as Montreal, Canada might very well improve channels of the lower St. Lawrence River to greater depth. The river is already improved from Montreal to Quebec and beyond. Substantial improvement of the navigable channels in the lower St. Lawrence, would be of no avail unless the greater depth were compensated by dams or by the use of additional water. That additional water, according to the agreement, would be obtained by increasing the flow of water through the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario. Lake Ontario is the smallest of the Great Lakes. To maintain its level with increased abstraction of water would require greater flow from the other lakes; thus the entire system would be adversely affected.

It is a well-established national policy, reflected in domestic law and in the 1909 treaty, that the waters of the Great Lakes should be preserved for navigation and commerce. Both the Federal Government and the Great Lakes States have opposed the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Drainage Canal, on the ground that the abstraction would adversely affect the levels of the Great Lakes. By the 1909 treaty, Canada and the United States, bound themselves to refrain from making any diversions, in their respective waters, which would affect the level of the waters in the territory of the other, except as the other gave her consent. The provision of the 1941 agreement, with respect to the maintenance of channel depths at and below Montreal, would obviously sacrifice the Great Lakes for the lower St. Lawrence River.

The history of navigation, through the St. Lawrence River, shows that it serves British commerce to a greater extent than United States commerce. If the navigation project is completed, that situation would be accentuated. The British Isles have always been large consumers of grain grown in the Canadian Northwest. The Ottawa conference of 1932 gave tariff preference to Canadian wheat transported from the growing fields to Liverpool by British facilities. Canadian wheat loaded at Fort William-Port Arthur, Ontario, on Lake Superior, was formerly transported in large volumes by means of American ships to Buffalo, N. Y., and then transshipped either by way of New York or Montreal. The imperial preference had the effect of routing Canadian wheat down the Great Lakes in Canadian facilities. If the United States intends to participate in the proposed navigation project and finance the greater portion of the cost, the United States should insist that Great Britain refrain from asserting discriminatory measures against United States ships.

We greatly appreciate this opportunity to make known to you our views concerning the proposed seaway. It will be considered a pleasure to respond to any further inquiries which may occur to you.

Respectfully yours,

THE PIONEER STEAMSHIP CO.,
J. T. HUTCHINSON, *President*.

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1946.

Hon. J. W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Because of absence from my office, your letter of March 12 regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, has just come to my attention. I do not believe that there is very much that I can add from the viewpoint of a bulk-vessel operator on the Great Lakes to the facts and conclusions already presented before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Lake Carriers Association. This group, which is composed of substantially all the operators of bulk-dry-cargo vessels operating on the Great Lakes, has made a thorough study of the St. Lawrence waterway proposal and, in my opinion, you can have full confidence in the facts and the conclusions they have presented.

In answer to your first question, it would be folly to say that the proposed seaway would not provide savings to some shippers, nor prove attractive to some operators. However, it is my opinion that it would not provide sufficient savings to a sufficient number of American shippers, nor prove attractive

to a sufficient number of American ship operators to justify the required expenditures. I personally fail to see where a sufficient number of Americans will be benefited to justify the expenditure of the public's money on the enterprise.

In answer to your second question, our company is engaged in the transportation of iron ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our vessels are not adaptable to ocean navigation and, furthermore, the expense of operation due to initial cost and high American wage rates would make it impractical to compete with foreign tramp ships. We therefore have no plans for future navigation of the seaway should it materialize.

I trust that the above answers your questions. If you have any further questions, I would be only too pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.

THE TOMLINSON FLEET,
Bay City, Mich., March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On my return from Cleveland, I find your letter of the 12th, addressed to me as president of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., 2900 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio. I am very glad indeed to hear from you in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

About 40 years ago the State of Michigan authorized a sum of money to be spent and the Governor, Fred M. Warner, to appoint a commission to see what could be done about improving the St. Lawrence waterway. I happened to be selected by Governor Warner as a member of that commission and I am the only one of that original Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission left, the others having passed on. Our commission set to work at once to interest other States in this great project and eventually we had 23 States contiguous to the Great Lakes that had formed associations favorable to the St. Lawrence waterway.

When this matter was called to the attention of President Coolidge, he decided that it was time to appoint a commission from the United States to act jointly with a similar commission from the Dominion of Canada, and he appointed as the United States St. Lawrence Commission the following:

Herbert Hoover, chairman; William C. Breed, New York; James P. Goodrich, Indiana; James E. Davidson, Michigan; Charles L. Allen, Massachusetts; James R. Howard, Iowa; James F. Noonan, Missouri.

Joint board of engineers: Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers; Col. William Kelly and Lt. Col. George B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers.

To work in conjunction with the American commission the Canadian Government appointed the following engineers: Duncan W. Maclachlan, Department of Railways and Canals; Oliver O. Lefevre, chief engineer, Quebec-St. Lawrence commission; Brig. Gen. Charles Hamilton Mitchell.

Many meetings were held and Herbert Hoover, with the commission and engineers, has been over this route three times. After years of study, preparation of plans and specifications and estimates of cost, we recommended the St. Lawrence route as the cheapest, most accessible, and best route, not only to shorten the distance to the seaboard, but to show the best promise in the reduction of freight rates.

At about this time the Dominion of Canada commenced work on its new Welland Canal locks in anticipation of the St. Lawrence project being completed. These locks now connect Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, so that the only impediment preventing the use of the St. Lawrence seaway by oceangoing ships is the rocky shallows in the river for minimum distance of 21 miles, or a maximum distance of not more than 24 miles.

I am president not only of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., but of all the companies noted at the head of this letter, except the Sierra Steamship Co., of which my son is president. All the ships owned by these companies are large, modern, steel freighers and there are 11 of them altogether. They are now engaged in the general lake trade, carrying ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our largest ships carry considerable grain from Duluth, Minn., down through the new Welland Canal onto Lake Ontario and to Oswego, N. Y., which is right near the St. Lawrence River entrance to Lake Ontario. The new locks installed by the Dominion of Canada are splendid in every way and will take care of at least 80 percent of all ocean tonnage.

My family has been engaged in the Great Lakes transportation for upwards of 75 years. In the early days the ships were small wooden sailing vessels, carrying about 21,000 bushels of grain, but as time advanced we kept pace with shipbuilding progress and have built larger and larger ships for our fleets.

Buffalo, N. Y., is my former home. My father and mother were both born there, as were all their children. I am still interested in companies doing business in that city and would not do anything to hurt Buffalo. However, all the lower lake ports can get along very well without stevedoring business; that is, the transferring of freight from lake ships to the railroads or canal boats navigating the Erie Canal. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway will be a wonderful thing for America, and particularly for the fifty-odd millions of people residing in the middle section of the United States.

Thank you for your inquiry, and I shall be very glad to answer any specific questions that you have occasion to propound.

With sincere regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

JAMES E. DAVIDSON.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the reorganization bill, passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it became mandatory upon the House and the Senate to agree upon a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. The act required the Budget Committee to make a report by February 15, which is now almost 3 months past.

For the benefit of certain Senators who may have forgotten certain sections of the Reorganization Act, I propose to read into the RECORD, with some care and emphasis, section 138, under the caption of "Legislative budget." Section 138 is as follows:

SEC 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

Mr. President, as one can readily conclude from the express provisions contained in this section, the budget report is long overdue. I ask in all seriousness whether anyone has seen the report, or can anyone give me a lead as to whom I might discuss this matter with, in order to ascertain whether or not a report will ever be forthcoming? I am certain that Senators on both sides of the aisle have waited daily for the report of the Legislative Budget Committee. In fact, the American people have long waited for an answer. It was only last week in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee that John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who was testifying on the tax reduction bill, emphatically stated that he and the American people were tremendously disappointed over the apparent indifference and lethargy of the Legislative Budget Committee in its failure to comply with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, no labor bill, no tax bill, no appropriation bill, nor any other important piece of legislation can supplant the absolute necessity for immediate action upon the part of the Legislative Budget Committee. It would indeed be interesting to know the inside story of why this budget is permitted to sleep so peacefully in Republican pigeonholes. Every Member of the Senate knows, and the country knows, that the people were entitled many weeks ago to some kind of a budget report, good or bad, even though it was based on a speculative guess.

Mr. President, the Congress did not pass the Reorganization Act in a spirit of flippancy or misunderstanding. I was under the impression that we meant what

we said and said what we meant, and voted accordingly, when the bill was passed. I noticed in Sunday's newspaper that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated definitely that under no circumstances would the Republican leadership violate the Reorganization Act by continuing this session of the Congress longer than July 31, as provided therein. But, we find the Senator conspicuously silent on compliance with section 138 of the Reorganization Act—a section far more important than that which fixes the adjournment date.

Three months have passed and no report on the legislative budget has been made. Not a single sound, constructive statement has been made by the party in power as to why no report has been made. The leaders of the majority party sit by silently, day after day, taking no steps to move this committee to action.

This afternoon I learned directly from the lips of one member of the committee that for the past 30 days there has not been a meeting between the conferees of the House and the conferees of the Senate upon this very important question.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the conferees should agree on some budget figure at once. Failing in what is their legislative responsibility, they should report immediately their inability to agree and ask for instructions. This, as every Senator knows, is the rule of the Senate—a sacred rule—yet for weeks we have seen this rule violated with total indifference and bold impunity by the majority party.

In the debate upon the legislative budget it was said that the fixing of a budget ceiling was not legally binding upon the Appropriations Committee or any Member of the Senate—and that is true—but it was also said repeatedly by many Senators, and emphatically by the senior Senator from Ohio, that a budget ceiling constituted a moral pledge to which he would rigidly adhere; but alas, there is no budget. It is buried along the side of other Republican campaign pledges and promises. One is inclined to believe that the Republicans have found the answer to the question, "Oh, grave, where is thy victory?"

Mr. President, it is significant that from the very convening of this Congress, section 138 of the Reorganization Act has been given little or no consideration by the majority party. The ink was hardly dry on this section when the political saboteurs moved in. The Legislative Budget Committee did nothing in the way of fact-finding previous to the time when the Senate was called to vote upon a cut in the President's budget.

That was the primary reason why the Senator from Illinois refused to vote either for the $6,000,000,000 cut or the four-and-one-half-billion-dollar-cut when the question was debated upon the floor of the Senate.

Individual Members of the Senate were compelled to reach a conclusion upon pure speculation, followed by more than a rough guess. We all remember that not one line of written testimony was submitted to the Senate upon which a reasonable judgment might be based. As will be recalled, the House voted blindly for a $6,000,000,000 slash in the President's budget, and the Senate voted for a $4,500,000,000 decrease in that budget. At the same time the Senate specifically said by a record vote, upon the motion of the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that we should apply $2,600,000,000 on the national debt. In addition to the foregoing figures, the House passed H. R. 1, reducing taxes $3,800,000,000.

Mr. President, to act intelligently upon these grave fiscal responsibilities we need the budgetary yardstick required in section 138 to guide us effectively. That is particularly true if we apply efficient and businesslike methods in our attempt to reduce expenditures, and the national debt and taxes. The slipshod method now employed by the Republican leadership may ultimately prove a financial boomerang to extravagant pledges and promises.

Mr. President, so long as the Senate of the United States, in dealing with the fiscal policy of this Nation, places the cart before the horse, I respectfully submit that Members of the Senate are in no position to denounce and condemn some of the business methods of the executive branch of Government. I say with the utmost sincerity that a limitation of authorized expenditures would be tremendously influenced by a sound budgetary report, which is not forthcoming, and apparently never will be so far as this session of Congress is concerned.

I pause at this time to ask any Member of the Senate or any member of the Legislative Budget Committee to advise the Senate and the country why some kind of budget report has not been made, and whether one will be made.

I hear no answer to that query. At least some Members on the opposite side of the aisle are listening, because I see smiles upon their faces.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does it occur to the Senator that the Senate and the House have wasted valuable time which, in these days when the country is facing a real crisis, could certainly have been devoted to more serious matters? We could have used that time to better purpose than to debate the legislative budget for a long period and then bury it in a conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is eminently correct. If we had never expected to make use of the budget which is specifically required under the legislative provision, section 138 of the Reorganization Act, we should never, as the Senator says, have taken valuable time of the Senate to debate the question for days.

Furthermore, if the conferees cannot agree they should come back here and advise the Senate that they cannot agree. They should have done so weeks ago. They should have asked for instructions, or asked for new conferees, to see whether or not some compromise could have been reached upon this important legislative question.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator will recall that during the debate on the budget the whole subject was referred to merely as a pious hope, a wish, or a New Year's resolution. I think none of us expected much more than what has already happened.

Mr. LUCAS. Some referred to it as a pious hope and a New Year's resolution, but others referred to it as a part of a rule being laid down by the House and the Senate which they would be morally bound to follow. In other words, it was said to be a moral pledge which both branches would be bound to follow. It was important. We destroy the heart of the Reorganization Act if we do not comply with section 138.

Mr. MYERS. When the budget was discussed on the floor of the Senate those who supported the $4,500,000,000 and those who supported the $6,000,000,000 cut frankly admitted that they were not bound by it, and frankly admitted that there was no intention of acting in accordance with the Reorganization Act, which, as the Senator knows, provides that once a budget is established, any appropriations exceeding the budget shall require joint action of the two Houses of Congress. That was the whole theory and purpose of the legislative budget. It seems to me that it is extremely serious that we wasted so much time when other legislation was necessary, and other matters were confronting the Congress and the country. Our Legislative Calendar would be much further advanced if we had not wasted that time in the early days of this Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. The Senate and the House of Representatives should not have led the American people to believe that there would be tremendous cuts in the Federal budget—and that was the impression created during the debates both in this branch and the other branch—unless we expected to go through with what we were talking about. As a result of what we were doing upon the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, the American people obtained the impression that a substantial cut was to be made in the budget—either $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000. The two Houses cannot agree. The budget is lost somewhere between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Under the Reorganization Act the American people are entitled, in view of the debate in the two bodies, to some answer from those who are responsible for the legislative budget.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Of course there may be some difficulty in the conference because the Senate determined that at least $2,600,000,000 of savings should be applied to debt reduction, and there was a serious difference of opinion among the conferees as to whether we should have debt reduction or tax reduction.

Mr. LUCAS. I am coming to that.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator think that there is any difficulty due to the fact that the conferees have concluded that they cannot approach even a $4,000,000,000 cut?

Mr. LUCAS. There may be something to that suggestion, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I noticed today a recapitulation of the cuts so far made in the budget estimates. They have gone over 47 percent of the total amount requested and they have not approached $2,000,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall discuss that a little later.

Mr. President, referring again to section 138, only one part of it, I read as follows:

> Giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President—
>
> They must—
>
> report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year.

Mr. President, is not the Congress entitled to those figures, as we consider all the appropriation bills? The primary purpose of enacting section 138 was to provide a yardstick or a guide for the Appropriations Committee to follow as it considered the various appropriation bills from time to time. Certainly, the Finance Committee was entitled to that report, if that committee were to report out any sound and equitable tax legislation. The only budget we have before us is the President's estimated budget, and, apparently, that is the only one any committee will have before it as it considers these vital problems affecting the economy and the stability of the Nation.

I respectfully submit that the Congress is in a vulnerable position economically if it passes any tax bill before the report of the Legislative Budget Committee is agreed upon, and before it knows the total amount of appropriations which the Appropriations Committees will report, in comparison with the President's budget.

Section 138 also provides that if estimated receipts exceed the expenditures, such a report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt.

That is what the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had in mind when he submitted a resolution to reduce the national debt $2,600,000,000, which was agreed to, as I remember, unanimously. I do not think there was a dissenting vote.

Mr. President, is this the fly in the political ointment which keeps the conferees from reporting a legislative budget?

Can it be that those who have for political reasons talked the loudest about cutting the President's budget $6,000,000,000 realize they are up against a stone wall in accomplishing this fact?

Can it be that when they recapitulate budget cuts, debt reduction of $2,600,000,000 and a tax reduction of $3,800,000,000 they know a budgetary report of any kind would shatter their dreams or nullify their promises?

Mr. President, since we do not have the legislative budget required by the Reorganization Act, it is necessary to use the President's proposed budget and his estimates of expenditures for consideration of our fiscal policies. The revised estimate for receipts submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, which is the President's figure, is in the sum of $38,800,000,000. The President's budget estimate submitted to the Congress on January 10, 1947, was $37,500,000,000, leaving a net balance of $1,300,000,000.

The Members of the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority passed a resolution saying they were going to cut the President's budget $6,000,000,000. I think it is extremely important that the Congress and the country be brought up to date on what has been accomplished by the House of Representatives in attempting to achieve that worthy objective.

I presume that everyone will agree that interest on the national debt is an obligation that must be met if we expect government to survive. That amount for the fiscal year 1948 is $5,000,000,000.

I presume that the great majority of the Members of the Senate will agree that those in the Treasury Department who are experts in calculating refunds due under tax laws are in a better position to make estimates on tax refunds than any other group of people. Everyone knows that the $800,000,000, which the House Appropriations Committee took from tax refunds is a bookkeeping transaction only. Remember, Mr. President, tax refunds are something that cannot be changed by altering the estimate. The amount of tax refund depends upon the tax laws. For example, under our present law, a man's income tax is withheld every pay day from his salary and is remitted by his employer to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We all agree that that is a good idea. One pays his tax systematically and regularly during the year. But if his salary goes down during the year, or he is unemployed for a few weeks, or if he has unusually heavy deductible expenses, he will find that the Bureau of Internal Revenue owes him money at the end of the year. Whatever the Bureau owes in refunds cannot be changed by any action of the Appropriations Committees, unless the Congress is willing to assume the responsibility for repudiating debts due and owing taxpayers. Such a course would be the end of government. It would be cause for rebellion and insurrection.

Again, if taxes are cut for the fiscal year 1948, a man who paid at the high rate for the calendar year 1947, before the reduction takes effect, will find he owes the Government less than he expected. Therefore, his refund is bound to be increased by changing the tax laws during the year.

This gesture of cutting $800,000,000 is an empty one. It is a phoney. Eventually it will not save any of us a cent. So, Mr. President, I am convinced that any fair-minded man who will eliminate politics in this budget must agree that during the fiscal year 1948 the $2,100,000,000 estimate by the Treasury Department is a fixed obligation which we shall have to pay.

The third item I wish to discuss deals with international affairs and finance. The President's proposed budget for these items calls for $3,500,000,000 which, as we all know, is a sharp decline from the fiscal year 1947. I am certain no Member of Congress wants this Government to default on its loan agreement with the United Kingdom. No one desires to default on our occupation responsibilities in Europe and the Far East. No one wants our Government to default on its obligations to support the United Nations. This part of the budget is important to our future peace, prosperity, and security. We have agreed to provide war damage for the restoration in the Philippines and for the relief of displaced, tired, and hungry people in Europe. No one will want our Government to default on our obligations to support the United Nations. To my way of thinking, this part of the budget is tremendously important to our own peace and security and our future prosperity. If we should fail in our foreign policy, our domestic policy is threatened, because in this atomic age no domestic policy standing alone will maintain and insure for America our high standards of living.

The President in his proposed budget estimated we would need $3,500,000,000 to carry out our international commitments. Since he made that estimate the Senate of the United States, at his request, has passed the Greek-Turkish loan, committing this country to an additional international obligation in the sum of $400,000,000. The Foreign Relations Committee has reported out unanimously another relief bill authorizing the appropriation of $350,000,000 for relief purposes in foreign lands. Neither of these items was contained in the President's proposed budget. So, in my judgment, $3,500,000,000, called for by the President, is the minimum. No doubt it will be more, in view of the Greek-Turkish loan and the relief bill for aid to foreign countries. Insofar as this presentation is concerned, however, I shall leave the figure at $3,500,000,000.

Another item in the President's proposed budget which the Appropriations Committee will find great difficulty in cutting deals with veterans' services and benefits. The President's estimate for the fiscal year 1948 is $7,300,000,000. Obviously this is a large item in the budget, but it is necessary if the Congress provides education and rehabilitation for deserving veterans in conformity with the laws the Congress of the United States has passed. This not only includes education and rehabilitation but also covers pensions, hospitals, and other veterans' benefits which we of the Congress so gladly supported when the bill was before us for enactment.

Another item which the Appropriations Committee has not considered deals with the improvement of the transportation and communications systems and the development of natural resources of America. The President in his budget

estimated for this purpose a total amount of $2,300,000,000, of which the largest single item is $443,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. We all know that a determined effort will be made by those interested in the development of rivers and harbors, good roads, and atomic research to prevent a cut in this appropriation.

Our agricultural program which has not yet been considered by the Appropriations Committee amounts to $1,400,000,000, according to the President's estimate. This includes price supports guaranteed by law, soil conservation, and rural electrification. I imagine there will be a fair-sized agricultural bloc in the Senate which will support that program to the limit.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that only this afternoon, before he spoke an agricultural bill was introduced by several Senators; and the appropriations required by that bill, if it is enacted, will be even greater than the appropriations required by the programs the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I shall refer to a number of bills which have been introduced, asking for authorizations of appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill to which I referred was introduced only this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I deem it advisable to call attention also to the President's budget which deals with social welfare, health, and security, wherein he requests appropriations of $1,700,000,000. A substantial portion of this sum is for aid to the aged and other dependent persons. It also includes money for crime control and protection of public health, and grants to States for vocational education. It will be interesting to see whether any appropriations for the aged people of this country, or flat grants to the respective States of the Nation, are cut.

At this point, I shall recapitulate, Mr. President, to show the President's estimate of items that will remain firm and rigid:

President's estimated budget	$37,500,000,000
Expenditures (President's estimate):	
Interest on national debt	5,000,000,000
Refunds due under tax laws	2,100,000,000
International commitments	3,500,000,000
Veterans' services	7,300,000,000
Total	17,900,000,000
Balance	19,600,000,000

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

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wish to say to the able Senator from Illinois that I do not entirely disagree with him in his criticism of the fact that the legislative budget has not come back to the two Houses of Congress for action——

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because I think that it was the intent of the Congressional Reorganization Act, the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act, that the legislative budget should be reported to the two Houses of Congress for action.

Nor do I disagree up to this point with the figures the Senator from Illinois has read in regard to certain fixed charges which probably cannot be affected by the Congress. Under those circumstances, they leave a relatively narrow area in which the Congress can operate in respect to reducing governmental expenditures.

But I wish respectfully to point out to my able colleague, the Senator from Illinois, what I pointed out on the floor of the Senate the other day when the Department of Labor-Federal Security appropriations bill was before the Senate for consideration, namely, that we can talk all we want to about economy in Government, but the only place that we can practice economy in Government is on the specific appropriation bills, when they come before the Senate or before the House of Representatives for action.

To date, during the present session, the Senate has had before it only one regular appropriation bill. That was acted upon on Monday of the present week. In connection with that appropriation bill, the Senate had only three yea-and-nay votes, when the Members of the Senate could stand and be counted specifically as being either for or against economy in Government.

I mention these matters at this time only because a few moments ago there was a brief discussion on the floor of the Senate on the subject of economy in Government and reductions in the budget.

As shown on page 4515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in connection with the vote on one item proposing an increase in the expenditures of Government, my able colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] voted "yea," in favor of an increase. My able colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who also spoke a few minutes ago, did not vote on that particular question. My able colleague the Senator from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] voted "yea," in favor of an increase in the budget.

On page 4526 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Monday it is shown that my able colleague the Senator from Illinois did not vote; my able colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] voted "yea," in favor of an increase in the budget; and my able colleague the Senator from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] did not vote on that question.

On the third, and last, yea-and-nay vote relative to economy, the three able Senators who have joined in the recent discussion today did not vote on the question of economy at that point.

I merely wish respectfully to point out that the only place where we can practice economy is on the particular appropriation bills as they come before us for action on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from California. He has made a very able contribution to the debate, as he always does. If he can get any satisfaction from any vote which I have cast in the Senate, he is perfectly welcome to it. But such matters as that do not relieve the majority party of the responsibility which they assumed when they took over the reins of control in the Congress on January 3 of this year and when they told the American people what they would do. I have only one vote, and it does not count for very much. Republicans have a majority of the votes in the House and a majority of votes in the Senate, and they can do whatever they want to do in regard to appropriations. They can cut the appropriations in half or reduce them 30 percent or reduce them any percentage which they wish, because they have the power to do so.

I voted for that increase because I thought it would be false economy to decrease such an appropriation at this time.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I say to the Senator from Illinois, as I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, that I think the Senator from California was very fair in the hearings. I congratulated him then for his fairness and for his ability. However, I think the premise of his remarks today is wrong. At the times which he has mentioned, I did not vote to increase the budget; I voted, according to the dictates of my mind and my conscience, for good Government, for efficient Government, for the right kind of Government.

In regard to the yea-and-nay votes which I unfortunately missed, let me say that if I had voted on those questions I would have voted in the same way I voted on the other question. If I had voted on the questions to which the able Senator from California has just referred, I would have voted for the adoption of the amendments which were offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and for the adoption of the cancel amendment which was offered by the Senater from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], because I am convinced that we are not going to have efficient Government with those appropriations reduced as they have been.

In view of those reductions, I think the normal functions of government are not going to be performed as they should be performed. I say to the Senator from Illinois that I directed a specific question to the Senator from California, asking where in the Office of the Solicitor, or where in the Bureau of Labor Standards, or where in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, economies could be made. The Senator had no answer. Another Senator rose and merely said, "We do not think they want to economize. We think they can economize if they desire to do so."

But, Mr. President, at no time during either the debate on the legislative

budget or the debate on the Department of Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill was I able to elicit any information as to how those functions could be properly and adequately performed following the cuts in the budget or in the appropriations which were made at that time. It was frankly admitted that the work load of those agencies in the next fiscal year will be equal to or greater than their work load in the present fiscal year. However, it was said that they did not cooperate.

Frankly, Mr. President, the Senator from California did not agree with the budget cuts made in the House of Representatives; frankly, he took the position that those cuts went entirely too far, because he was willing, and properly so and fairly so, in the committee to restore some of the items which had been eliminated by those cuts. He thought the hatchet had been wielded with too much force and had cut too deeply. He thought the cuts which were made were too drastic, and in the committee he acted to restore some of the cuts.

I desire to go a little further. Not only do I disagree with the action of the House of Representatives on those matters—and in that respect I am in accord with the Senator from California—but I also am in disagreement with the action of the subcommittee of which the Senator from California is chairman. Of course, I think he has acted with the best of motives, and I think he was sincere in what he did, and I think he may believe that he is able to prove the correctness of his position.

But I voted, not for greater expenditures, I say to the Senator from California, but for what I believe would be efficient government.

Mr. President, it is easy to twist a phrase. It is easy to attribute to others, either to me or to other Senators, motives which were not our motives.

I repeat my statement of the other day that the budget items for the agencies to which we have referred were materially reduced by the President, and the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended appropriations which they believed represented amounts absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of the Government. The fact that we agree with the experts, and the fact that we agree with the President does not mean that we are not in favor of economy. It only means that we were not in agreement with the able Senator from California. I believe that the premise upon which he based his remarks was an incorrect or a wrong premise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, but I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not care to interrupt the Senator again, but I merely wish to say to my able colleague from Pennsylvania, for whom I have the highest regard, that I am not quarreling with him at this time, and with his position on the Labor and Security appropriation bill, which was passed last Monday. I merely desire to point out that if one entertains the view that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States can support, during peacetime years, a governmental structure which requires the expenditure of $37,500,000,000, 2 years after the war, as recommended by the President of the United States, and if one believes that our economy can support such a vast expenditure of Federal money, of course he is entirely within his rights to vote that way, and in so doing he should uphold the budget figures submitted by the President of the United States. But if Senators believe that the people of the United States cannot support such a vast expenditure during peacetime, then the only way to curtail the expenditures of the Government is for the Congress of the United States to take into its hands the matter of governmental economy, and the only way we can get economy is by voting for it, and not talking about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The very able and distinguished Senator from California referred to peacetime years. Most of the $37,500,000,000 budget to which the Senator refers, I think he will agree with me, was made necessary by the exigencies of the war which has just been concluded. The big items in the appropriation bills of the last year, and which will be in the appropriation bills this year, are the appropriations for veterans, for paying the debts created by the war, and the like. So I do not look upon the budget and the appropriations for this year in the light of a peacetime America. We are paying our war debts, we are paying off our veterans and building new hospitals, we are giving veterans aid from every angle. As the Senator from Illinois well said a little while ago, we are paying $5,500,000,000 on the debt created because of the war alone. So, while I agree with the Senator from California that certainly in peacetime we could never afford a $37,500,000,000 budget, we are far away from a peacetime budget. We are paying on obligations which were created in the wartime years, 1941–45. While I appreciate very much what the Senator has said, I think he must agree with me that we have not quite yet returned to peace, insofar as appropriations are concerned, because so much of the money we appropriate goes to pay debts created in the years when we were in the war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am under no delusion that we can go back to a figure we had prior to the war. I fully recognize that, and that is one of the reasons why I did not support the House in its $6,000,000,000 cut. It was because we have certain international commitments, and due to uncertainties in the international field we have to maintain adequate armed forces in the air, on the land, and on the sea. But I wish to say to the able Senator from South Carolina that I still sincerely believe that even when we take care of those matters, and meet the necessary expenditures for veterans, in the other functions of the Government of the United States there is still a lot of "fat" which could be cut out.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from California that there is still a great deal of "fat" that could be cut out. But when the Senator speaks of the $37,500,000,000 figure he knows that the appropriations for the normal functions of Government, outside war expenditures, outside the War and Navy appropriations, are less than $6,000,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate all the contributions made by Senators. Especially am I impressed with the arguments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from California. He has practically corroborated everything I have said in the short address I have made today before the Senate.

First, the Senator agrees with me that there is a certain number of items in the budget, which I have noted, which are almost fixed and almost untouchable so far as any decrease in the appropriation is concerned.

Second, he says the time has come when we should quit talking about economy in government and do something about it, and that is why I am making my remarks here today, because the majority party, from January 3 on, has been talking about a $6,000,000,000 and a $4,500,000,000 decrease in the President's estimates as contained in his budget. There has been much sound and fury and little action along that line on the part of the majority, which causes me to come on the floor of the Senate and invite the attention of the Senate, as well as of the country, to the failure of the majority party to accomplish what they said months ago they were going to accomplish in the way of cutting the budget.

Mr. President, my opinion, shared by the great majority of Congress, is that the $17,900,000,000 is a near must in executive expenditures. This means that if the Republicans are going to cut expenditures by $6,000,000,000, they will have to perform this major operation upon the $19,600,000,000 balance I have just indicated.

Included in that sum is $11,200,000,000 for national defense, the largest budgetary item in the President's estimate.

Mr. President, if it be concluded that no material cuts can be made in the items composing the $17,900,000,000 as requested in the President's budget, it is axiomatic that a reduction of approximately 37 percent must be made in the remaining items of the budget in order to accomplish a $6,000,000,000 reduction, set as the objective of the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to observe just what has been done with the appropriation bills to date. The appropriation for the Interior Department, that little simple appropriation the country heard so much about not long ago, was estimated at $295,420,420. It was cut in the House to $161,413,513. The amount of the reduction was $134,006,907. The percentage of reduction was 45.4 percent. That was

in the small appropriation for the Interior Department, where the majority put the meat ax to work.

Then we come to the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriations. The estimate of the President was for $4,099,-123,500. The amount as passed by the House of Representatives was $3,202,-050,750. It was in that appropriation they included the $800,000,000 for tax refunds. The amount of the reduction was $897,072,750. But if we take off the $800,000,000, as they have to do as a bookkeeping transaction, it means they cut it $97,000,000.

For the State Department the estimate in the President's budget was $279,537,-623. That was cut in the House committee to $219,128,058. The amount of the reduction was $60,409,565, or 21.6 percent.

The estimate for the Commerce Department was $286,989,000. The amount recommended by the House committee was $191,057,000. The amount of the reduction was $95,932,000, or 33.4 percent.

For the Department of Justice the estimate was $111,470,000. The amount recommended by the House committee was $108,396,500, a reduction of $3,073,-500, or 2.8 percent.

For the judiciary including all the Federal courts, the estimate was $20,-624,900. The amount recommended by the House committee was $17,146,450, a reduction of $3,478,450, or 16.9 percent.

The total estimates to date, in the President's budget, which have been considered by the House Appropriations Committee or by the House itself, amount to $6,856,577,743. The total passed by the House, or recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, is $6,383,-779,053; a reduction of $472,798,692, or a percentage reduction of 6.9. That is a far cry from the 37 percent or 38 percent reduction that is necessary in order to reach the $6,000,000,000, or even the $4,500,000,000 budget reduction figure.

Mr. President, I ask that the table from which I have been quoting the figures be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Appropriation bill	Estimate in President's budget	As passed by House or recommended by House Appropriations Committee	Amount of reduction	Percentage of reduction
Labor Department and Federal Security Agency	$1,763,412,300	[1] $1,684,586,780	$78,825,520	4.5
Interior Department	295,420,420	[1] 161,413,513	134,006,907	45.4
Treasury and Post Office Departments	4,099,123,500	[1][2] 3,202,050,750	897,072,750	21.9
Additional funds for tax refunds on basis of Treasury estimate		800,000,000	−800,000,000	2.4
State Department	279,537,623	[3] 219,128,058	60,409,565	21.6
Commerce Department	286,989,000	[3] 191,057,000	95,932,000	33.4
Justice Department	111,470,000	[3] 108,396,500	3,073,500	2.8
Judiciary	20,624,900	[3] 17,146,450	3,478,450	16.9
Total	6,856,577,743	6,383,779,053	472,798,692	6.9

[1] As passed by the House of Representatives.
[2] This difference between the estimate of the President and the amount shown in this column includes a downward revision in the estimate of the Treasury of the amount of tax refunds to be made of $800,000,000.
[3] As recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, assuming that no material reduction can be made in the budgetary items in the total sum of $17,900,000,000, I now add to that sum the total amount of appropriations which has been passed by the House of Representatives, or its Appropriations Committee, for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency, the Department of Interior, the Treasury Department, and Post Office Department, the State Department, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice and the judiciary, namely, $6,383,779,053.

From this sum a total of $2,100,000,000 must be deducted on account of refunds due under tax laws, since this amount is included both in the appropriation for the Treasury Department above, and in the irreducible minimum of expenditures below, $2,100,000,000; leaving a balance of $4,283,779,053; plus estimated cost of irreducible expenditures, $17,900,000,000; totaling $22,183,779,053.

I now return to the $6,000,000,000 cut promised by the House of Representatives. If that objective is reached, it would mean that the President's budget would be cut from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000.

Total expenditures accounted for above, $22,183,779,053.

Balance, $9,316,220,947.

If the judgment of the House of Representatives is sustained and $6,000,000,000 is cut from the Budget, this means that $9,316,220,947 is all that remains for military expenditures, public works, flood control, support to prices of agricultural commodities, soil-conservation payments, support for the aged, blind, and for widowed mothers. Included in this amount is the expense of the Congress, Presidential offices, and a number of small Government agencies.

It must be remembered that the President's estimate for the national defense alone was $11,200,000,000. Just where it will be possible to reduce expenditures $6,000,000,000 in these perilous times is a ponderable question that only the stars can answer.

It must be giving some folks a severe headache, as golden promises run headlong into indisputable facts.

If the House version of the legislative budget should prevail, its $6,000,000,000 cut would require a 16-percent cut of the total budget estimate of the President. Even if the Senate version should prevail, and $4,500,000,000 were cut from the President's proposed budget, that would require a 12-percent cut in the President's total estimate. It is significant to say that in many items in which a drastic cut has been ballyhooed, the House Appropriations Committee has actually been successful in making a cut of only 6.9 percent.

Mr. President, there are those in the Congress who are constantly telling the American people that bureaucrats are entrenched in the Federal departments, wasting the taxpayers' money, and that if it were possible to remove the bureaucrats from the pay roll of the Government in Washington, a total of $6,000,-000,000 could be saved. Human nature being what it is, I do not doubt that there is some loafing in Government departments. I do not doubt that there is some overlapping of agencies and duplication of effort. I am for removing from the Federal pay roll every individual whose elimination does not impair the essential services of government. But I submit that even with a $31,000,-000,000 budget, personnel in quantity as well as quality is needed to administer effectively such a fund.

The distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. HOLLAND] was at one time Governor of Florida. He understands what it means effectively to administer a fund. If proper personnel is lacking, or if the quality of personnel is lacking to administer it properly, there will be false economy in government.

It is difficult to keep qualified individuals in Government. We have all seen industry lure from the Government pay roll, by offering much higher salaries, thousands of the Government's best trained men, among them many who while they were in Government service were the objects of the most bitter attacks by those who cry "bureaucrat" every time they get an opportunity.

Parenthetically, I should like to say that all the loafing and wasting of taxpayers' money is not confined to the executive branch of Government. I do not think anyone would contend that the Senate of the United States has any monopoly on efficiency and economy, even when the Republicans are in control.

Mr. President, based upon commitments and obligations we are duty-bound to honor, and based upon actual appropriations made by the House of Representatives to date, I undertake to say that unless the essential services of Government are sharply curtailed and the budget for national defense severely cut, the $6,000,000,000 pledge by the House of Representatives will fall short by billions of dollars. Assuming, however, that we should be successful in cutting the President's budget $2,500,-000,000, which would result in appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 of $35,000,-000,000, I submit what seems to me to be some more interesting figures:

Total revenue is estimated at	$38,800,000,000
If our expenditures are	35,000,000,000
The balance would be	3,800,000,000
The Senate voted overwhelmingly to pay on the national debt the sum of	2,600,000,000
Balance	1,200,000,000

If we pass a tax bill that costs the Government $3,800,000,000, we could easily drive the Treasury Department into bookkeeping transactions which will ultimately lead us into deficit financing, in balancing the budget without paying a single dollar on the national debt. Mr. President, I notice that some who once denounced the Government of the United States for going into the red, as the Senate proceeds with certain fiscal policies, today apparently have little fear of red ink.

However, in fairness, it should be said that there is a school of thought which holds that tax reductions will actually increase the Treasury receipts, and that tax relief and substantial reduction of the national debt go hand in hand. There is precedent for that theory. It happened back in the twenties. But I respectfully submit that there is no comparison between the twenties and the forties. Everyone knows that we have at the present time the highest national income in history, and the evidence of the experts before the Committee on Finance indicates that for the fiscal year 1948 it will not run over $170,000,000,000. That is based upon the theory that there will be no unforeseen economic calamities, and no dangerous recession.

Mr. President, there is another factor which cannot be ignored at this time by the Congress in formulating a sound fiscal policy of government. There is no man in the Senate who has not and will not continue to experience pressure from occupational, regional, and local groups. They are all for cutting Federal expenditures to the bone, until any cut threatens their share in Government disbursements. All Senators have received resolution after resolution from organizations in their respective States, demanding economy at all costs. But the moment one of their pet projects is threatened by a general economy movement, the lip service they gave to cutting expenditures in Government immediately fades from the picture. They become special pleaders for cause. They have no hesitancy in advocating the enactment of legislation carrying the authorization for appropriations which will bring something to their community or section of the country at the expense of the Federal Government.

And so it seems to me, Mr. President, highly appropriate at this time to place in the RECORD an estimate of the cost of a number of bills which have been introduced by the majority party in the Congress, seeking appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, which are not included in the President's budget. In making this estimate, when I found more than one bill introduced for the same project or the same purpose, I listed an estimated cost of only one, in an effort to avoid duplication in this tabulation and to ascertain as nearly as possible what would be the cost of carrying out the provisions of the divers and sundry authorizations proposed by the majority. Obviously, the total amount does not carry the accuracy of official budget estimate. It could be more; it could be less.

The bills I am about to enumerate are not all that have been introduced, because a number of Democrats are also the authors of many bills seeking additional appropriations.

I read the list I have prepared of bills pending in the Senate, as follows:

ADDITIONAL COST OF LEGISLATION PENDING IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS INTRODUCED BY REPUBLICAN MEMBERS

IN THE SENATE

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

S. 652, Mr. GURNEY: Universal Military Training Act of 1947, creates a Universal Military Training Corps, $1,486,000,000.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES LEGISLATION

S. 82, Mr. FERGUSON: Authorizes 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave annually for classified substitute postal employees, $49,171,000.

S. 447, Mr. LANGER: Provides for annual and sick leave for rural mail carriers, $16,000,000.

S. 674, Mr. BALDWIN: Substitute postal employees shall receive compensation for overtime service on the basis of 150 percent for hourly rate of pay, $14,000,000.

S. 549, Mr. LANGER: Grants postmasters an additional $200 per annum, in addition to their base pay, after 10 years' service, and an additional $200 per annum for every 5-year period of service thereafter, $12,200,000.

S. 203, Mr. LANGER: For 3 years, rural carriers shall receive an additional equipment maintenance of 2 cents for each mile traveled, $8,776,000.

VETERANS' SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE

S. 208, Mr. LANGER: Increases subsistence allowances to veterans receiving educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to $100 (now $65) in the case of a person without dependents; and $125 (now $90) in the case of a person with dependents, $765,000,000.

S. 112, Mr. KNOWLAND: Increases the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving compensation both for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education or on-the-job training to $250 (now $175) for veterans without dependents, and $300 (now $200) for veterans with dependents, $145,638,000.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

S. 644, Mr. BALDWIN: Increases the wartime service-connected death compensation or pension, payable to surviving widows for children of World War veterans, $32,764,000.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S BENEFITS

S. 429, Mr. WHITE: Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, extends to merchant seamen hospitalization, vocational and educational benefits; provides for loans and disability benefits, $20,000,000.

MISCELLANEOUS

S. 654, Mr. GURNEY: Authorizes appropriation of Federal funds for the purchase of land for the construction of armory and the construction or purchase of warehouses or other storage facilities, $15,000,000.

S. 582, Mr. CORDON: Authorizes annual payments to the States, for the benefit of their local units, of 2 percent of fair value of national forest lands, situated therein, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, $12,000,000.

S. 586, Messrs. CORDON and MORSE: Provides for an additional Military Academy and Naval Academy in Oregon or California ($175,000,000 over a 5-year period), $10,000,000.

S. 321, Mr. GURNEY: Amends the Pay Readjustment Act so as to increase to $936 annually (now $780) the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, $1,400,000.

S. 672, Mr. GURNEY: Authorizes leave of absence for officers and employees of the United States and the District of Columbia who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, without loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating, for duty with troops, field exercises, or instruction for not more than 15 days in any 1 year, $1,600,000.

S. 597, Mr. BUSHFIELD: Forest Pest Control Act—the Secretary of Agriculture, either directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government, or any State, may conduct surveys on forest lands and take action to prevent or eradicate insect pests and tree diseases, $600,000.

S. 230, Mr. GURNEY: For the construction of aviation facilities in the United States Naval Academy, $12,000,000.

S. 286, Messrs. LODGE and SALTONSTALL: Authorizes a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps at or near Boston, $6,000,000.

It might just as well have been at Hartford, Conn., but it was Boston, Mass.

AGRICULTURE

S. 669, Mr. LANGER; S. 109, Mr. REED; S. 68, Mr. BUTLER: Authorizes the payment through the Commodity Credit Corporation of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn of the 1945 crop, not sold before April 18, 1946. Reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and now on the Senate Calendar, $337,000,000.

I want to say with respect to this legislation that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Illinois who is now speaking were the only two Senators who voted against the proposal for the expenditure of $337,000,000, and I anticipate a pretty good scrap here on the floor of the Senate when the agricultural bloc begins fighting for that $337,000,000.

S. 724, Mr. CAPPER: Farm labor supply program. Six months' extension of the farm labor supply program beyond June 30, 1947, $10,000,000.

We already have passed that bill.

S. 800, Messrs. MORSE, CORDON, and JOHNSON of Colorado: Authorizes building of access roads to standing timber to assist the veterans' emergency housing program, $10,000,000.

S. 814, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming: Wool Act of 1947, 2-year period, $42,000,000.

S. 568, Mr. CAPPER: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, 5-year period, $50,000,000; fiscal year 1948, $10,000,000.

So it goes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the remainder of the bills as I have prepared it. The bills speak for themselves without taking the time of the Senate to read them in the RECORD.

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

INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS

S. 938, Mr. VANDENBERG: Aid to Greece and Turkey, $400,000,000.

Senate Joint Resolution 77, Messrs. VANDENBERG and CONNALLY: Provides for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization. Authorizes annual appropriation, contribution, and expenses, 4-year period, $208,000,000.

(In fairness, it should be noted that these bills are part of the program of the President and required by the present international situation.)

EDUCATION

S. 199, Mr. AIKEN: Education Finance Act of 1947, authorizes for the purposes of more

nearly equalizing the educational opportunities among and within the States and increasing the amount to be appropriated year by year, fiscal year 1948, $400,000,000.

S. 472, Mr. TAFT: Education Finance Act of 1947 (same as Mr. AIKEN's bill), $150,000,000.

S. 866, Messrs. WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT: Housing bill, increasing per annum to a maximum of $160,000,000 in the fifth year, then declining to $140,000,000 for 40 years thereafter, fiscal year 1948, $38,000,000.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

H. R. 1889, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma: Veterans' Adjusted Service Compensation Act of 1947. Eighteen to twenty-two billion dollars over a 5-year period, approximate figure in 1948 (sponsored by VFW), $2,000,000,000.

H. R. 1122, Mr. LEMKE: Veterans' Rehabilitation Act, several billion dollars.

H. R. 1820, Mr. HAGEN: Provides for computation of double time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay of enlisted men with 30 years' service, effective from July 1, 1942, $17,000,000.

MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

H. R. 871. Mr. RUSSELL: Creates a National Mineral Resources Division, $100,600,000.

POSTAL SERVICE

H. R. 2364, Mr. HAGEN: Grants first-, second-, and third-class postmasters increases in salary, depending on service, $38,000,000.

H. R. 1271, Mr. STEVENSON: Revises provisions relating to compensation of rural letter carriers on the basis of 5 tours of duty per week, $15,653,000.

H. R. 1185. Mr. COLE of Missouri: Additional allowances to third- and fourth-class postmasters, $2,583,000.

H. R. 1188, Mr. COLE of Missouri: Rural mail carriers serving heavily patronized routes shall be paid equipment maintenance of $1 per hour for the time spent serving a route, $1,595,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

H. R. 1815, Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Creates National Science Foundation, between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

H. R. 1367, Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Authorizes construction of experimental submarines, 4-year period, $30,000,000.

MISCELLANEOUS

H. R. 2161, Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Extends from 5 to 8 years the period during which the Secretary of the Interior may construct and operate synthetic liquid fuels demonstration plants and increases the authorization for these purposes, 3-year period, $30,000,000.

H. R. 115 and H. R. 116, Mr. MCDONOUGH: For a naval and military academy in the southern district of California ($10,000,000 for each academy), 3-year period, $20,000,000.

H. R. 1341, Mr. ANDERSON of California: Authorizes construction of a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., 5-year period, $28,750,000.

Mr. President, I did not reach the bills which have been introduced by Members of the House of Representatives. There is one to which I wish to call particular attention, introduced by Representative SCHWABE of Missouri, who seeks a bonus for veterans, by introducing the Veterans' Adjusted Service Compensation Act of 1947, which would require the expenditure of from eighteen to twenty-two billion dollars over a 5-year period. For the fiscal year 1948 it would cost $2,000,000,000.

Following is the summary of the bills introduced by Republican Members of the Senate and the House:

Summary

Estimate of proposed expenditures contained in bills introduced by Republican Members of the Senate for the fiscal year 1948	$3,700,000,000
Estimate of proposed expenditures contained in bills introduced by Republican Members of the House for the fiscal year 1948	2,300,000,000
Total	6,000,000,000

It is a coincidence that the bills which have been introduced by the Republican Members of the House and the Senate total $6,000,000,000, the exact amount which the House of Representatives some time ago voted it would cut from the President's estimate.

I do not undertake to argue the merits or demerits of these bills, Mr. President. No doubt I could support some of the bills which have been introduced, indeed, I have supported some of them, for instance, the bill which proposed to implement the request by the President of the United States for a Greek-Turkish loan. I supported that bill, and was glad to do so.

I place this picture before the United States Senate and the country to show exactly what is going on at the present time so far as the question of economy in Government is concerned. I bring it into focus merely to show the Senate and the country the character of thinking of the majority in Congress while it struggles with the fiscal policy of the United States.

EMPLOYMENT LEVEL UNDER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the preachment of the Senator from Illinois, which convinces me, as it does other Senators who have heard his remarks, that we must admit we are still living in another New Deal emergency.

Mr. President, it is not so material whether we agree under the reorganization plan to cut $6,000,000,000 from the President's budget ceiling, or even $4,500,000,000, or $3,000,000,000, or any other amount. What is consequential is that in the consideration of every appropriation bill coming before this body we attempt to effect every possible economy consistent with good government.

I should like to take a minute to refer to an official report released yesterday by the United States Civil Service Commission.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not at this time. The report is for the period ending March 31, 1947.

I read as follows:

Paid employment in the continental United States at the end of March totaled 1,944,372 * * * a net decrease of 21,776 during the month. A total of 310,179 employees were stationed outside the continental United States, a decrease of 10,642 from the 320,821 * * * reported at the end of February. Thus a grand total of 2,254,551 persons were employed on March 31, 1947, a net decrease of 32,418 during the month.

I recall with a great deal of interest that last June when the Congress had before it the pay raise act, the Bureau of the Budget, representing directly the views of the White House, made representations to the legislative branch that on June 30, 1947, the end of the current fiscal year, we would reach a post-war level of 1,611,000 in the paid civilian employment of the executive branch of Government. If during the three remaining months of the current fiscal year, April, May, and June, the reductions are comparable to the reduction in civilian employment during the month of March, the last month available in the figures presented by the United States Civil Service Commission, we shall have on June 30 of this year a total of 2,157,297 employees in the executive branch of Government.

Mr. President, that will represent a total of 546,297 in excess of the budget ceiling presented by the Bureau of the Budget last June for the end of this fiscal year. I present these figures so that Members of this body will have tangible evidence that the executive branch of Government is not cooperating in any way with the legislative branch to effect the reductions in paid civilian employment which are essential if we are, in fact, to effect the economies which are necessary if we are to cut even a single dollar under the President's budget of $37,500,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

I present these figures because there has already been organized resistance on the minority side in the consideration of the first regular appropriation bill for 1948 considered by this body. It will be interesting to observe, in the consideration of the 11 other regular appropriation bills, whether there will be only lip service to economy, as has been pointed out by the speaker who preceded me, on behalf of some of the Members on the minority side. I am confident that we shall have more than lip service.

Mr. President, we can rightfully expect a continuance of the organized resistance against every proposal and every movement made by the majority party in both branches of Congress in an effort to effect economy and efficiency and cut below the $37,500,000,000 ceiling proposed by the President for the coming year.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself and other Senators.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I ask to have read and propounded to the Senate. This agreement is in three parts; and if Senators will listen to the several divisions of it, I think it may be helpful in reaching an agreement of some kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 9, 1947, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the amendment proposed to S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE), on page 54, after line 4, relating to boycotts and other unlawful combinations, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 9 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the first portion constitute a separate unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I thank the present occupant of the chair for bringing that fact to the attention of the Senate. Up to this point the agreement has to do only with the amendment now pending before the Senate, which is known as the Ball amendment.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to offer an amendment. It is not quite ready. Would I be barred if this agreement were consummated?

Mr. WHERRY. It would not bar the Senator, except that at 1 o'clock there would be no opportunity to debate the amendment; but the Senator could offer an amendment after 1 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator to refer to another amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Any amendment may be offered up until 1 o'clock, when we propose to vote on the pending amendment. After that time an amendment could still be offered, but it would not be debatable. Between now and 1 o'clock tomorrow the Senator can offer any amendment he wants to offer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Any amendment to the pending amendment would be voted on at 1 o'clock tomorrow, but any amendment to the bill itself would not be affected.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a different thing. I am speaking only with reference to the Ball amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the next portion of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered further, That debate on any amendment thereafter proposed shall not exceed 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of such amendment, and that when no further amendment is to be proposed the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered.

Provided, That after the disposition of the so-called Ball amendment and until the third reading of the bill has been ordered, no debate shall be in order except on a pending amendment.

Ordered further, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 3 p. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, passed by the House; that the bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill 1126 as amended; that the third reading of the bill be considered as ordered; and that a vote be immediately taken upon the final passage of the said House bill 3020.

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, May 13, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 3 p. m. shall be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the said bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand the proposed agreement, the pending amendment would be voted upon on Friday at the hour fixed in the proposal, and thereafter any amendment which might be offered to the bill could be debated for not more than one-half hour. Let me say, Mr. President, that I have no desire to delay the final passage of this proposed legislation. However, I am faced with a situation, which addresses itself to me as one of very great importance, which compels me to object to any agreement for a final vote on Tuesday, May 13, at 3 o'clock p. m. as proposed. I therefore object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection long enough to permit the Senate to consider the first part of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement and see if we can agree on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska proposes a unanimous-consent agreement to the effect that at 1 p. m. on Friday the pending amendment and any amendments thereto shall be voted upon. The clerk will read that portion of the proposed agreement, which the Chair understands is being offered as a separate unanimous-consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 9, 1947, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the amendment proposed to S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE) on page 54, after line 4, relating to boycotts and other unlawful combinations, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 9 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand the part which has just been read deals solely with the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and any amendments to that amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it is to be acted upon at what hour on Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. At 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To that part of the proposed agreement I do not object.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to make sure that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not preclude offering further amendments after the pending amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. When the pending amendment is voted upon at 1 o'clock, the Senator could offer an amendment, but there could be only limited debate on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator could offer an amendment——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator please propound his question again?

Mr. AIKEN. Would adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed preclude the offering of further amendments to the bill, after the amendment now before the Senate is disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. No; not at all.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the unanimous-consent agreement now proposed relates wholly to the pending Ball amendment and to amendments thereto.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the proposal now

submitted would shut off or limit debate on any amendment proposed thereafter to the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement which has been proposed? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask that the second proposal be read. I should like to explain that I think there are seven other amendments which have been offered to the bill, and which remain to be acted upon by the Senate. Additional amendments may be offered, of course. We are attempting to have the Senate agree that each Member of the Senate will not use in excess of 30 minutes on any amendment which has been offered or on any amendment which may be offered to the bill or in further debate on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. How much time would that allow?

Mr. WHERRY. The total time consumed by all Senators would be unlimited up to that point; the agreement would provide that debate would continue until the time limit has been reached.

Mr. AIKEN. How much time would that permit for debate on the bill, after the amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. The agreement would limit debate on the amendments and would not permit discussion of the bill during the time when the amendments were being debated.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the debate on the amendments consumed all the time until the time limit was reached. That would leave no time for debate on the bill itself, I assume.

Mr. WHERRY. That would not happen if no further amendments are offered; but if sufficient additional amendments are offered so as to require further debate, there would be available all day Monday from 11 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the afternoon, and then on Tuesday from 11 o'clock in the morning until 3 p. m. That time would be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the bill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There are now pending or are to be offered, as I understand, approximately seven amendments, of which two are merely formal, and probably will be accepted with little or no debate.

So, under this proposal, the debate on five amendments would last two hours and a half, and therefore probably would conclude at half past 3 on Friday afternoon, at which time, when all amendments which then had been offered had been debated and voted upon, there would be a third reading of the bill, and that would cut off the offering of further amendments.

Thereafter, the time available for debate on the bill would be indefinite, and the time for voting on the bill would be indefinite, unless the Senate fixes an hour certain for voting on the bill itself. The Senator from West Virginia has objected to such a proposal.

So I take it that the Senator from Nebraska is now offering only the second branch of the proposed agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It provides that after the vote is had on the Ball amendment, the Senate shall then proceed to vote on all other amendments, with half an hour's time allowed to each Senator to debate each amendment, and that when all the amendments are adopted, there will be the third reading of the bill. Then the bill will be open to debate indefinitely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, is the question now before the Senate the adoption of the second part of the proposal, which limits Senators to 30 minutes of debate on the amendments which are pending or on any which may be offered?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are advised that there are seven amendments. I know of another amendment which will be offered. I feel definitely that 30 minutes is too short a time, and would cut off discussion. I know of past occasions when it has been regretted that such agreements had previously been entered into.

So, Mr. President, I feel that I must object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia withhold his objection, and state how much time he believes might be required for the additional amendment to which he has referred, so that we might suggest an amendment of the proposed agreement, in order to allow ample time for debate of all the amendments?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall withhold the objection, to say to the able Senator from Nebraska that I do not wish to agree to fix any particular time for debating the seven amendments and an additional amendment, which I know will be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire of the Senator from West Virginia whether the amendment which he says is to be offered will be an amendment to the bill or an amendment to the pending Ball amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, it will be an amendment to the bill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that we have been debating this bill for 2 weeks. The bill has been debated fully; practically every feature of it has been debated. The subject matter covered in the amendments has been debated. It seems to me that the Senate should stay in session until all the amendments are disposed of. Therefore, I think the Senate should hold a night session tomorrow night, until it has been possible to complete action on all the amendments and to have the third reading of the bill.

I have no particular desire at this time to press for a vote on the bill itself, but it seems to me we can reasonably hope—and I say this after talking with the authors of the amendments already offered—to take final action on the amendments by Friday afternoon. But if we do not do so, I believe we should stay in session thereafter. So I ask Senators to count on a night session Friday night, with the idea of completing action on the amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is obvious that the second part of the agreement, fixing a time limit of 30 minutes on each pending amendment or each amendment which may be offered following the disposition of the pending amendments, cannot be agreed to. The usual form of agreement is that during the pendency of a certain matter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than a certain time on the bill or on any amendments thereto.

I would suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if he would put his request in a form to read, that following the disposition of the pending amendment and any amendments thereto at 1 o'clock tomorrow, during the further consideration of the amendments to the bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the bill or on any amendment thereto—which would give any Senator an hour—such a proposed agreement might be accepted and that would still leave open the question of debate on the bill itself, after all amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, but it seems to me that really would not accomplish what we have in mind. It seems to me there would be no limitation in that event.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be an hour's limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be better than none.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1126, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from West Virginia has definitely objected to the second part of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I further to understand that the Senator from West Virginia has objected to an agreement fixing the hour of 3 o'clock on Tuesday as the time for final vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have objected to such a proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. According to the Chair's understanding, the third portion of the unanimous-consent request has not been offered independently; and the objection lies to the second portion, which was offered independently.

Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to offer the third portion independently?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I shall not do so, because the Senator from

West Virginia has said that he would object to such a request, if I made it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, I would object to a request for a final vote on the bill itself at the time suggested.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, if I may do so with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia what time, if any, he would agree to have a final vote taken on the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From my own point of view, I feel that between Friday and sometime on Wednesday we might work out an agreement as to a time for a final vote on Wednesday; and if Senators desire to fix a time on Wednesday, I would make no objection, as I view the matter at this time. That would give an additional day on the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that we should proceed under the first part of the agreement. I understand that it has been ordered that the Senate will vote on the so-called Ball amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, and that the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow will be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] will have charge of the time for the proponents and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] will have charge of the time for the opponents; and after the vote is taken at 1 o'clock, we shall proceed with the amendments, which may then be pending.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I give notice that the Senate will remain in session tomorrow night if it is impossible to finish voting on the amendments tomorrow afternoon.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all grace and mercy, vouchsafe to keep us this day without sin, that we may pledge a sincere dedication to our country and its vital needs. Grant us deeper thoughts and experiences of Thine own divine nature, out of which have sprung the affections of men and of angels. O stir in us that quality of character, that sturdy courage, which will make us superior to all circumstances.

Dear Lord, in the hours of memory there haunt us duties undone, deeds neglected, and acts unworthy; O forgive us and grant unto us strength to be equal to the unprecedented tasks before us. Make us messengers to homeless hearts, to loveless lives, and to the multitudes without a compass, that we may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and Thine shall be the praise forever, in the name of Him who is our eternal hope. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the late Charles L. Gerlach.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $248.50, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] upon the observance of the birthday anniversary of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Young Women's Christian Association, which letter is addressed to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. I have his permission to put this in.

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

There was no objection.

THEY SPEAK FOR AMERICA

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the four teen-age Americans who Tuesday afternoon relighted the torch of American patriotism. By their own reaction to a Communist Party line speech deriding America, they proved that love of God, love of country, and love of the American Constitution and flag are still the paramount emotions in the hearts of young Americans.

These four young Americans, three girls and a boy, walked out on a eulogy of Russia and Russian communism. They demanded that pro-Russianism, procommunism, and un-Americanism bordering on sedition be barred from American schools. They protested against being forced by their principal to listen to statements that they recognized as false about the superiority of life in Soviet Russia compared to life in our own United States.

They had not read the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, on the floor of this House when he pointed out that the average wage of workers in the United States is $46.40 per week, as against $14.40 in Russia.

From their own knowledge of their own country, however, they knew that the pro-Soviet utterances of Mrs. Aleksandra Pavlovna Lewis, Russian-born, and an invited guest at their school, were the baldest form of lies and propaganda. They did what all red-blooded Americans should do under similar circumstances. They refused to give the consent of silence. They walked out.

Their action was as dynamic and can well be as far-reaching in effect in 1947 as was the Boston Tea Party, which first showed the temper of the people of the United States in regard to personal freedom.

For 14 years the educational system of the United States under the New Deal has been drugged by the enforced opiate of so-called progressive education. For 14 years the communistic thinking of the New Deal has recognized Russia, fostered communistic ideologies, and sought to plant in the minds of an entire generation of young Americans a willingness to accept internationalism, communism, and total regimentation of the people.

Through the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress, the Young Communist League, and more recently American Youth for Democracy, the international educational agencies of the Comintern have sought to kill patriotism in America.

The action of these four students at Western High School Tuesday proves that the torch of liberty still burns brightly in the minds of American youth. Their act must not be allowed to pass without fitting recognition by the House of Representatives—the directly elected representatives of the American people. We know from the reaction of the people at the polls last November that we are through with communism within these United States. I am glad to know these four young people will be honored by the Members of this House early next week in a fitting manner.

And we can well thank God for this proof that the little red schoolhouse has not become the big Red school system.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the public and Members of Congress are being bombarded with half-truths and falsehoods. For instance, it is urged that Cuba is the only dependable source of sugar for the United States and, therefore, should be given a near monopoly of that market. Proponents of this falsehood cite the wartime sugar record of our domestic areas and claim that this demonstrates the undependability of domestic producers as sources of sugar.

WAR RECORD

First, here is the record of sugar production since the outbreak of World War II compared with the prewar average—in short tons, raw value:

Year	Cuba	Domestic	
		Cane sugar	Beet sugar
1935-39 average	3,128	2,385	1,520
1940	3,127	2,335	1,897
1941	2,734	2,306	1,588
1942	3,800	2,479	1,726
1943	3,230	2,466	998
1944	4,738	2,039	1,056
1945	3,923	2,258	1,278
1946	4,476	2,026	1,551

Now, let us see what happened. In 1940, the first year of the war, the domestic beet area set a new production record. During the first 3 years of World War II, this domestic area maintained its output above prewar average. Cane-sugar production, in contrast, did not increase until 1942, the third year of the war; in fact, it decreased in 1941, especially in Cuba. Since 1941 Cuban production has been above prewar, but with sharp fluctuations, which certainly do not demonstrate unusual dependability. Production in the domestic cane-sugar areas since 1943 has been reduced by unfavorable weather in Puerto Rico, Florida, and Louisiana by a labor shortage and a strike in Hawaii in 1946, and generally by the impact of the war on these sugar-cane producers in a country fully at war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Boston Herald May 7 relating to T. Bertram King, Director of the Loan Guarantee Section of the Veterans' Administration; a letter from the East Boston Social Centers Council; a letter from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; and a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., all endorsing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, and all of which I agree with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brilliant speech by my illustrious predecessor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Plain Talk.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 52]

Bates, Mass.	Gifford	O'Toole
Bell	Gregory	Ploeser
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Powell
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	Preston
Camp	Hart	St. George
Canfield	Hartley	Scoblick
Chapman	Hinshaw	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Chiperfield	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard
Clements	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	McDowell	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	McGarvey	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Macy	Tibbott
Dirksen	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Domengeaux	Meade, Ky.	West
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Mitchell	
Fenton	Morrison	
Fuller	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Legislature, two editorials, and a telegram.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cumberland News.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include three editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain tables and documents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain newspaper clippings and other data.

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

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had completed the reading of the first section of the bill.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after "paragraph", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that today is the sixty-third birthday of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. The policy on which he is now embarking is the most significant, probably, that America has ever undertaken. It is going to do one of two things: It is going to make Harry Truman one of the great men of all history, if he follows through and cleans out communism in this country, or if he fails to do that, if he fails to follow through, it will probably have exactly the opposite effect.

Christian civilization and atheistic communism cannot long continue the way we are going. I wish you would look at the Washington Post of this morning. I feel like dubbing that publication the American Pravda. On the front page it has the picture of a Communist propagandist who went out here and insulted the students at Western High School on yesterday. On another page it has an advertisement of a Com-

munist meeting here tonight. This Communist meeting is brought here for the purpose of trying to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

The measure now before the House, which President Truman has recommended, definitely lines him up on the side of those of us who have been fighting this Communist menace for years. If he will just follow through and help us to drive this pernicious influence from American soil, he will have saved our Christian civilization, and as I said, will go down in history as one of the great leaders of all time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say in connection with the subject matter of my remarks is said without rancor or ill feeling, but I believe it is my duty to bring to the attention of the House and to explain to my colleagues who requested time yesterday just what the situation was when debate was closed. It was the understanding that the opposition was to have 3 hours. At the beginning of the session on yesterday, the clerk of our committee advised me that on the majority side we were entitled to 51 minutes and from the minority side we were entitled to 73 minutes, and he suggested that I submit the names of those who were to speak in opposition. I submitted those lists to both the majority and minority leaders. The majority leader fulfilled his obligation under that agreement explicitly. The opposition received 51 minutes from the majority side. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] refused to recognize the list that I submitted to him, and when the time had expired there were still 19 minutes due the opposition.

I call your attention to the fact that as the debate closed the distinguished former Speaker and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] were both given, I believe, 18 minutes of time. There was no time for the opposition. The House should know that because I believe an agreement has been violated, contrary to the understanding between the parties.

I make that explanation because there were six or seven men on our side who wanted to speak and who had no opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I know the gentleman did not intend to say that the minority side did not recognize any of the men on his list because I am sure he will recall that some were.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I did not say that, my distinguished friend.

Mr. JARMAN. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You did recognize the opposition to the extent of some 48 minutes, but that still left us 19 minutes in the hole.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I understand that the gentleman absolves the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; I said you fulfilled your agreement explicitly.

Mr. EATON. I sincerely thank the gentleman for that bill of health.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hope that as debate now proceeds under the 5-minute rule there is going to be no effort to shut off the opposition. Hardly a man who stood in the well of this House has failed to call attention to the seriousness of this situation. Even under the rule only 9 hours is allowed to debate this important problem. In the past we have spent as much as 20 hours on other matters which were only half as important as this. So I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we can have plenty of time under the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I regret very much there was a misunderstanding yesterday but the misunderstanding came about in this manner: Anyone who came to me from the opposition, I granted time. I was looking for people on the opposition in order to give them time. The mistake I made, if it was a mistake, was that I thought everyone had to come to me and ask for time, and I gave them time. Let me say to the gentleman that I had given out all of my time when I came to this table yesterday morning. Shortly after that the gentleman sent a list around and I told him that was not the way I understood the agreement. I am very sorry that I did not have the names the gentleman had on his list, but I had no more time. I gave the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] 20 minutes. I certainly would not have given him 20 minutes had I known you wanted time for other speakers. I just want to say, if there was a mistake made, I yielded to everyone on this side who came to me and asked for time. I did not know the gentleman had a list over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wish to make this statement: The gentleman fully understands, of course, the difficulty the chairman has in trying to give time to the very large number on our side who wish to speak. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the House owes it to the gentleman from Wisconsin and those associated with him in their attitude toward this bill that he have this time now. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee at this time grant the gentleman the 19 minutes for use as he sees fit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to my distinguished chairman, I think that is out of order, and that we should proceed under the 5-minute rule. This is water over the dam. I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader that we want to be fair, but you did recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], and we still had 19 minutes coming.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry; that was not my understanding.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is always unfortunate that in the affairs of the House of Representatives any misunderstanding in respect to time should arise. However, it seems to have arisen on this occasion, as it has on other occasions during the time I have been here.

I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman: As far as I know, there is no inclination to push this measure through without full and adequate time under the 5-minute rule for discussion of the various proposals and amendments that will be made, and opportunity afforded Members to speak on the measure as they see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I know of no reason why consideration of the bill in the Committee cannot proceed through the day and through tomorrow, if that is necessary, in order that Members may have full and complete opportunity to present their views on this very important matter, while at the same time we make reasonable progress in consideration and final action on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I would like to suggest to my leader, however, that in this matter of time, the Rules Committee should fix the limitations and fix the conditions when situations like this arise.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while the House is considering the very important request of the President for a $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, it is necessary that we of the Congress carefully inquire into all aspects of the Middle East situation, and particularly the current financial condition of Greece, the principal recipient of the proposed aid. It is particularly important that the Greek Government be required, as a condition of the

pending loan, to tax every available source of income. For this purpose I want to call to the attention of the Congress a situation permitting Greek nationals living in the United States to evade taxes, which I believe should be corrected.

There are living in the United States a considerable number of Greek nationals engaged in business who are not subject to income taxation by any country under present law. The Greek Government does not tax its citizens living abroad. Apparently the United States Government is unable to do so, in many instances, because of present loopholes in the Federal income-tax laws. It is only just and right that these Greek nationals should be required to make tax contributions for the governmental services and benefits which they enjoy while living in our country.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I might also add that the Greek Government does not even tax its citizens at home.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am not dealing with that matter now, I am dealing with those Greek nationals who are living in the United States.

Also, at a time when their country is in a very precarious financial condition and is asking the people of the United States for help, these Greek citizens should bear their share of the burden. Mr. Maximos, the Prime Minister of Greece, has expressed his country's willingness to fully cooperate with the United States and to work toward correcting any inequities which exist at this time. I believe both Governments will be not only willing but anxious to correct this tax situation, which has heretofore been overlooked.

At this time I would like to tell you gentlemen about the aspect of this situation, with which I am most familiar. The tax evasion I have described is especially noteworthy in the field of shipping. Greek shipowners, before the war, operated very extensively under the Panamanian flag, through Panamanian corporations which they owned and controlled. Substantial tonnage was also operated under the Greek flag. Under a series of international treaties made pursuant to section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code, the United States has for many years exempted the income of Panamanian, Greek, and other foreign shipowners from taxation within this country, in return for reciprocal exemptions from taxation to American shipowners on profits earned from activities outside the United States. These international agreements were intended to avoid the danger of double taxation, but they have been misused so as to provide the equivalent of tax exemption. This abuse should be stopped. Thus, in the case of Greek shipowners operating under Greek and Panamanian flags, these exemptions have operated as one-way streets. The Greek shipowners were exempted from taxes otherwise payable to the United States, although American shipowners received no benefits, because no taxes would have been levied in Greece or Panama. Moreover, through the device of Panamanian operation and residence outside of Greece, Greek-owned vessels, in many cases, escaped requisition by Greece during the war. They were brought into the Allied shipping pool only after the United States and Panama became belligerents.

From the information I have received, it is apparent that wealthy Greek shipowners are now reinvesting their war-swollen profits, upon which no taxes have ever been paid to any government, in ships purchased from the Maritime Commission under the Ships Sales Act. Approximately 100 of these ships are planned for operation under the Greek flag and I believe that a similar number have been or will be purchased for operation under the Panamanian flag. Because of the low wages and other reduced operating costs, owners of these Greek and Panamanian vessels are now earning fabulous profits. Many of these owners reside in the United States. Panama has no income tax law. I believe that, except for trivial amounts, these shipowners have successfully evaded payment of taxes to the United States as well as to their own impoverished homeland. Profits earned by Panamanian corporations are allowed to accumulate to the credit of the corporations. These funds ultimately are withdrawn in the form of loans which are, in reality, disguised dividends, or are reinvested in additional tonnage or are otherwise transferred to safe custody of the beneficial owners without payment of an income tax thereon.

To be fair, I regret that I must state, while the subject is being discussed, that in some cases it appears that American citizens have attempted to use Panamanian corporations in order to escape payment of taxes to our Government. I appreciate that there may be sound operating reasons for operation of some ships under the Panamanian flag, but it is apparent that, in certain cases, the American shipowners practiced this device primarily to avoid payment of taxes to our country. This abuse should be corrected also.

I am confident that millions of dollars of tax revenue will result from the imposition of taxes upon the amassed wealth of those Greek millionaires and the inflated income of those Greek citizens now residing in New York and other cities. If we are to provide relief, we must make it our business to see to it that the beneficiaries of our relief exercise the maximum degree of self-help. We must insist upon their doing all in their power to help themselves. Greece should be required to enforce democratic responsibilities upon its citizens as a condition of our loan to them. Particularly I refer to the responsibility to finance their government to the utmost of their ability, which is especially vital during this critical period.

I am writing today to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asking that an investigation of this matter be made immediately, that any violations of existing tax laws by these people be immediately stopped and prosecuted, and that if such tax avoidance is deemed legal under existing statutes, desirable amendments be recommended.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was an exchange between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], which occurred over the policy of the Russian Government in agreeing unilaterally with the Yugoslav Government for the transfer of material for the Yugoslav Army and for the giving of long-term credits to the Yugoslav Government such as we are intending to give here to Greece and Turkey. I will read that exchange from the RECORD because it concerns a cablegram to the Department of State dated June 11, 1946, a copy of which was not available on the floor at the time.

The essence of the debate was that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] unbelievably said that if such a cablegram or telegram had come into the State Department giving the fact that Russia had taken unilateral action first with one of her satellites, Yugoslavia, in 1946, he then would condemn Russia. So I am here to nail that down and have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] publicly on this floor condemn Russia, which I think is a real gain for the American people. I will read the exchange that occurred in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 on page 4724, referring to this cablegram:

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first I have heard of it. I cannot account for the accuracy of that report.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman may accept it as accurate, because I will produce the cablegram to the State Department.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. However, assuming the statement to be correct, then I say that that action as well as this action should be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. So the gentleman now disapproves the action of Russia on June 11, 1946; is that correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disapprove the action of any country that takes unilateral action on any matter that involves the peace of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Including Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including Russia, the United States, Turkey, Greece, or any other nation in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Then if I am right in my statement that we did receive such a cablegram from Yugoslavia, the gentleman condemns Russia just as he condemns the United States right here, does he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do.

Mr. FULTON. That is very interesting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think any action should go through the United Nations when that action affects the peace of the world.

I hold in my hand from the State Department a copy of that cablegram dated June 11, 1946, received by the State Department at 3:10 p. m. on that day. It is addressed to the Secretary of State from Moscow and states among other things, and I will not read the entire cablegram:

Questions were reviewed of interest to both sides in regard to Jugoslav treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar cooperation of April 11, 1945, and full agreement was achieved on all questions involving economic collaboration, trade, supply of material to Jugoslav army, and close cultural and political collaboration.

Watch particularly what Russia does with the situation right in this same area; yet you find a lot of people here complaining, among them some Republicans, that we are the first country to step outside the United Nations and take unilateral action. This is clearly wrong because the next paragraph I shall quote, shows it:

Government, U. S. S. R. agreed to supply Jugoslav army with arms, munitions, et cetera, on conditions long term credit, and also to assist in reestablishment Jugoslavia's own war industry.

I believe that ties the gentleman down. For once the gentleman from New York is siding with the American Government and is not agreeing with every action that Russia has taken. This, in my opinion, is a great advance in this Congress.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. KEE. Who signed that telegram?

Mr. FULTON. It is signed by "Smith" and it is also captioned "Repeated Belgrade as 29."

The cablegram designation for our State Department is No. 3953 Plain Moscow, 1834, eleventh.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemena from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Is the telegram signed by General Smith, our Ambassador to Russia?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct, by our own Ambassador.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the able gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there not another agreement made with the present Government of Poland?

Mr. FULTON. There are other unilateral agreements by the Soviet Government with various satellite countries. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Council not so many weeks ago made that charge, and in support of it quoted excerpts from newspapers in Poland and the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULTON. So that is the second action taken by Russia, unilaterally, outside the United Nations' sphere, and on the very type of subject matter that we are proposing today concerning Greece and Turkey.

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that over a period of time since VJ-day we have supplied South American countries with war materials, and nobody has ever complained?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There was nothing ever said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate we have heard praise of the insurgents and the guerrillas in the hills of northern Greece and Macedonia, but the fact of the matter is that these insurgents are under the domination of the Soviet Union. We admired the courage of Benedict Arnold as long as he led the Revolutionary forces to victory, but as a traitor he was despised by America and rejected by England. The classic speeches of Demosthenes 2,300 years ago in denunciation of the aggression of Macedonia are applicable in 1947. His orations made him immortal, but his cries and warnings were in vain. He saw that the forces of aggression were threatening Greece from Macedonia and as 2,300 years ago the master of Macedonia, Alexander, invaded and destroyed Athens, and from Athens proceeded to the conquest of the world, so today Russia with her communism the master of the insurgent forces in Macedonia is threatening to engulf not only Greece, not only Turkey, but the entire world.

We have heard something about the selfish rich of Athens collaborating with the Germans, and about the tax evaders among the wealthy Greeks temporarily in the United States. Unfortunately, we have tax evaders in our own country, and unfortunately in the cities of the South and the cities of the North there are the selfish rich. I have no respect for those who put the dollar above their country, and I despise the tax evaders, whether they reside in the United States or in Greece. The purpose here is aid to Greece and Turkey. Let us keep to the main issue.

If there is one nation more than another that is sympathetic with the struggles for freedom and for liberty in countries great and small, that nation is the United States.

I shudder to think what would have been the fate of the colonists had it not been for the aid and assistance extended to them by France. I know that the forces of selfishness are ever present. When Washington and his ragged and barefoot heroes were at Valley Forge, I know that the rich Tories were in Philadelphia giving aid and comfort to the British, but I also know that another Philadelphian, Benjamin Franklin, was at that very time in France pleading for the cause of the Colonies.

The Governments of Greece and Turkey are not perfect. They have their problems. Greece has been invaded, her cities destroyed, her highways obliterated, and her industry wrecked. Reforms will not be easy; rehabilitation will be difficult.

The government in Greece is a coalition government. It represents the best that the majority could agree upon. The first lesson in democracy that patriots must learn is that the majority must rule. The insurgents in northern Greece must abide by the will of the majority.

One small nation after another has been absorbed and is today under the power of Soviet Russia. If a helping and powerful hand had been extended, these nations might be free today.

While communism is marching on, other nations and other countries, especially the small nations of the world are looking to the United States for help and for assistance and for leadership. If we fail them they too may succumb to the threat of communism.

In this momentous hour, I cannot remain silent. I urge the passage of the pending bill.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has its weakness; it is in process of organization and perfection. The proposed bill does not bypass the United Nations. Its representatives in Macedonia have been rebuffed. The United Nations has been prevented from aiding freedom in Greece by the refusal of the communistic forces in control in the hills of Macedonia and in the neighboring satellite countries under the dominion of Russia to cooperate. Moreover, Russia has veto power, and the veto power and policy of Russia have prevented successful conferences for peace and a successful functioning by the United Nations.

THE OBJECTIVES

I extend to say the objective of the bill is to promote peace to enable countries to work out their own destiny without infiltration or domination by any outside power. Peace is jeopardized whenever a totalitarian regime is imposed upon free peoples, either by conquest or infiltration, either by direct or indirect aggression.

During World War II the Greeks fought valiantly against the enemies of the United States and the Soviet Union. Greece was wrecked by invasion. The Greek Government has charged before the United Nations that insurgents receive supplies from neighboring countries under the dominion of Russia.

Sometimes we are prone to criticize Turkey for failing to enter World War II. The fact is that Turkey rendered invaluable assistance. She prevented Germany from not only obtaining possession of the Dardanelles, but from conquering Cairo and thus advancing through Egypt and north Africa.

On March 12, 1947, while Secretary of State George C. Marshall was doing his best to secure a successful peace in Moscow, President Truman appeared before the Senate and the House and announced that a grave situation confronted the world, and that our responsibility required us to aid Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism.

APPEASEMENT

We tried appeasement with Japan in Manchuria and China, and it failed. We tried appeasement with Mussolini in Ethiopia and with Hitler at Munich, and

appeasement failed, as appeasement always will. We have been patient with Russia. We have seen one peace conference after another fail because of Russian opposition. The program of Russia is to delay, absorb, and dominate. Russia has absorbed one country after another while delaying peace in disregard of her obligations to the United Nations. Today Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the border of Greece are a threat to the gateways to the Orient. If Russia takes Greece and Turkey, she is fast on her way to conquer India and China.

THE ISSUE

The issue is whether freedom or communism is to obtain. The issue is whether the Americanism of the United States or the communism of the Soviet Union is to obtain in the world.

SOBER THINKING

Our way is not easy, but our duty is plain. We must be patient with Greece and Turkey as we have been with Russia. We are dealing with a government in Greece and a government in Turkey that are not perfect. We might as well admit that we have our limitations in the United States. We must display both faith and patience. We must be firm. We must not be any more satisfied with conditions that obtain in Athens than we are with conditions that obtain in some American cities. The road to freedom and to peace is always hard. Aggression must always be resisted. We have been most generous. Russia has been bluffing. It is time to call her hand. The President of the United States, Secretary Marshall, and their advisers, both Democratic and Republican, urge the passage of the pending bill. The responsibility is great. The cost will be high. We have much to lose but much more to gain. Russia must understand once and for all that appeasement is no part of our foreign policy, and that all governments, great and small, in their own way, without aggression, infiltration, or domination, must be permitted to work out their own destiny.

OBJECTIONS

It has been asserted that the funds advanced under the bill might be used in paying loans of Greece and Turkey to other governments. This objection has been fully met by the express terms of the bill.

It has been next suggested that the whole matter be referred to the United Nations. I have already answered this objection. At present the United Nations is without the power or the funds to render the aid needed. Moreover, Russia has plainly indicated that her veto power would be asserted.

Again it is urged that the program will lead to war. We have tried to make one agreement after the other with Russia. The bill does not provide for combat forces. Russia is out to get all that she can, but she does not want war. At least she does hot want it now. Her plan may be for war in the future, but she does not want it now. The program is to prevent war.

FOREIGN POLICY

The United States has endeavored in every way to get along with Russia. The proposed program is unprecedented. The time has come for the United States to say what it means and mean what it says. We now mean business. There is a point beyond which the United States will not retreat.

There is no partisanship in our foreign policy. It is supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Republican Senators and Republican leadership cooperated with Democratic Senators and Democratic advisers in the recent Moscow Conference just as the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other body have previously cooperated with former Secretary of State Byrnes. Previous conferences have failed because of the refusal of Russia to agree.

All nations must be able to work out their destiny free from coercion. Governments have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will in violation of the Yalta agreement in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. One small country after the other has come under the influence of the Soviet Union.

The small nations must have assistance if they are to survive. They are looking to the United States of America. It is time for action. They must have the assistance of the United States if they are to work out their own destiny.

There are two ways of life. The choice must be free. One way is based upon the will of the majority. The other is based upon the will of the minority being forcibly imposed upon the majority. One way of life is communism. The other is freedom, which is synonomous with Americanism. The tree of freedom cannot grow in the soil of communism. The seeds of totalitarianism are nurtured by misery and want. They grow in the soil of poverty and strife. They reach their maturity when hope for freedom has died. Free people in the free countries of the world look to the United States for aid in maintaining their freedom. The proposal does involve risk. It may involve war, but the best way to promote peace is to be prepared for war. If we fail to assert and maintain our leadership in the struggles for peace, we will not only jeopardize the welfare and the future of the United States, but we will endanger the peace of the world.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure passes without crippling amendments. The strategic and political aspects of the issue which we have been discussing here for several days are all important. In the first place, Soviet Union has a foreign policy of expansion and of spreading communism wherever and whenever possible, with the ultimate goal of world domination. The security of the United States of America is at stake. We must never lose sight of this fact. In the first place, Turkey and Greece are the outposts against the spread of communism in the Mediterranean area; in fact, the military aspects of this measure are more significant in many ways than the relief aspects as far as the security of the United States is concerned.

What will happen if we do not extend aid to Greece and what will happen if we do not extend aid to Turkey and protect the strategic Dardanelles? In the first place, Greece will fall under the domination of the Soviet Union. Turkey will probably yield to the demands that are being made by Moscow. The whole Middle East would then be in danger.

When I was in Iran over a year ago the members of the Parliament in that country said the ultimate object of the Soviet Union is the annexation of Iran so that Russia may have access to the oil of the Persian Gulf. I have heard a great deal said about oil in connection with this issue, and some say they do not like the smell of oil. I like the smell of oil, and I will tell you why. It is necessary to our economy in peace, and it is crucial in time of war. Our automobiles run by oil, our houses are heated by oil. Oil is essential to every man, woman, and child in this modern world. If the Middle East goes, the Soviet Union will press westward, and finally the western gateway of the Mediterranean will come under the control of Moscow. The Mediterranean Sea will become a Soviet lake, and then definitely the security of the United States will become imperiled. We can either deny this aid to Greece and Turkey or we can give it. If we deny it, it means that we intend to retreat from our present position of world leadership.

I am amused to hear some say that we cannot afford this policy. Can we not afford to maintain our place of leadership? If this great country cannot do this, then it means that we must retreat, and it means that the center of political gravity will shift from the city of Washington to Moscow, an eventuality which I for one will oppose to the end. If this program is going to cost $400,000,000 or if it costs 10 times that much to stop the march of communism in the Mediterranean area, it will, in my opinion, be money well invested.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please tell us how the appropriation of $400,000,000 will stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. Well, sir, this is the first step, and if it requires more money, I, for one, am willing to vote it.

Nobody can predict with accuracy the future. No person possesses omniscience, but certainly if $400,000,000 cannot stop communism in the Mediterranean, let us appropriate enough money to do this job. Let us call the bluff of the Soviet Union and we will soon find out whether or not Mr. Stalin wants to fight. I believe he will stop short of that point where the United States of America and Great Britain are willing to take a stand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In other words, we are on our way, but we do not know where we are going.

Mr. MERROW. Do you know what the future is going to be in 2 or 10 years from now?

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Again, I ask the gentleman a question which I asked a week or so ago. If $400,000,000 or 10 times that

amount fails to stop it, then does the gentleman advocate going to war in order to stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. I will say to the gentleman if that becomes necessary to protect the United States we probably will go to war. We did not want to do anything when Mr. Hitler took the Rhineland and walked all over Europe, but finally we sent millions of our boys to Europe and spent billions of dollars. Let us not forget recent history. Firm and resolute action before Nazi Germany occupied the Rhineland in 1936 or before the many other annexations of territory by Germany would have, in my opinion, avoided the Second World War.

Mr. BREHM. Then, why not save the $400,000,000 and go to war right now and get the thing over with?

Mr. MERROW. Are you willing to do that?

Mr. BREHM. I would be willing to do that if it is to be our policy to stop communism—let us stop it and let us quit bluffing.

Mr. MERROW. I want to call Russia's bluff immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the large number of Members who want to speak, the Chair desires to state the policy that the Chair will try to follow in recognizing Members. Inasmuch as the Chair does not know whether Members intend to speak for or against the bill, the Chair will follow the principle of alternating between the majority side and the minority side.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, there is now pending a committee amendment to which, I believe, there is nc opposition. Pro forma amendments to strike out the last word could well be deferred until the committee amendment is acted upon. Would it be in order to dispose of the committee amendment and then proceed with the pro forma amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is the will of the Committee, the Chair will put the question on the first committee amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if that is done, will it in any way prevent the Members from speaking for 5 minutes in discussing this bill under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry, but will answer the gentleman by saying that the matter of recognition of Members to speak will proceed on the basis of Members being recognized if they seek recognition. Beyond that, it will be the policy of the Chair, or at least the policy of the Member now occupying the chair, to alternate recognition between the majority and minority sides.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, all I am interested in is that the Members will not be deprived of speaking on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the control of the Committee and not in the control of the Chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in order that the Committee may have clearly in mind what we are voting on that the Clerk may read the committee amendment again.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after the word "paragraph", insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 15, strike out the word "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 2, line 20: Strike out the word "countries", and insert "countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: Insert after (4) (A) after the word "information", page 2, line 19: "Except atomic weapons, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information relating to atomic energy or any of the foregoing other than as may be permitted in any general international agreement."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill describes in broad and essentially unlimited categories the kinds of assistance which the President of the United States is authorized to give to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. If you will turn to section 3 (c), line 6 through line 12, to 3 (d), you will see that we are not talking about International Harvester machines. Since there are no limitations on the types of weapons or information which may be transferred, I call your attention to the fact that the President is thereby, in his discretion, empowered to furnish atomic bombs, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information concerning any of the foregoing to either Greece or Turkey or both.

In pointing this out, I need not emphasize that no reflection of any kind on the President or on his purposes is intended. On the contrary, I believe the President himself has the right to ask Congress to be meticulously precise as to its wishes in this matter. The authorization to give weapons must be at least as definite as an appropriation bill. Since the House is not in the habit of giving funds without specifying both the exact amounts and the purposes for which each amount is to be used, there is no justification for vagueness or carelessness in saying whether or not Congress intends to authorize the President to give atomic bombs or top secret information to the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

Nor can we escape responsibility by saying, "Oh, all that has been taken care of by the Atomic Energy Act." I have been advised by most competent legal authorities that the Atomic Energy Act itself does not prohibit the President, in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief, from transferring, as he may deem essential to the national defense, such weapons, substances, or information to any foreign country.

It is frightening to think that this bill, as now written, authorized the transfer to two such governments as those of Greece and Turkey, weapons, materials and information incorporating what Congress has repeatedly and excitedly declared to be the most vital element in the bastion of our security.

If there were a bill before you to give atomic bombs to Britain, I believe you would reject it out of hand. Surely materials and information which cannot be shared even with Britain and Canada—who participated in and contributed to all phases of our atomic energy development and therefore have a claim to such fruits, apart from the fact that they really know our secrets anyway—must not be entrusted to Balkan governments which are neither, to say the least, stable nor dependable.

Months were spent in determining whether the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission had sufficiently demonstrated his loyalty to our form of government, whether he sufficiently understood the principles of democracy, to make him a fit person to guard our bombs and our knowledge. We have not spent 5 minutes inquiring into the beliefs of King Paul of Greece to whom, under this bill, the President would have the authority to hand over anything or everything related to atomic energy.

Of course, the President may be relied upon to do nothing which would, in his opinion, jeopardize the common defense. Yet he should be instructed and backed up by a clear statement from Congress covering the point. For the subject of atomic bombs has been injected both in the hearings of this bill and in the debate on the floor.

On this issue, therefore, I offer an amendment which in no way impairs the authority of the President to furnish assistance except that it prohibits the transfer to Greece and Turkey of atomic weapons, fissionable materials—the main ingredient of the bombs, source materials from which these ingredients are derived and information relating to any of the foregoing or to the production of atomic energy so long as such information is held in secrecy classification by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentlewoman from California on the drawing of her amendment. It is well drawn, but it puts us in a peculiar quandary when it comes to deciding how to

vote on it. It might well be called a Henry Wallace amendment because it is one of those amendments which if you vote against it means you might want to send atomic bombs over there, but if you vote for it you as much as say you do not trust the President of the United States because he might send them over unless he is restrained.

As for myself I wish to say directly that while I am a Republican I have full faith and confidence in the Government of the United States of America and I have full faith and confidence in the man who is the President of the United States of America, who represents me as well as everyone here in this room, Harry Truman.

Let us simply put this amendment on the basis of confidence. If Henry Wallace has no confidence in Harry Truman and the Government of the United States, maybe some of us do. If therefore you wish to vote a lack of confidence in the President's exercising his emergency powers that still remain to him, then vote to make a certain area of the world consisting of Greece and Turkey to be under a limitation of our power and our foreign policy. Our power and foreign policy are based not only on the population here but on our strength.

We in the United States are trying to get an agreement internationally over the control of atomic energy and its use, and for the control of atomic weapons. We should not have any restraint on us when we go in and deal openly and broadly before the United Nations for such an agreement. I hope you will not tie the hands of the American Government which represents you by any such amendment, and I hope you will not throw a cloud on the President by implying that he might use such a thing unless we do something to control him and tie his hands.

Further than that, if you add this limitation, we lawyers of the House know that when you start outlining things that you will not send, it means that you will send everything else. Under this reasoning it means that you would send all the supersonics, all the jet planes, all our long-range guns, it even means that you would go into chemical warfare and send over disease germs to spread over countries. I do not want to be taken as saying that I agree to that.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur absolutely in the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is not a question of who is President. If we had anyone else as President I would thoroughly agree with the gentleman and his argument.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have complete confidence in the President so far as matters concerning foreign affairs are concerned and the exercise of judgment in those matters. I am sorry that the distinguished gentlewoman from California has offered the amendment. I join with the gentleman in his able argument and strongly urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, my distinguished colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact also that the atomic-energy law prohibits this Government from giving any information in regard to atomic energy to a foreign power without authority from the Congress?

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly correct, and this amendment again tends to cast a doubt upon Mr. Lilienthal and the Atomic Energy Commission now handling the matter in secret for this Government.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. If this bill is passed, then adoption of the pending amendment would merely be giving encouragement to Communist Russia to continue her aggression and her undermining of the United States of America?

Mr. FULTON. That is right. It contains, in essence, the same principle as the old Neutrality Act. We were going to make ourselves impotent and powerless in certain parts, which would let the forces we are trying to stop operate freely.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have such very great regard.

Mr. FULTON. That is returned.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The President as Commander in Chief is permitted under the Constitution in the defense of our country and would be permitted to send atomic energy or information about atomic bombs. As I said before, this is not a reflection on the President.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. This, of course, is no reflection upon the President.

Mr. FULTON. Why is it not a reflection upon him?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The question of atomic bombs has been interjected into the hearings and into the debate on the floor of the House. This bill is being passed in the hope that it will aid our program for peace, and it should not be passed with the idea abroad that this is an atomic-bomb bill.

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentlewoman from California? If this is no reflection upon the President of the United States, she then infers that the President of the United States would not send atomic bombs anyhow in his own discretion. If he would not send them anyhow, then the particular amendment becomes useless.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. FULTON. Because then it is a mere, idle gesture, and this bill is no idle gesture. If, on the other hand, it might be construed either here or abroad to be a condemnation or a tying of the hands of the President of the United States, the amendment should be voted down. So the gentlewoman is in a dilemma and must choose whether her amendment is merely useless or a lack of confidence in the President.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about following the President. I wonder if he recalls a former President on one occasion telling the Congress that he had more information on foreign affairs and knew more about foreign affairs than the Congress did, and that the Congress should leave the question to him and he would keep us out of war. Shortly thereafter we found ourselves in war. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. FULTON. I do, and may I make a short answer on that. It will be recalled that the President of the United States under the Constitution of our Government is given full and free power over our foreign policy. We in Congress can consult, advise, and implement his foreign policy, but whoever he is, I am going to take his judgment. I take the judgment of the Congress on declaring war. Of course, the Congress and not the President declares war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a good amendment.

Now, the gentleman just suggested that he had full faith and confidence in the President, and I will say to him that I believe he does not have any more faith than I have in the President, generally speaking, but I believe he is just a little bit in error, because the committee itself put a provision in the bill indicating that they wanted some safeguards on what the President could do. I believe one Member speaking yesterday called attention to this fact, and in the bill itself the committee put in this provision:

> *Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee itself wanted a safeguard in there, and to say they have full faith and confidence, that the President may have just any free hand to do what he wants to do, I believe, is begging the question just a little bit.

Now, I can see nothing wrong in that because I am telling you that in the action we propose to take today—and I oppose this bill in its essence—we are scaring the people of the world to death,

and you can say all you want to. We are scaring the people about this matter.

Somebody said communism is on the march in Europe. I say that communism is on the retreat in Europe, and it is; and as the world begins to recover, it will retreat more. What about Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, and Switzerland? You hear nothing about communism in those countries. Why? Because the leaders there are evidently giving their people good government, and communism grows and spreads where there is squalor, where there is degradation, where there is confusion; and wherever you find democracy and good government, communism cannot grow.

Gentlemen, when we give good government to our people communism will not grow here. You cannot destroy a false political philosophy or a false religion by bullets. It is impossible. It is like a ghost. You cannot shoot a ghost, because it has no tangibility. There is nothing corporeal about it. You cannot hit a ghost, you cannot see it. It is intangible, and you cannot kill the things that are in the minds of people by bullets and force. We can and we will stop Russia or any nation, or any group of nations, that might come against us by force. We will do it. But we cannot stop communism by force. We will merely spread it by such use. The way to defeat an erroneous philosophy is to give those who accept it a true one—a better one to take its place.

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

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated that communism is on the decline in Russia and other countries that he named.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg your pardon. I did not say in Russia. I said in Europe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, where in Europe?

Mr. MORRIS. All right, where in Europe? Did you not know and does not every sensible person know that——

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said where?

Mr MORRIS. Just a moment. The gentleman asked me. Let me answer it. Did you not know, and does not every sensible person know, that when we helped Russia defeat Germany that we were of necessity giving some impetus to communism? Every sensible person knows what happened. And just as soon as we did that, and Germany was defeated, communism took a big impetus temporarily. I say to you there is less communism in Europe than there was immediately following the war, and everybody knows it that has any judgment about the matter.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much impressed by the gentleman's philosophy that bullets have no effectiveness in stopping ideas. I just wondered what a glorious thing it would be if the gentleman would deliver that speech on the floor of the Legislature in Oklahoma City, in view of what happened on yesterday.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but that is a little bit too direct an action for us to take at this time, I believe.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I interpreted the gentleman's answer to my question a moment ago, he would say, then, that it was a calamity that we defeated Germany?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I did not say that, but those who are on the other side have been implying that all the time. That is just what they have been implying. Those who are supporting this bill have been leaving that implication all the time. They seem to be suggesting that we created a worse Frankenstein than we had before.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. After the gentleman makes that speech down in Oklahoma City, will he go up into South Dakota and make it there?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, if the occasion arises I will make it there, too.

Let me leave this final thought: For something like a hundred years, as I recall it, the best brains and the best minds and the best hearts and the best people in Europe said that Christianity and Mohammedanism could not live in the same world. They had about five or six wars, and they, those of the Christian faith, made crusades to the Holy Land to rescue the Holy Land from the so-called infidels, the Mohammedans, and they fought and killed each other, and each side became just as barbaric as the other, as people generally do in war, but they finally decided that they could both live in the same world, and so can we if we will just keep our feet on the ground and not lose our heads.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said a while ago that this bill is no gesture. The bill states in its title that it is to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey and continues, in subsection 1, "By rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise." Every Member of Congress knows that this is not a loan nor credit, but it is a gift of $400,000,000. We were told to go to the aid—I say aid—of Greece and Turkey, but from listening to the debate every Member here and all the people of this country ought to realize this is for no other purpose than to build up an army in Greece and Turkey and to give them everything that is possible in the way of aid and assistance in fighting anyone who wants to take the Dardanelles. It is a war measure. That is the meat in the coconut. It is also for the purpose of protecting the oil interests in the East. These are the only two things for which this bill is intended, and the American public should know it by this time.

A WAR BILL

If you want to go to war again pass this legislation. I do not want to go to war, and I do not want America to go to war. I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I say to you it is a war bill in a camouflaged style.

It was only last week that we on the Committee on Rules discovered it after the Committee on Foreign Affairs came in and gave us that information.

What does this bill do? It provides for this $400,000,000 which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations to see whether we have $400,000,000 for this purpose—for armament; build up our own armed forces. Furthermore, this bill should have been reported to the Committee on Armed Forces of the Congress rather than to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It never should have come here from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They administer tariffs, armed forces, and agriculture.

Let us analyze this a little. We have been here for the last few weeks with the Committee on Appropriations trying to cut down the expenses of Government. We cut out from the Department of Interior appropriations some $150,000,000 that they wanted to use for reclamation and for the parks of this country and for fish hatcheries and other things that the American people want. But, no, we would not give them that. Here we are today, however, asking for $400,000,000 to be given to the President of the United States to go over to Turkey and Greece and build up a great army for Greece and Turkey to fight some other foreign country. Oh, call it an indirect war bill and you name it correctly.

Gentlemen, as sure as you are knee high to a grasshopper, let me tell you that I believe that army we are building up over there is just as liable to be used against us as it is to be used against Russia. I am afraid of it, and I do not want any part of it. If you are after Russia, say so, and stop fooling the American people. You are not fooling Russia.

You may think you are going over there now and start in on a policy that this country never thought or dreamed of a few years ago, to build up armies in those two countries, but how soon are we going to be asked to build them up in every other country in the world. Why, it is the most ridiculous and preposterous idea that I have ever heard proposed. Thank God it is not a party measure, because if my party—the Republican Party—were proposing a thing like this I would think they were screwy. This can be named the Truman bill.

This country is now in debt to the extent of $257,720,000,000 as of May 5. That is the greatest debt that any country on the face of the earth ever dreamed that they would owe. Four hundred million dollars may mean $40,000,000,000 before you get through with it. Forty

billion dollars, added to the $257,000,000,000, is enough to wreck this country financially. If you carry this country of ours down financially you will wreck it. A nation that is not financially strong is weak.

I am telling you Members that there is nobody in this Chamber who knows what $400,000,000 is. You have been so used to squandering the money of the taxpayers of this country that you are just simply cockeyed. You do not know what $400,000,000 is in volume. I want to tell you that you ought to get down to a little bit of arithmetic. Ten cents make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us get back to the old fundamental principles that we were taught when we went to school and which we understand. Let us get a little common sense. Let us return this bill back to the committee and do something different than what we are trying to do here. You are taking America into a third world war. You know it; so do I. Let the American people in on it, and see what they think about it. America wants no more war in Europe. We had enough of that. No. 1 under Wilson, No. 2 under Roosevelt, No. 3 now under Truman. It is time to stop it. Do it now. Vote this bill down.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I hope we will be able to consider it on its merits and on the basis of how it affects the legislation we are considering. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, it might be difficult to vote against an amendment which indicates that it is to protect the atomic secrets, but is that what this amendment proposes to do?

As you know, the Atomic Energy Control Act was handled by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. We spent many weeks on it. It is a very complicated measure and one that received very careful consideration. Under the existing law, all matters relating to fissionable material and atomic energy are placed in the custody of the Atomic Energy Commission. That Commission is prohibited by existing law from disclosing to a foreign nation the secrets with reference to atomic energy until such time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that all of the secrets, and our interest in them, are fully protected.

The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] argues that that does not control the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. Perhaps that is true, but it is equally true that we cannot in this bill control the powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. His powers as Commander in Chief come to him under the Constitution. We cannot in this legislation restrict or abridge the powers which the President has.

I think the danger in this lies in the fact that, under the well-known and generally understood rule of statutory construction—the expression that one excludes all others—if we now adopt an amendment to this bill which would provide that fissionable material and atomic-energy information shall not be delivered to Greece and Turkey, the logical statutory construction is it may be delivered to every other nation in the world. So, in order to avoid a very highly probable construction that the adoption of this amendment would exclude Greece and Turkey from receiving atomic information and permit every other nation in the world to receive that information, I think it is highly important that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to practically all phases of this debate, I think this bill could very appropriately be called a bill to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to crawl on the anti-Communist bandwagon. This bill, stripped of all of its artificiality, is nothing more nor less than subterfuge of the lowest rank. It makes my stomach turn to have Members of Congress rise in the well of the House and speak of this bill as a protector of human rights and liberties. The same individuals who are such loud proponents of this bill are the same individuals who accepted the crimes of Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran with silence. The matter of freedom and liberty did not concern them then. So let us reason this thing out, concretely and specifically. Let me ask you this simple, profound question: If Greece, which is now involved in nothing more than a family quarrel, civil war—if Greece were located in South America, would we be here today voting an aid bill for Greece? Of course we would not. Their freedom and liberty then would not be of concern to the Members of this Congress.

Let us take the case of Turkey. Suppose Turkey were located in Africa instead of where it is, do you suppose for 1 minute we would be here passing an authorization bill to help the people of Turkey? Of course not. How in the name of common sense, then, can anyone talk about freedom and liberty and talk about Turkey in the same breath? Has anyone here ever heard of the philosophy of government that is exemplified by the Turks ever being on the side of the United States of America in the entire history of the existence of their country or our country?

I remember when I was a little boy, in 1915, how I left the farm on behalf of my father and we went from one farm to another and I was collecting dimes and pennies and nickels and dollars for the relief of the starving Armenians. That was in 1915 when the Turks massacred and slaughtered in cold blood, 2,000,000 Armenian people. Their only solution of the Armenian problem was to slaughter the Armenians. Never have they been a democracy. Never have they fought on the side of democracy. And here you are going to pass a bill to aid the Turks in order to defend freedom and liberty. Stripped of all of its artificiality, as I said in the beginning, many Members of Congress and many leaders in the United States of America and our State Department are on the hot seat. They went over to Yalta and Potsdam and Teheran and they appeased. They handed over Finland and Lithuania and Latvia and Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania to the Communists. Do I hear the hearts of any of those men who are interested in freedom and liberty for the Turks and the Greeks, do I hear their hearts bleed over the enslavement of those people that our country delivered to the hands of the Communists?

Do I see hearts bleeding about freedom and liberty for those countries? Not once do I see it.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that communism is playing out in those countries?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, yes. I will read you the last axiom from the Communist manifesto. You are not going to stop communism or ban communism through any such stupid bill as this. You have got to do something else to stop it. Listen to this. This is an axiom from the Communist manifesto:

> Communism will be vigorous and united only as long as it is feeding on the properties of others. When the Communist comes to the place where it can no longer feed on the "host," it must feed on itself and die.

If it had not been for the United States of America dishing out $2,000,000,000 since the war ended to finance communism in Europe, you would not have the threat of communism in Greece and Turkey today; you would not have it.

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

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, certainly there is no one who has been more disappointed, and I might say disgusted, with Russia's disinclination until a few days ago to indulge in discussion of a final settlement of lend-lease matters than I have; in fact, I have been considerably disgusted with Russia's conduct since the end of the war generally, as most of you have. There has, however, been a misapprehension about that lend-lease matter. I intended to try to clear it up yesterday, but when I came here and saw the long list of requests for time that the ranking minority member had, including requests from opponents as well as proponents of the bill, I did not even mention it to him.

It will be recalled, particularly by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that in the original lend-lease agreements there was nothing said about time or amount of payment. That was all left to a general settlement after the war. The time came, however, when we could foresee the end of the war and realized that when it came there would doubtless be in the lend-lease pipe line many heavy-industry articles which, though valuable indeed for war purposes if they reached the recipient countries during the war, would be equally valuable to their economy after the war. Under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act, therefore, the United States entered into

agreements with all lend-lease recipient countries, including Russia, to the effect that as to whatever was in the pipe line when the end of the war came the recipient country could either cancel her orders therefor or tell us to conclude the manufacture of the material and agree to pay for it, generally over a 30-year period and in the case of Russia at 2⅜ percent interest. In other words, it was very much to the advantage of the United States to enter into those agreements.

When the end of the war came in the case of Russia there was in the pipe lines considerably more than $250,000,000 worth of goods. Russia canceled the orders for much of it and told us as to the $250,000,000: "We would like for you to continue the manufacture of those goods and we will pay you in 30 years for them 100 percent with 2⅜ percent interest." We agreed to that. Two hundred and thirty-three million dollars of this $250,000,000 had been shipped to Russia before discontinuance of shipments at the end of December, leaving $17,000,000 only. Now as to that $17,000,000, some on the floor have labored under the misapprehension that it is entirely oil refining machinery. Some of it is oil refining machinery; some of it is railroad equipment for Russia's widegage railroads. It was all built to Russia's specifications and would not be worth anything to us except for junk. Now, as to the oil refining machinery there are a number of parts for oil plants in this $17,000,000. The big bulk of the plants have already been shipped. If you ask why there are parts remaining, I call attention not only to the difficulties of transportation recently but I also call attention to the cars you see running around Washington with wooden bumpers and I ask, What good to us would those wooden bumpers be? What good to us would be parts of oil gages or of oil refining plants which we could do nothing with but junk if we did not send them to Russia? Not only is it a solemn contract that we entered into but it is a solemn contract for the best interests of this country which has been fulfilled 93.2 percent. I do not believe my colleagues, with that knowledge of the situation, will entertain any objection to our country carrying out its agreement with Russia, whether we like its form of government, whether we wish that form of government to spread out over the United States or not.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 20 minutes.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending Douglas amendment close in 30 minutes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, let me indulge upon the committee in a bit of ancient history. Many centuries ago Greece was the cradle of democracy. I believe that over the whole period of the history of humanity Greece has emerged as the only genuine democracy known to the world.

You will recall when any great questions were being decided by the ancient Greek legislature the populace would gather ostracons on the beaches before Athens and cast them on the various issues. The pile of ostracons which was the largest decided the question. The lawmakers were then directed by the people to vote as they had expressed themselves and as the people wanted them to.

That was purer democracy than we have today, for no representative in this House can be so certain of the feelings of his constituents as were the Greeks of old. The land which gave us our concept of government ought to receive our help when her own freedom is threatened.

Greece today—and I think I speak with all accuracy—is in jeopardy. The cradle of democracy is being overturned by forces in the Old World with which Americanism is at odds. I say the time has come when the American Nation must take a stand in the interest of downtrodden peoples like the Greeks.

A century and a half have passed since those Barbary pirates swept the Mediterranean clear of American seamen. You will also remember the inspiring tales recorded that our leaders of that time raised up and cried, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Today, Mr. Chairman, I say that the issue is again presenting itself. When a decade ago the hosts of Adolf Hitler swarmed over Europe and crushed innocent and helpless peoples under their heels, the American National rallied, and we joined forces against the Nazi oppressors and wiped them off the face of the earth. Now, it is obvious that there are other "isms" and other oppressors raising their gargantuan heads, their ugly visages, and threatening the peace of the world and the future of our generation. The time has come again for us to take a definite stand. It is our duty to protect the underprivileged and the unfortunate members of the human race. They, too, no matter how small, no matter how humble, must be able to assert themselves in the great family of nations so that freedom, liberty, and equality will be perpetuated throughout the entire world.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that we should take a definite stand. I want to ask this: In the gentleman's opinion, if Greece comes under the control of Moscow, will that not make Russia a Mediterranean power and imperil the security of the United States?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I can answer that in this way: That America has never retreated. We have never surrendered our position in international affairs, and I do not think that now is the time to begin. I think that the only recourse we have is to see that the seven seas and the lands all over the globe are made as free as possible. It is our bounden duty and our responsibility to see that the freedom the Constitution of the United States personifies and guarantees should be preserved, not only here but wherever the forces of oppression have raised their heads.

I say that the question is here before us. We have debated at great length on this question and it is time we come to a decision on it. I hope that we decide wisely and that we will be able to chart a course of action which will preserve representative government and freedom throughout the world.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, in common with a lot of other Members of this House I spent about 4 years in the Army. One of the discouraging things is that many of these young fellows have risen here in the last 2 days and spoken about their disillusionment that now that we have won the war we are facing another series of disillusionments. But that is one of those things that cannot be helped. When you get rid of one tyrant, one dictator, if another one raises his head that issue has to be met head-on.

In common with a lot of these same fellows who have spoken here who have served overseas, I was overseas, in Belgium, France, England, Luxemburg, and Germany, for 2 years. The only difference between my situation and theirs, I expect, is that due to the type of work in which I was engaged I had a chance to go into an average of 15 or 20 French, Belgian, and Luxemburg homes each day. Some days I would go into the home of a baron or a count, and the next day I would be in the home of a peasant who was wearing wooden shoes. Having the curiosity I have, I studied and tried to find out everything I could about the very thing we are debating here today. After having watched the way the Communists work in France, Belgium, and the other countries over there, I say to you that we all know the same pattern and techniques of infiltration will be followed and is being followed in Greece and in Turkey, and it is being followed in this country. To those who are not afraid of the threat of communism which is facing this country I say this: It has been mentioned here that the countries that do not want communism are not having it. They mention Belgium, Denmark, and other countries. Those countries are not in the same position that the war-devastated countries are such as Greece, Italy, and part of France, because when the Germans retreated, as any soldier will tell you, although Belgium, Denmark, and those

places suffered through the occupation, the Germans did not take their livestock away, they did not tear up the railroads, they did not leave the forces there that make for communism such as we have in Greece, Italy, and other Balkan countries.

Some Members have raised the question here of the cost of this policy. When this subject was recently mentioned by one Member of this House another Member said, "Thank God no bombs fell on this country." One gentleman over here, thinking he was making a wise remark, stated "that a bombshell fell on the Treasury of the United States to the tune of $400,000,000." When you start talking like that, do not think for one minute that a bombshell did not fall in the hearts of thousands of mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts in this country when they got those terse messages from the War Department which said that their sons or their husbands were killed in action. We cannot think in terms of dollars in this matter.

I am going to support this bill, I do not care whether it costs $400,000,000 or $4,000,000,000, as long as it will stop the mad rush of communism that is sweeping over Europe, the Middle East, and is making inroads in this country. We should spend any amount of dollars that is needed to stop this insidious thing. I think this business of dollars and cents is one of the most false arguments that can be propounded here on the floor, because if you have more incidents in this country such as went on out here at Western High School, in Washington, D. C., the day before yesterday—and God knows how many have gone on in this country that we do not know about because other students have not been sufficiently trained to see what is happening under their very noses—we are not going to have a United States Treasury here some day, when this force of communism reaches Greece and Turkey and marches on into the Middle East and reaches Iraq and Iran and the oil fields over there. Some of the people speaking for this bill seem to be afraid to talk about oil. When the Russians get into Iran and Iraq, when they get the oil fields there, they are going to be in a position to wage war for a hundred years. It will not be like Hitler's Germany, when we landed on D-day and when Patton executed the break-through in France, when the reason we were able to go through there was that Hitler ran out of high-octane gasoline. If Communist Russia gets those oil fields, it will have all the oil it needs to wage war, and it will get them if it can go into Greece and Turkey; and it will be able to go in there in 24 hours if we do not give those countries some form of relief.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that not only is the Near East in danger but if the Communists take over Greece, Italy is gone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are millions of Americans of Italian blood who are hoping that Italy will be saved. If the Communists go into those countries, the chances of Poland's being reclaimed will be gone for many generations. It is amazing how some people overlook the responsibility they owe to the land of birth of their forebears.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we Americans seem to have the greatest national faculty of embarking upon a program and then placing upon our own hands manacles and handcuffs which render it impossible to carry the program through effectively. As I said here yesterday, there will be a number of restricting amendments offered on the floor, amendments which have not the intent or the purpose of rendering it possible to carry this program through to a successful conclusion, but amendments which have instead the purpose of destroying the successful application of this proposed legislation. In proposing the support of this legislation I do not do so with a bleeding heart, as was indicated broadly by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] in commenting on this bill. My heart does not bleed for the people of Greece or the people of Turkey, but my heart is very much concerned over the Red tide of aggression which is sweeping over the earth. I am deeply concerned about whether or not $400,000,000 will do this job. But until we stop counting the cost of this program in terms of dollars and start counting the cost in human lives and freedom if we do not carry through, we shall continue our policy of shrinking back from the stark realities of life today.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do you know of any standard by which you can measure a man's life or his leg or his arm in terms of money?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Those are abstract things, and I agree perfectly that you cannot measure those things in terms of dollars and cents. There are higher values in life—values that cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Among those things are freedom and basic rights.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman did not mean to say that the intent of the bill was to deliver the atomic bomb to Greece or Turkey, did he?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I did not make that statement, or even infer it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No; I thought you were speaking on the amendment, and I was led to believe that that is what you are implying.

Mr. JACKSON of California. No, indeed; that is not my intention.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not this bill provide that we shall do whatever is necessary with no limitations?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I believe that is the intent of the bill and if that is not the intent of the bill, then we are stultifying ourselves so that we cannot hope to achieve our purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. In conclusion, I can only offer the suggestion that almost every amendment that will be here offered has been considered in its entirety by the members of the committee. Very little new will be offered on the floor of this House today in the way of amendments. We have heard most of the arguments pro and con. We have heard scores of witnesses and taken hundreds of thousands of words of testimony.

Again, I suggest to the committee that if you want this program to succeed—if you want to try to make an effort here and now to stop this type of international aggression, then you support this legislation without major amendment. If you want to see it fail, if you want to see us going into this project without any chance of winning through, then you will support many stultifying amendments that will be offered from the floor.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman made the statement that all amendments that will be offered have been considered in the committee. I have an amendment which I propose to offer which was not considered by the committee.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I beg your pardon if I am in error on that point. I should say, almost all of the amendments have been considered in the committee.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman assume that he has thought of all of the possibilities and that he has all of the wisdom and all of the light that might come upon a question of this great importance?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I can assure the gentleman that was not my intention. However, I think if all the alleged wisdom on both sides of the issue was not heard by the committee it was because the other experts did not show up to be heard, because we have had more authorities on both sides of this question than I even imagined existed.

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

Mr. Chairman, on this matter of amendments I want to suggest that I do not think the bill before us is any sacred cow nor do I think that it is the arc of the covenant and that anyone who touches it will fall over dead. I do not think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has all of the wisdom of this House. Let us be frank about it. Our committee has heard in executive session our two ambassadors and certain military officers and representatives of the Army and Navy. I think we do have knowledge superior to many of the Members on the floor on many phases of this

matter. On the other hand, it seems to me that we have to consider amendments on their merits, to write the best piece of legislation we can. For instance, I disagree with some of my colleagues on the pending amendment. I think the pending amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is an amendment that cannot hurt the bill, because if there is any conceivable possibility that the President of the United States would give our atomic information to Greece or Turkey, that possibility should be barred.

Remember, this bill starts out by saying, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law"; so that the power given in this bill amends former legislation. On the other hand, if this amendment is defeated, I cannot conceive of the President furnishing any atomic information or atomic energy information to the Greeks or to the Turks. I think the gentlewoman from California is going to propose shortly two amendments which I consider very, very bad. I am therefore going to oppose them when the time comes. It seems to me we have to keep our eye on what we want to do here and consider these amendments on their merits and not vote them up or down because of any preconceptions or prejudices. I urge that you give such attention as we deserve to the members of the committee who heard the testimony. Some of my colleagues differ with me on this particular amendment, but the important thing is to bear in mind the very important amendments which will be offered, which are destructive of the program, and which will be offered later. I hope that neither the proponents nor the opponents will waste their energy on amendments that are not too important one way or the other.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman has made a very fair statement regarding his position and that of the committee. From my point of view, the committee did an excellent job. I think when the Vandenberg amendment was added, about all the repair work that could be done was done. But does not the gentleman from Ohio think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] advanced a valid argument? That is, the implication that under the amendment of the gentlewoman from California the information could be made available to others and not to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. VORYS. That is an argument that should be weighed. I simply want to say that on this amendment I cannot conceive of the President failing to carry out exactly what is contained in this amendment. Therefore, whether it is in the bill or not seems to me not of any great importance. On the other hand, I recognize the great wisdom of some of those who have spoken on this matter. My only plea was that we consider these amendments on their merits. I beg of the committee to give to us on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who have had greater opportunity to learn some information which cannot be of record, such consideration as we deserve. At the same time I do not want to have the question of whether this bill goes through untouched by amendments, be the question that determines whether or not we have a sound foreign policy. That is all I had in mind.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that the gentleman is of the opinion that the committee has produced a very fine bill and that the committee seemingly has a greater grasp or knowledge of this entire subject matter than most of the membership of the House, and in view of the fact that the gentleman has spoken any number of times, I wonder if the committee would not permit us, who have not had such an opportunity, to take a few minutes to express ourselves as the debate goes on.

Mr. VORYS. This is the second time I have opened my mouth in this debate, but I agree with the gentleman that all should have an opportunity to express themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how any Member can support this amendment, whether he is for this bill or against it. This measure is going to pass. If it is going to pass, then we certainly ought not to begin to appease Russia in advance.

I am the only man in either House of Congress who has stated openly that he was in favor of breaking relations with Communist Russia. Do not kid yourselves, they are already making war upon us.

I think this amendment would tie the hands of the President of the United States and give comfort, if not aid, to Russia in case of a conflict for which they are preparing.

I have been fighting this battle againt communism for many years. I have taken more punishment, more abuse, than any man in either House of Congress.

This is the first time a President of the United States has come out on our side, and I am not willing to tie the hands of Harry Truman, because I know that if we get into war, if it is necessary to use the atomic bomb we will use it. Let me disillusion the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. If he thinks communism is on the wane in either Europe or in this country he ought to attend the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He ought to have heard the testimony of Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, the other day. He ought to have heard the testimony of Mr. Bullitt. We asked Mr. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia, what would happen in the event Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it. He said that it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], that I read into the RECORD the statement of the leader of the Communist Party who is going to speak in Washington tonight. You speak about its being on the way here, it is marching right up to your very door. I read into the RECORD where he said time and time again that they were for a world revolution overthrowing all governments and making communism the dominant power of the world, he said, they were just as sure to take you over as the world stands.

And, he said: "When that day comes it will not be a Government of the United States but it will be a Soviet government and behind that government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Do not deceive yourselves. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that they are working all over this country, and it was no accident that this tool of Russia went to Western High School here in Washington day before yesterday and for 55 minutes poured into the ears of those children anti-American doctrines and arguments that were so shocking that the students got up and walked out.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] what I said before: I have never agreed to and have never been satisfied with seeing Poland, the home of Kosciusko, turned over to the ruthless bunch of lawless brutes who are now destroying the Christian people of Poland.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that there is nothing for us to worry about so far as communism is concerned in this country?

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to get to that point. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Of course it is here, threatening the security of this country. I am going to call on the President of the United States to join us in driving communism from American soil. The President is my friend. He is a man I can talk to. He is the most human individual I have ever seen in the Presidency of the United States. But let me tell you this, he is a Christian gentleman, a deep-water Baptist, if you want to know the truth, the only Baptist that has ever been President of the United States. Oh, no. I know that you are going to say that Harding was a Baptist. I understand he was a Baptist only by marriage.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me impress upon you that if the Communists take over this country there will be no Baptists in Missouri, there will be no Methodists in Mississippi, or Presbyterians in Iowa, there will be no Catholics in Louisiana or New York, there will be no Episcopalians in Virginia, because when the Communists take over all Christian churches will be closed. It is

written in every Russian booklet today that "religion is the opiate of the people." Communism is out to destroy Christianity and everything that is built on Christian principles.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I remind the gentleman of the fact that 2 weeks ago the President said we need not worry about that; it is a bugaboo here, that is all.

Mr. RANKIN. I have some doubt whether the President made that statement. May I say that the President of the United States realizes the danger that civilization is in today, and this amendment will not help him to meet that danger.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman referred to remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] about what had happened in Poland. Is it not a fact that what happened in Poland and what is happening in the rest of eastern Europe points out the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what the Communists want to do in the United States, and they say so in every Communist convention where they know we have no one listening in.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman think that the Government of the United States of America can afford to finance those who are fighting communism, and at the same time finance those who are in favor of communism?

Mr. RANKIN. No; and I voted against aid to the ones who are fighting on the side of communism.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman know that our Treasury Department today is buying every ounce of gold that the Russian Government produces?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. O'KONSKI. And we are paying them $36 an ounce for it.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Christian people of Poland are looking to the Christian people of the rest of the world for protection, and they will get it through this bill a great deal quicker than they would by our placating or appeasing Communist Russia. Communism and Christianity cannot live in the same atmosphere; communism and human liberty cannot continue to exist on the same soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for 5 years I have been in Congress listening to security problems presented before the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Armed Services. While I cannot add anything to what has been said on this particular problem, I think I approach it from a different viewpoint and with a different attitude than many of the speakers who have talked here today, yesterday, and the day before.

In my opinion, this is a problem in international and national security. To understand what the security situation of the world is today, I suggest that every one of you take a look at a globe and you will find that from 30 degrees north latitude, up over the Pole, is the area of the world in which we have so-called civilization. That is also the area in which all the trouble spots of the world are contained. That is the area in which all the wars of the last three or four centuries have been germinated. Due to rapid air transit we can get from one part of the world north of 30 degrees north latitude to any other in the same area in one trip. The rapid airplanes of today can go from any major point in the particular part of the world in which trouble may start to another point in the same area, and with modern weapons can destroy any city or other congested area therein.

We have a situation that in the event there is a major difference between us and a great power there is the possibility of us being attacked on any day and any hour. You know that the destructive capacity of weapons has stepped up so tremendously that we can truthfully say today that an army or an armed force has the possibility of destroying every nation in the world; in fact, modern wars come without warning, and they come to every household in the country. There is no longer any front any more. The whole nation is the battleground. Therefore, in contemplating these problems and listening to experts on all kinds, it is my considered conviction that there is only one true security system which fits the world of today. That security system is one that is based on law, one that is based on order, one that is based on a vehicle whereby the controversies of great nations can be settled in some orderly, peaceful way. In my opinion this problem before us today brings in focus the matter of trying to foster and develop the idea of peaceful settlement of controversies. If we do not find some way to handle the matter by peace, by some method of adjudication, the world, in my opinion, is doomed to destruction.

Why do I say that what we have before us today focuses that particular question? This is the reason for it: During the war, and in fact for many years before the war, but especially during the war, our leaders contemplated that when this war ended they would find some way to bind the world together, to settle their problems in some lawful, Christian way other than by mass murder, which we call war. The result was that the Allied leaders made certain agreements, and one of those agreements that we have before us today, was that a country which had been devastated, like Greece and others, should have the right to hold a free election and select the kind of government it wants. That meant they were to have the kind of a government they wanted, irrespective of its kind.

Now, what do we have? Greece exercised that right. The record in this case shows that 85 percent of the people selected the government they now have. We may not like that type, but that was their selection. Now we find that one of the great powers, that agreed to that proposition, is by infiltration, by encouraging brigands and bands, is robbing that particular country of her right to select and have the government that she wants and which she by a free election selected. I say now is the time to find out by a firm, aggressive, frank attitude and statement whether Russia intends to comply with her agreement, and to allow Greece to have the government of her choice, or is she trying to destroy that right by creating turmoil and revolution in Greece?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Now is the time, right here and today, to find out whether Russia intends to abide by this preliminary agreement so we will know whether she will abide by the agreements we may make hereafter. She is talking about limiting armaments, doing away with the atomic bomb, and various things of that kind, indicating that she also wants a peaceful world, and if we can find out now by the action proposed in this bill, which we can, whether she will respect agreements, we will know how to talk to her and deal with her in the future.

I tell you that if Russia and America cannot get together in a solemn agreement to stop this mass murder that we call war, we are living in a very dismal world and a very gloomy outlook for our children.

I have traveled around the world. I have talked to doughboys and sailors in all parts of the world, and the one thing they told me above all others was this: "Mr. JOHNSON, you and your friends must find a way to avoid future wars, to keep faith with the eleven or twelve million men who fought this war and with our comrades that died and were wounded." We have to find some way to establish a world of peace through agreement, through peaceful methods. If we take a firm stand today, we will find a way to make an accord with Russia, as well as stop her onrush down through the Mediterranean and over the rest of the world. This is the test. Are we going to take a chance? Are we willing to sacrifice? Are we willing to pledge our honor and our money and our men that we will take a stand for liberty and for adherence to solemn agreements solemnly made, to the end that in the future our children and grandchildren may have and will have a peaceful world?

The passage of this bill will do that. It will let the world know that we are

demanding that those with whom we agreed stand by their commitments, the same as we are doing. It will give hope to the nations involved that we will protect their right to a free choice of the government under which they are to live and protect their right to sovereign integrity after they have made their choice.

It will let the world know that we hold sacred commitments to protect small countries. It will notify our Allies that every country is entitled to its autonomy and that its right to a free and independent life shall not be nullified. In other words, we want agreements to be kept and observed, be they preliminary ones or final agreements. The basis of law is that contracts are sacred. If we can establish that now, then we may move forward to the hope of a world of peace. Drifting, temporizing, evading responsibility and leadership, and doing the expedient rather than the right thing, will bring us turmoil and even disaster. If we take our stand firmly now, it will result in a show-down, and my prediction is that it will lead ultimately to accord with Russia and to peace that will be lasting.

That is why I hope this bill gets an overwhelming vote of approval.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment now pending. I think it would be a serious mistake to adopt that amendment at the present time in view of the consideration we have given the matter. As we all know, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 585, which is the law that controls the use and the handling of atomic energy and of fissionable materials, together with information of a confidential nature regarding them. That law before enactment was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs, it was considered by a special committee of the United States Senate over a long period of time, it was considered by both the House and the Senate over a long period of time, and then it went to a committee of conference. We worked long and carefully in framing the bill, especially in framing the penal clauses of the bill. I think to amend by indirection that statute—and that is what this amendment would do—is a serious mistake.

I fully agree with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he refers to the fact that on page 13 of that statute under the heading of "Control of information" there is a prohibition which we placed in the law against any information covering atomic energy being delivered to a foreign power without first obtaining the passage of a concurrent resolution from Congress. I think that alone makes this amendment repetitious and unnecessary.

But I go further, Mr. Chairman, and say this: On that same page of that act we find 14 or 15 prohibitions against the use of atomic energy and against the dissemination of information covering fissionable materials. We find that these prohibitions are couched in most careful and exact language. This Congress attempted to make the unlawful disclosure of atomic information to foreign powers one of the most serious crimes known to the penal statute books of America. It is a crime which may be punished by death and, in the event lesser punishment is desired, he may be punished by long years of imprisonment as much as life imprisonment, and the imposition of thousands of dollars in fines.

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

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

Mr. ELSTON. Is it not a fact that the same act on page 9, section 5, subsection 7 (d) makes provision that the Commission shall not distribute any fissionable material to any foreign government?

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. Those provisions of the law as we passed them in the last session of Congress make this amendment useless and repetitious. As I said, I think when we are dealing with the lives of people and with crimes which may be punished by death, we ought to be very careful before enacting amendments to any such a law by indirection.

I am not worried about what the President of the United States may do in this case. I am not worried about what this commission controlling atomic energy may do. I am certainly not worried about what we may do to the Communists in Russia to stop this propaganda that has been spread all over the world for the last 20 years. They say that the best way to kill a snake is by stomping it on the head. I believe that is right. That is the reason why I rise at this time against this amendment, and I hope the Committee will not adopt it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened here with a great deal of interest during the last 7 days. I am greatly confused as to what this proposal is all about. What I would like to have made clear to me is: What is our foreign policy? What is the policy of our State Department? As I said the other day, is it to remove this communistic threat or is it to protect the oil fields of Iraq, Iran, and Arabia, or is it to protect the Dardanelles, or is to protect Greece? Just what are we trying to do in venturing into Greece and Turkey.

We hear talk constantly about the threat of communism. Yet the other day in the Senate debate Senator BYRD said:

> Out of the $16,000,000,000 the sum of $1,525,000,000 has been or will be given to Russia and her satellites. Again, I ask, can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right? Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows: Russia, $203,000,000; Poland, $463,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $202,000,000; Finland, $92,000,000; Hungary, $18,000,000; Yugoslavia, $296,000,000.

Certainly, no one will question whether Yugoslavia is a satellite of Russia.

> More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

I cannot understand this talk about $400,000,000 to remove the threat of communism in Greece, and yet we are pitching hundreds of millions of dollars into Russia through her satellite nations.

Senator BYRD continues:

> In view of the fact that our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly $16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than can be expected today within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations.

And in answer to a question by a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs about oil, he says this:

> Right today, the State Department is urging Congress to approve $17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, and yet at the same time the State Department requests Congress to approve $400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey.

Now, what is this all about anyway? I cannot understand. We dish out hundreds of millions to Russia on the one hand to assist them and hundreds of millions on the other hand to stop them. Somebody ought to clear the air as to what is our foreign policy. Where are we headed for? American people have a right to know. Is this our first step in imperialism? Is this an attempt to put a turban on Uncle Sam? As I said the other day:

> It appears to be a step in the direction of imperialism. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of policy that this Nation has always avoided, and Uncle Sam has never yet tried to gain sovereignty over any other nation, and I do not want to see him attempt it now.

From all the talk you would think it appears to be a very critical situation, and yet the bill is for the purpose of aid to Greece. I would like to know just what it is all about, and if some member of the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee can tell me what our foreign policy is to be, I certainly will be pleased to hear from him.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, many long years ago Aeschylus, the tragic poet of Greece, said: "He hears but half who hears one party only." During the course of this debate, we have certainly heard more than one party. Many members of both parties have spoken. In this debate we have heard both sides of the important proposition fully and ably discussed. This has been one of the best debates I have ever had the privilege of hearing during my membership in this House. We have had the privilege of hearing many excellent speeches. As I have listened to the debate, I have been very much impressed by the sincerity of each of the speakers. I accord sincerity to all who have spoken. During the course of the debate, however, I have been reminded of one brief sentence uttered by Paul as he stood on Mars' Hill, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive

that in all things ye are too superstitious." The distinguished gentleman who has just addressed us appears to be somewhat superstitious and rather suspicious. He still wonders about the foreign policy of our Nation. I believe that for once in the life of this Nation our foreign policy is easily understood and that above all it is now forthright and fearless. I believe that our foreign policy is clearly understood even by the man on the street. I am somewhat surprised to hear Members of Congress stand in this Chamber and express wonder and ask many questions concerning the foreign policy of our Republic. I believe that the foreign policy of our Nation is now generally known by our people.

Today is the second anniversary of victory in Europe. The great conflict which ended 2 years ago today was cruel and costly. In the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea, gallant men won great victories; yet today the documents of peace have not been written. In the First World War gallant men won great victories, but the fruits of victory were lost. Woodrow Wilson, our great and beloved statesman, came back from France with high hopes for world peace, only to die of a broken heart mid the ruined fruits of victories which were won on the fields of carnage and at great cost in blood and treasure. In the First World War men thought that civilization had learned the supreme lesson, but they were mistaken and millions died in vain. While it seems that we must always deal with great uncertainties, it at least appears reasonable to believe that had our Nation followed the admonition and advice of the great Wilson the world would not have been cursed with the cruel conflict which ended in Europe 2 years ago today. We are now wondering whether the fruits of the last great victory will be lost. We are wondering whether those who have been liberated from the yoke of oppression and from the cruel heels of tyranny shall again be immediately enslaved by a bloodless conquest which is sweeping across the earth. One needs only to look at a map to know and to understand what is happening in the world. Shall those who have been liberated be denied the blessings of free government and unfettered elections? Shall the Yalta agreement be a mere "scrap of paper" and a fraud on the people of the world? Shall we abandon the fight for freedom and break faith with those who have so recently died on the altars of freedom? The governing authorities of some nations even now respect only strength—they respect power and despise weakness. If we are to remain strong and powerful, we must at all times be fearlessly frank and eminently fair in our dealings with our own people and with the peoples of the world. I do not like unilateral trading and star-chamber sessions. I agree with Woodrow Wilson that the policy of our Nation should be at all times "open covenants openly arrived at." Can we study recent history and fail to know that we are still living in a world of secret covenants secretly arrived at? Certainly we are not here dealing with an important matter in secrecy. Our policy and our program have been openly announced and loudly proclaimed. We are not engaged in unilateral trading. We are about to make a loan to nations in distress, and nothing we are about to do is incompatible with the letter or the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. The purpose of this loan is known throughout the world, and no nation has a right to challenge us or to question our motives.

Men of great prominence and Members of this House of great influence have stated that America is embarking upon a program of imperialism. Every act in the history of our Nation belies that statement. Certainly Greece and Turkey know and understand the history and the ambitions of America. Neither the people of Greece nor of Turkey question our motives nor fear the consequences of our generosity. Both countries have asked for our help and assistance. If Greece, the very cradle of democracy, should fall, Turkey could not stand alone, and with Turkey would go Italy, and with Italy, would go Europe. If we are to deny this aid and assistance to either Greece or Turkey, we might as well strike out the enacting clause.

While there was no doubt in my mind as to this important proposition, my convictions were fortified during a recent visit to both Greece and Turkey. As you know, I was a member of the delegation of the American Congress which attended the first postwar meeting of the Interparliamentary Union which met in Cairo, Egypt, Monday, April 7. The delegation was headed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY and was composed of four Members of the Senate and six Members of this House, equally divided between the members of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. In returning from Cairo, the delegation had an opportunity to visit Ankara, the new capital of Turkey, and Istanbul, the ancient city of Constantinople; and in Greece we visited the ancient city of Athens. At each place we conferred with members of our own diplomatic corps, with ordinary citizens, with members of the press, and with high Government officials of both countries. We had conferences with the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister of Turkey, and in our conferences with both officials and with members of the press, members of our delegation propounded questions in an effort to obtain, in a short space of time, as much information as possible. We stated at every conference that we were not there for the purpose of answering questions but rather for the purpose of asking questions. I do not believe that any delegation could have obtained more information in the short time at our disposal.

Easter Monday morning I was in Greece. I stood at the Acropolis in the ancient city of Athens and looked down on Mars' Hill on the very spot where Paul stood when he spoke to the men of Athens, and I was conscious of the fact that though I was standing upon the ruins of Greece I was in the land of democracy and among people who loved freedom. In addition to talking with many Greeks, with members of the press, and with diplomats, we conferred with the Foreign Minister, with the Prime Minister, and with King Paul, and Queen Frederika. I hold no brief for any Greek who in any way collaborated with the Nazis. While I know a little something about the heritage of both King and Queen, I frankly confess that I know very little about their attitudes or action during the recent war. I do not, however, hesitate to say to this House that I believe that King Paul and Queen Frederika are both personally popular and that the Government of Greece is now generally popular. I do not hesitate to express the belief that both Turkey and Greece will fight to the last man in the defense of their territories and in the defense of the integrity of their governments. I believe that every man in our delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, believes that the people of Turkey hate and despise communism and that the Government of Greece today is even more popular than it was at the time of the death of the late King George. The new King has a pleasing and dynamic personality and is more popular than was his deceased brother. He has at his side Queen Frederika with whose great simplicity and sincerity all of us were impressed. They are both social-minded and have taken an active interest in the welfare of the underprivileged boys and girls of Greece. They appear to be anxious to pull their broken nation together and to lead it in the pathways of peace and progress.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that every member of our delegation was very favorably impressed with the attitude of every Greek official with whom we conferred. We were told by our own diplomats of a little incident which might give us an idea of the attitude of the present Queen of Greece. This incident was verified by the Queen herself who discussed it with us freely. She had been advised that the Communists were holding a meeting in some part of Greece. She insisted upon attending the meeting. She said that if they were Communists there must be some reason for it, for they would not be Communists unless they had grievances or causes, and she wanted to know the facts. When she insisted, she was told that it was not the proper thing for her to do, but she was determined to attend the meeting. She went to the meeting and gave them a chance to speak to her, and she in turn addressed them. She told them of her great interest in their problems and of how anxious she was to better their lives. When she had finished her speech was loudly applauded, and she was taken upon the shoulders of those there assembled as evidence of their approval of her attitude and conduct. This incident occurred just before she became Queen. Now both she and King Paul are in a position to vindicate themselves before the peo-

ple of Greece and before the people of the world. They both seem to realize that they now have a great opportunity to serve the people of their country; yet, they both also seem to appreciate the difficulties to be encountered and the weaknesses of their government when surrounded by the strength of other powerful nations. After all, we must confess that it takes a little courage for a frail woman to go from the home of royalty to a meeting of distressed and complaining citizens or subjects and to discuss with them their plight and their problems.

In the brief space of time allotted to me, I shall not attempt to discuss the many issues involved in this proposition. We know that it may be fraught with dangerous consequences. The future is uncharted. We must have faith, although we know that at this moment our ship of state is sailing on uncertain seas and may even come upon the rocks. I have great mental comfort and satisfaction in the knowledge of the fact that I am doing what I sincerely believe to be right in voting to grant this aid to the devastated and war-torn country of Greece and to the burdened and distressed people of Turkey. The people of Turkey might not fight communism merely because of their love for America, but I believe that they will fight to the last man for the integrity and freedom of their own nation, and I further believe that both the Turks and the Greeks will prove worthy of the confidence we are about to place in them by granting them this loan.

If our foreign policy is to stop communism, we had better stop it in the Black Sea, at the Bosphorus, in the Sea of Marmora, or at the Dardanelles, or at some place far distant from our own shores. Here we are dealing with a vital spot in this world. These helpless people will be easy prey to communism without the aid and assistance which we are here about to give them.

Our brave men fought for freedom, and to the institutions of freedom we are devoted. If we fought for freedom, are we not at least willing to try to keep men free?

Byron once wrote a poem which is an inspiration to those who have looked so recently upon the land of Greece:

The mountains look on Marathon
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone
I dream'd that Greece might still be free.
For standing on the Persians' grave
I could not deem myself a slave.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 12 words.

Mr. Chairman, in this momentous debate, so far reaching in its implications, sincere and conscientious legislators on both sides of the aisle are to be found arrayed in opposition. Here is no place for bitterness, for recriminations, for name calling—least of all, for attempt at political advantage. A great responsibility faces each one of us. We must each meet it squarely and unflinchingly.

It is true that the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have held 17 meetings on this bill and listened to volumes of testimony, are deserving not only of our gratitude for a conscientious job well done, but also, it seems to me, to a rather unusual degree of our confidence in the conclusions at which they have arrived. With only 1 negative vote they have urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Their searching investigation, however, does not relieve us of our duty to study and analyze this great question.

The principal objections to this measure, at least those which have troubled me the most, are these:

First, it is said that this is a step which will lead to war. If I felt for one moment that such would be the effect of my affirmative vote, I could never support this bill. One who has actually seen the unspeakable carnage and devastation of armed conflict, hates war, and loves peace with an unmatched passion. Although great uncertainty beclouds the future, no matter what our action here may be, it is my considered judgment that our extension of this aid to these two countries in our effort to thwart the disruption of their internal economy and their seizure by minority groups inspired by outside pressures, is the most important step, at the moment, which we can take looking toward international peace and stability. It must be apparent by now that plain speaking, backed up by forthright action is the only language which some of the nations with whom we deal seem to understand. A policy of appeasement, a querulous, weak-kneed attitude, will never work. Strength is what they understand and what they respect. Therefore, it seems to me, that such a demonstration of our firm resolve to assist those independent countries which stand in the way of further expansionist aggression is the mightiest blow we can today strike for peace.

Second, it is said this procedure bypasses the United Nations. This argument is made, not alone by those with ulterior motives for whom it is purely an alibi, but by many sincere critics of the program. To the extent that these opponents say that steps should have been taken before, or simultaneosuly with the submission of this matter to the Congress, to present it to the United Nations, I am in agreement. That step was taken after we were asked to act. How much better it would have been to have done so before. Of course, it would have been futile as it is now for two reasons: One, because the United Nations has not yet the funds nor is it yet functioning to meet such a situation as is here presented, and two, any such action as that here contemplated would be blocked by the veto of a single power.

It is exceedingly important, however, that we do nothing to undermine and everything to strengthen the United Nations. Such an organization is our only hope for a permanent and enduring peace. I have on many occasions said, and I reiterate it now, that I believe wholeheartedly in the principles of this international organization and yield to no one in my fervent desire to see it work. It is my hope that the action which we take in Greece and Turkey will be limited to that which would have the approval of the United Nations if that organization were presently set up to function.

In this bill as originally drawn, I was greatly worried about this proposition. I am not at all sure that I could have supported the measure as originally recommended by the President. It seems to me, however, that by the amendment which is now a part of this bill, whereby the President is directed to cease the program of aid to these countries at any time when he is notified by the United Nations that the continuance of such assistance is deemed unnecessary or undesirable, as to which this country waives any right of veto, effectively takes care of any objection that the United Nations is being ignored or in any way bypassed. True, one country alone cannot, through sinister motives, prevent the continuance of this aid, but if a majority of the nations of the world, which have associated themselves together in this international organization, determine that we do not need to or should not go further, and they so notify us, we must stop. Although that is to some degree a surrender of a measure of sovereignty, in this world now so compact and so interdependent, we should not complain of this restriction on our unfettered action. This amendment completely negatives any claim that we in this country stand for unilateral, as opposed to joint and mutual action.

Third, it is contended that we cannot afford this expenditure. My answer to that is we cannot afford not to extend this aid. True, we must maintain a sound domestic economy. We are committed to reduction in the expenses of government. I have supported measures to that end. I shall continue to do so. But I cannot believe that our national economy and stability hangs by so tenuous a thread that the expenditure here contemplated will bring upon us the disaster which some have pictured. If my original thesis is correct, that this is an important step toward peace, as I devoutly pray and firmly believe it is, it is certainly peace at a modest price. Measured alone in dollars and cents, it represents an expenditure of approximately $1 for every $850 spent by this country winning World War II. That does not mean, of course, that we can do this thing 850 times without ruining our country, any more than we could go through another war without the same result, but these figures should serve to give us a perspective toward the problem we are now facing. No one can say with certainty that this plan will succeed, but it does seem to me far from accurate to depict this program as a fatal blow at the vital and vigorous economy of our Nation.

Fourth, it is said that we should not use our resources to bolster up or strengthen reactionary undemocratic foreign governments. I hold no brief for the regimes now in control of either Greece or Turkey. They are far from perfect. They, by no means, represent the choice of leaders or governmental

systems whom freedom-loving Americans would voluntarily select. Our representatives should insist, as I believe they have a right to do, without being charged with improper interference in the internal affairs of another nation, upon a clear demonstration that the governments of those countries are the choice of a clear majority of the people. But the reason I am for this bill is not because it helps Greece and Turkey, but because it helps the United States. It is unfortunate that the only vehicle through which this aid, extended in our own enlightened self-interest, can be accomplished, is not more to our liking, but we must operate with the tools which we have, fortified by the very substantial provisions for our protection incorporated in section 3 of this bill, requiring free access to United States observers to assure the effective utilization of our assistance, permission to representatives of the press and radio to report fully, prohibition against transfer without consent of any article or disclosure of any information to one not an agent of the government concerned, prohibition against the use of any such financial aid to make payment on any loan made by any other foreign power, and an injunction upon each government concerned that it must give full and continuous publicity as to the scope and progress of our economic assistance. These are all assurances which the governments of Greece and Turkey must give, and in default or breach of which our aid shall be withdrawn.

Finally, it is contended that this measure represents a committal of this Nation to a policy of imperialistic expansion which is contrary to and violative of American tradition. Only a tiny minority in this country voices this objection, to only an infinitesimal fraction of whom I am willing to concede sincerity of motive. This is the argument of those who see so much to condemn in the United States and so much to commend in the Soviet Union. We have no territorial ambitions. No thinking American seeks to establish an empire beyond the seas. Never in all history has any nation interested herself in the welfare of the peoples and stability of the governments of foreign areas with loftier motives or more unselfish purposes. Our only self-serving objective is the creation in this world, whose oneness daily becomes more and more apparent with dramatic clarity, of a universal condition of peace, tranquillity, and security wherein all peoples may live together in mutual friendliness, forbearance, and tolerance. To ascribe to the proponents of this legislation an aim at world domination by an imperialistic United States is a figment of wild imagination and a creature of subversive rationalization.

I have discussed and attempted to point out the weaknesses in the principal objections to this bill because they are admittedly troublesome and because any one of them, if firmly entrenched in a Member's mind, is sufficient cause to justify him in a negative vote. Again I say this is not an easy decision, but from those who oppose the program I ask a constructive alternative. Somewhere, some time, we must check the forces of expanding aggression, the existence of which no thinking person can deny. We can do it now in Greece and Turkey, or we can do it later, at some other place; indeed, we can wait until those forces threaten our own shores. I, for one, prefer to take a position now. Not one of militancy, but of firmness and determination. In that course lies our greatest hope for peace.

By this bill we will buy time, time to put our own house in order and root out or at least subject to the pitiless glare of publicity those elements in our domestic economy and our own Government who would disrupt and destroy our way of life to substitute another, time to build a United Nations organization which can effectively function in like crises, time to establish and fortify with adequate safeguards the international control of atomic energy, time, I pray to God, for nations to become more acutely aware of the utter futility of armed struggle and the necessity, if we are to survive, for the establishment of a practical, workable, enforceable program of international disarmament.

My conviction that this measure should pass will lead me not only to vote for it but to vote against crippling amendments which would undermine the program. That is not to say that I shall support none of the amendments which may be offered. One which I intend to offer or to support, if offered by some other Member, and which I have been hopeful might have the support of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have so diligently and faithfully studied this problem, would limit the number of military and naval personnel in either Greece or Turkey to 100. The witnesses who appeared before the committee testified that it was contemplated to send not more than 70 to Greece and probably a lesser number to Turkey. The limitation I propose gives an adequate leeway. The adoption of such an amendment would serve to show to the world, if our protestations have not carried conviction, that there is no intention, under any circumstances, to send combat forces into these countries. We all concede, I believe, that such a policy would be fraught with perilous possibilities. We must permit no loophole whereby the military minded might, under any circumstances, take a step to involve this Nation so deeply that it could not, with honor, extricate itself short of war. We, as a Congress, must not, by indirection, delegate our responsibility in that regard.

Finally, when all is said and done, we are faced today not with a theoretical problem but with a fact. Our President has announced to the world, whether we agree with him or not, that he is asking the Congress to meet, at this time and in a specific place, a direct and definite threat to the peace and security of the world. He has stated that on the 12th day of March our policy of appeasement is at an end. For this Congress to repudiate him and the statement which has echoed around the globe, would be a declaration that we are a divided nation, would be an open invitation to further aggressive tactics and would be, in my judgment, a devastating blow, not to the President, not to the Democratic Party, but to the position of world leadership whose mantle is now ours, and to the future peace, security, and well-being of every man, woman, and child who proudly claims this great Nation as his own.

[From the Washington Post]

ATTENTION TO REALITIES

Members of the House who are still arguing that the protection of Greek and Turkish independence should be left to the United Nations might well ponder events since the proclamation of the Truman doctrine. Secretary Marshall has asked them to bear in mind the failure of the Moscow Conference. This failure demonstrated that the Russians are betting that the drift they are inducing will wind up in a catastrophe which will expand the area of communism. Encouragement of drift is to be seen in other matters which await Russia's participation. For instance, look at what is happening to the UN's European Commission. This was set up belatedly to study European reconstruction, and got under way only after Russia's satellites, alarmed over the end of UNRRA, pushed Russia into it. It is meeting currently in Geneva. A wrangle is going on there on the perpetuation of the bodies which are the only means available for holding Europe together as an economic entity. The immediate subject of argument is the transport organization. According to the New York Times' correspondent, Russia is seeking to kill it. The inference cannot be resisted that Russia is seeking to use the European Commission, not to put Europe to work, but to prevent other people from doing so.

As we have said several times already, the United Nations has neither the finance nor the police to do what is required in the Near East. The recent report of the military staff committee of the United Nations makes for doubt, indeed, whether the UN as at present organized will ever be in such a position. It is this committee that was intended to put force at the disposal of the world organization. But a wide area of disagreement between Russia and the west is reported by the military staff committee. The Russians are revealed as not ready to contribute a contingent or a base to the United Nations on a permanent basis for the purpose of building up a unit which could be trained as a United Nations unit for police work. They object even to interchange of military information. Distrust of world organization could not be better demonstrated than in this military staff report. The United Nations is thus being hog-tied from acting as anything more than a hortatory body. In these circumstances, if we were to leave it to the United Nations to attend to the Greek and Turkish requests for aid, we should, in fact, be making the idlest of idle gestures. It would be dangerous living for this Nation to trust an organization which is not able to develop any teeth or any authority to look after our national security, for that is what is involved in the Greco-Turkish bill.

Nor can we even rely upon the United Nations to do the elementary job of finding out the facts. The Balkan committee of the United Nations has had a trying time in investigating the border situation in Greece. It is now in Geneva engaged in writing its report. In early April the Post wrote of the need to keep the border under observation, and on April 18 the Security Council authorized the Balkan committee to return a subcommittee for that purpose. Now comes the news that Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania will not work with this subcommittee. Albania refuses even to recognize it. Yet, in the face of this progressive sabotage of the United Nations, some Americans are

still taken in by Muscovite charges that, in responding to Greek and Turkish requests for economic and military aid (the pattern of which, incidentally, has been set in Russia's own pacts with her satellites), we should, in some mysterious way, be bypassing the United Nations. We hope the House in the vote on Greco-Turkish aid will have the wisdom that comes from attention to realities, and think of it as self-aid.

[From the New York Times]

A CHALLENGE TO UN

A serious challenge to the authority of the United Nations has come from three of Russia's Balkan satellites—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania. These countries have served notice on the Balkans Investigating Commission, created by the Security Council to investigate violations of the Greek border, that they will refuse to work with the Commission's subsidiary group authorized by the Security Council to continue surveillance of the border until the Council can act, and will in particular bar this group from their territories, where the border violations originate. Albania, which has been playing hide-and-seek with the United Nations, says that it refuses even to recognize the subsidiary group.

The issue arose as a result of the Security Council's adoption on April 18 of an American proposal to the effect that, pending a new decision by the Council, the Investigating Commission, now drafting its report in Geneva, "shall maintain in the area concerned a subsidiary group composed of a representative of each of the members of the Commission to continue to fulfill such functions as the Commission may prescribe in accordance with its terms of reference." The Commission's terms of reference, as laid down in the Security Council's resolution of December 19, 1946, explicitly authorized it to conduct its investigation in such territory in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia as the Commission considered necessary, and to call upon the governments, officials, and nationals of those countries for relevant information. Despite this, Yugoslavia now takes the lead in barring all further surveillance beyond the Greek frontier.

Under article 25 of the United Nations Charter all members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. The Investigating Commission has promptly referred the Balkan challenge to the Council, and the Council's decision will go far toward determining its authority.

In this incident we have another answer to those who charge that in trying to aid Greece the United States is bypassing the United Nations. The bypassing is being done elsewhere. And the clear evidence of that fact should be taken to heart by every Congressman trying to make up his mind how to vote on the Greek-Turkish aid bill now before the House.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

OVERSELLING THE UN

The language of Trygve Lie's appeal for the submission of all international problems to the United Nations "even when the most vital national interests are at stake" was somewhat ambiguous. But if he intended what his statement has been interpreted to mean—namely, that the problem of aiding Greece and Turkey should have been submitted to the UN—then he has done a disservice to President Truman's effort in behalf of those countries and, perhaps more importantly, to the United Nations itself.

Mr. Lie, Secretary General of the UN, did not mention Greece or Turkey by name. He did say, however, that "the bedrock on which the United Nations can build solidly and securely for the future" is a readiness of members to resort to the UN and to live up to its "solemn principles and purposes."

From this language, two inferences can be drawn. One is that he was rebuking President Truman for moving directly to aid the governments of Greece and Turkey without recourse to the UN. And the other is that the UN would have been competent to deal with the problem if it had been dropped in its lap.

So far as the first point is concerned, there is not a great deal to be said except that its effect, if it has any effect, will be to hamper the effort which this Government is making to check the spread of Communist-dominated regimes into the eastern Mediterranean. If Mr. Lie believes that any useful purpose can be served by this, it can hardly be denied that he has the right to express himself. But the implication that submission of the case to the UN would have enabled that institution to "build solidly and securely for the future" is another matter

The trouble with this is that the UN is not even remotely competent at this time to deal with an issue like that involved in the Greco-Turkish question. It has no funds for loans to either Government. It has no facilities for extending any kind of military assistance to those Governments. And, most important of all, the Russian representative on the Security Council, by the exercise of his veto, could prevent the extension of any aid, even if the UN were capable of assisting.

For Mr. Lie to ignore these plain facts, and to talk at the same time about building solidly and securely for the future, is merely to play with words, for the strong probability is that submission of the question to the UN, far from strengthening that agency, would tend to wreck it.

One of the troubles with the UN today is that it has been "oversold." Through the medium of loose statements many people have acquired a grossly exaggerated notion of the contribution to peace and security which the organization is capable of making at this time. The danger of this is that when the truth becomes generally known there will be cynical reaction in this country that will seriously undermine American support for the UN. This is something that Mr. Lie and others, who seem disposed to overplay their hands, would do well to keep in mind.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I did not spend Easter Sunday as did the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] hobnobbing with Greek Royalists. I believe his sincerity but I do know, however, that there have been various official reports concerning the very corrupt and undemocratic Government of Greece, and I do happen to know that Fredericka, the present Queen of Greece, consort of Paul, was a Nazi, a direct descendant of Kaiser Wilhelm. She is not going to change overnight, and I am not going to take my impressions about the Greek Government from royalty and others having royalty opinions in the city of Athens. He talked to officials and even the press but all of them probably held to their prejudices and bias in favor of the royal couple. I would rather go into the very heart of Greece and talk to the peasants and get their reactions as to the bribery and the corruption and the coercion that exists in the Greek Government.

But, aside from that, my inclination has been to vote for this bill, but I had grave doubts as to the wishes of my constituents. I received many conflicting reports in the form of telegrams, letters, and verbal communications, and I determined to take a poll. I secured from the Board of Elections of New York City an exact list of all the voters of my district, and I sent to every election precinct or district 150 ballots. In all, I sent out 24,000 ballots to my district on which was printed the following:

I favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey. I do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The constituent was asked to check one of the two questions, affix his signature, and address, and mail back the ballot to me. Not more than one questionnaire or ballot was sent to each family.

I have received in my office thus far almost 5,000 returns; over 20 percent. I have spoken to direct-mail advertisers, and they tell me that is a very excellent return. The result of the poll showed that my constituents oppose decidedly military and financial aid to Greece and Turkey. For every return indicating approval of such aid there are three cards indicating disapproval; in other words, my district is opposed to this loan in the ratio of 3 to 1.

It is interesting to note that in hundreds of instances the vote is in favor of financial, but not military aid. Others favored such aid provided it was channeled through and controlled by the United Nations. Hundreds wished to eliminate Turkey from the terms of the bill. Hundreds of others opposed the aid because of the autocratic governments of Turkey and Greece.

The following conclusions are inescapable:

The preponderant majority of my constituents do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

They would favor it if only financial aid were advanced, if it were channeled through and controlled by the United Nations, and if Greece and Turkey were truly democratic countries.

The poll was taken without any advance publicity. Pressure groups could not have exercised any undue influence because the greatest number of returns came in the first few days after mailing. The vote was consistently 3 to 1 against the loan throughout the daily count. That ratio did not vary.

I was put to considerable expense to conduct this poll. I deemed it worth while, however. My district is just as intelligent as the district of any other Member. My people are just as alert and awake. I desire to represent my people. That is my duty. Despite the preponderance of view against the bill, I tried to argue with many of my constituents, I tried to change their view but could not. They are my last court of resort. Their view must prevail against my inclination to support the administration especially when opposition is on a 3-to-1 basis.

If the imbalance had been say 1 to 1½, or even 1 to 2, I would have allowed my tendency to vote for this bill to bear the weight in favor of the aid, but I cannot buck up against a tide of 3 to 1 against that aid. Therefore, unless the amendments to be offered by the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] are carried, I must perforce vote against the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, after the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is disposed of, I expect to offer a series of amendments, the first amendment on removing the military provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am revolted by the sham and hypocrisy of the so-called Greek-Turkish aid program. The American people feel a warm and generous sympathy for the courageous Greeks who drove the Nazi invaders from their soil and who have suffered so much both at the hands of foreign oppressors and domestic tyrants. But the administration is using those sympathies to drum up support for a program which will not help the brave Greeks so much as it will give aid and comfort to their oppressors. If the Greeks are starving—and I have no doubt they are—why is the major portion of the appropriation destined for military purposes rather than relief? If our goal is the economic rehabilitation of Greece, surely this requires a long-term and well-thought-out program, a program in which other nations as well as ourselves should participate. Instead, we propose to put weapons in the hands of the Naziphile Greek Government, to shoot down those very Greeks who were most militant in resisting the Axis forces, who endured incredible hardship while their King luxuriated in Claridge's Hotel in London. I have misgivings even about the smaller sum which is destined for relief. In the past, relief for Greece has been gobbled up by the rich men of Athens, protected by an archaic system of taxation and foreign-exchange laws which permit them to send all their wealth out of the country for safekeeping. It is for the benefit of these rich idlers that American taxpayers are being mulcted.

And what of this noble impartiality which with the same hand lavishes gifts upon Greece and upon Greece's traditional enemies the Turks, persecutors of Greek Christians as well as Jews for thousands of years? If the Turks are suffering anything, it is indigestion over the swollen profits they amassed during the war by gouging the Allies for every ton of wheat and every pound of chrome. I tell you it is absurd and odious for us to pretend that we are helping to establish democracy and prosperity in Europe when we ally ourselves with the craven and corrupt Greek monarchy, and give generous gifts to Turkish war profiteers.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Greek people are in great need. But they are not going to be helped by sending them guns and tanks. There have been too many guns and tanks in Greece already. The corrupt Greek monarchy has been maintained in power by guns and tanks—by British guns and tanks and by American lend-lease guns and tanks in the hands of the British. When the British took over in Athens they were ruthless in their determination that any opposition to the monarchy—a monarchy that served the interests of the British—should be suppressed. Greeks were forbidden to hold public meetings. Newspapers could not be published without British permission and British censorship of their contents. A curfew was proclaimed between 7 p. m. and 7 a. m.—no Greeks were allowed on the streets of Athens between those hours.

An American in Athens in late 1944 has reported an example of just how this curfew was enforced. A little Greek vendor of odds and ends—some cigarettes, bits of wire, shoe laces, and other trifles which were very precious and rare in Nazi-pillaged Athens—had an orange crate on the corner opposite the hotel in which the UNRRA mission was billeted. A customer stopped about 5 minutes to 7 p. m. The American watched the transaction from the window of the Acropole Palace Hotel to see the bushels of drachma notes change hands. One hundred billion drachmas equaled about 1½ cents in American money. There were few one hundred billion notes and payments were made in millions, one billion, five billion and such notes. The counting of fistfuls of paper took time. The customer left with his cigarettes about 7. At 7:03 the little Greek tradesman was busy packing his stock into his orange crate when a British patrol car came by. There was no questioning. There was no arrest. The patrol turned its machine gun on this "law-violator" and riddled his body with bullets. In the spot where he had tried to make his meager living was a pool of blood and bits of flesh scattered over the pavement. This was British enforcement of "law and order" in the early stages. The repression by the British grew more widespread as time went on.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that there have already been too many American guns in the hands of the British and in the hands of the Greek monarchy imposed by the British. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the United States should have no part in bolstering up a corrupt monarchy which could not last 5 minutes in Greece without outside help. I say that if we are going to ship relief to Greece let us ship relief and not guns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that if we do send relief to Greece we should see that it gets to the Greek people, and not to the royalist clique. What happened to the foodstuffs which the United States sent to Greece? What happened was that they were sold for fancy prices to the few wealthy Greeks around the King and his circle, and the people of Greece continued to die in the streets.

American members of the UNRRA mission have reported that the only place that they saw lend-lease food from the United States was at royalist cocktail parties. Chicago sausages, California sardines, American cheese were lavishly served at cocktail parties while the people of Greece wasted away from starvation.

The Greek monarchy helped to finance itself by the sale of American food at exorbitant prices. The Greek Government does not believe in taxes. To this day it raises a large part of its revenue through the sale of relief supplies—supplies for which the people of the United States have taxed themselves to give to the poor of Greece.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not send guns to Greece. I say that if we send food we should see that it gets into the hands of the people who need it and not into the hands of a corrupt monarchy.

I have heard many Members who are in favor of this speak of Greek freedom and Greek democracy. There is no democracy in Greece. The gentleman from North Carolina spoke of visiting the ruling princes of Turkey and Greece. He saw the wrong people.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the delegation went to Athens and conferred with the wrong people. Can he think of anyone better to confer with than our own diplomatic corps who were there at the time and with the press, including representatives of the American press, and with the officers of the Greek Government and citizens of Greece? We were only there a short time. I am not attempting to speak as an authority on Greek affairs.

Mr. BENDER. Will my friend tell me how long he was in Greece?

Mr. COOLEY. We were there 2 days and nights. We conferred with these people and did not waste a minute in our effort to obtain information.

Mr. BENDER. Did the gentleman confer with any of the poor people of Greece who are starving?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; we certainly did. We spoke to representatives of the poor people. The gentleman seems to be objecting to the fact that we accepted an invitation from the King and Queen of Greece. I regret that the gentleman was not along with us because I think he would have accepted the same invitation.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I am glad I was not because I am not given to dining and wining with royalty. I am just an ordinary citizen from Ohio.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does not this projected program in effect set the United States up as the dictator of Greece?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman states a fact.

You know when we go into this business we are like the fellow who was going into the rabbit business on a very small scale. But the rabbits would not cooperate and pretty soon he was in a big business. That is exactly what we are doing here.

The gentleman from New York spoke of $400,000,000. This is just the beginning. When Britain pulls out of India next year, we will have 400,000,000 Indians on our hands. God only knows what that policy will result in. When the French come in next year with their

hands out, and the British come in again before this year is up for more money, then we are in the same position as the fellow who wanted to go into the rabbit business on a very small scale. You cannot operate on a small scale and our economy cannot stand the impact of the cost of this.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUFETT. The proponents of this program are not honest enough and do not dare to come here and tell us the whole story for they know it would be defeated. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENDER. They know that, and they would not come here and ask us at one time to provide all the money that is required.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we have had very illuminating debate on this first amendment. I am wondering if we cannot make an arrangement to come to an end on this one amendment. I want to give everybody a chance to speak but there will be plenty of opportunity on other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman submit a request at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that I think the debate on the amendment is over, so long as the Members know there is no stopping of debate on the section. It seems to me the Chair might put the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. May the amendment be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Red Cross bill is on the Speaker's desk for signature.

I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BENDER and Mrs. DOUGLAS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California rise?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 2, line 24, insert the following additional clause:

"*Provided, however,* That none of the aid herein authorized for Turkey shall be furnished until the President shall have advised the Congress that the United States has requested the appropriate agency of the United Nations to inquire into conditions in Turkey and to take such action, if any, as may be necessary to safeguard the national integrity of Turkey, and that the United Nations has failed within 1 year after the enactment hereof to take action which in the President's judgment is adequate for that purpose."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed in this bill to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey. It seems perfectly obvious that the conditions prevailing in these two countries are not the same. Greece is in the midst of civil conflict, Turkey is not.

Facts have been presented to the committee to show that Greece is in extreme need of aid. The facts show that Turkey is not in imminent economic peril or in dire need of outside assistance. Turkey at the beginning of the war had somewhere around $45,000,000 in gold. Her total gold and foreign exchange resources today stand at $245,000,000. Of this $227,000,000 is in gold.

When we talk about aid to Turkey we are talking about military aid. There is no evidence that economic aid is needed in Turkey or that the Government of the United States expects to extend economic aid to her. We are falling into the ancient error, it seems to me, of preparing for war without attending the issues which create war.

The amendment which I now offer is motivated by my unshakable conviction that military assistance to Turkey is a problem for the consideration of the United Nations and not for the consideration of any single country or group of countries however unselfish and benevolent their intentions.

The Vandenberg amendment reflects our grave uneasiness and doubt in embarking upon a foreign policy of military assistance to Turkey in the absence of sufficient evidence made available to the American people or Members of Congress justifying the widely publicized conclusion that Turkey is imperiled by outside pressures.

What are the facts to buttress our position committing the Nation to so grave a step? I do not say there are no facts; I say that we have not yet learned those facts. I say, too, that the United Nations alone is in a position to make an impartial examination into all the truth of Turkey's claims and to make the facts available.

What I propose in my amendment is wholly consistent with the purposes underlying Senator VANDENBERG's amendment. It goes further, however, in that instead of saying that the United States will do so-and-so unless the United Nations at some later date says "No," my amendment says that the United States will not do so unless the United Nations fails to take action within a specified period of time. There is a vast difference between steaming ahead on our own subject to countermanding orders from the United Nations and giving the United Nations in the first instance precisely the kind of responsibility it was set up to discharge.

I urge taking the question of Turkey to the United Nations. Let me remind you that the reason we propose giving military aid to Turkey is to help Turkey maintain her army so that she can resist outside pressures. I say we should bring the matter of outside pressures on Turkey before the Security Council, which was set up to establish and maintain the peace of the world.

Russia has no right to bring the kind of pressure against Turkey which requires Turkey to maintain an army she cannot afford. If she is doing so she should be called to account. And she should be called to account for her actions before the nations of the world.

I am not against aid to Turkey, if the reasons for aid are clearly spelled out before the world's tribunal, the United Nations.

What we are doing if we give military aid to Turkey is to say to Russia, "Here is 10 cents on the dollar, we will put down the other 90 cents if it is needed." We say further, "We are backing the national integrity of Turkey and that Russia had better not bring undue pressure upon her in the settlement of the Dardanelles question," because it is the Dardanelles we are talking about in this bill in its relation to Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, we can express our interest in the Dardanelles just as well in the Security Council of the United Nations or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as we can by giving Turkey money to maintain her army and not forfeit the moral leadership that is ours and ought to be ours in the world. We run no risk by carrying the alleged Turkish problem to the United Nations. If Russian forces rolled over the Turkish border we would be at war. The sum of $100,000,000 which we propose to give to the Turkish Army in this bill would accomplish nothing. The Turkish Army could not stop the Russian Army.

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

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my understanding correct that if the question were taken to the Security Council it must be by an unanimous vote of the Big Five?

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

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, I say "No." Neither in the Security Council nor in the General Assembly can the discussion of any subject be barred. The only time that the veto works is when direct action must be taken by the Security Council. The United Nations forced the Russian troops to leave Iran with no more power than they have now. If the Russians rolled over the border of Turkey, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts we are in war.

We have an interest in the Dardanelles. I do not question that interest, but we can express that interest as well in the Security Council or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as by giving aid to the Turkish Army. We should work through the world organization which we helped create, and in which, I am convinced, lies the one hope of peace for the world. We can always do what we propose to do here if the United Nations fails to act.

My amendment provides that the President shall instruct the United States delegate to the United Nations to request the United Nations to study conditions in Turkey and to evaluate the contentions of the Turkish Government insofar as they purport to show that the national integrity of Turkey is threatened by pressures from outside sources.

No group is better qualified to judge the Turkish position and to weigh the reality underlying Turkey's alleged fears than the United Nations. For such purposes was the United Nations established and only if it discharges these functions vigorously and with the full cooperation of the United States can the world preserve the hope of lasting peace.

The amendment allows a period of 1 year during which the President of the United States is to get this train of actions under way. If within that time the United Nations acts, presumably the President will await its report before deciding on the next step. If, on the other hand, the United Nations signifies that it is unwilling or unable to accede to our request, the President upon advising Congress of the fact is thereafter at liberty, within his discretion, to furnish such military assistance to Turkey as is authorized in the bill before us.

One final word. The issue in the Turkish question is the problem of the future of the Dardanelles. At Yalta and at Teheran the United States and Great Britain solemnly pledged their assistance to the U. S. S. R. in bringing about a revision of the Montreux Convention, which gives Turkey its present stranglehold on the straits. The problem has not been settled; not even fully considered or debated formally among the interested powers. It will not be settled—on the contrary it can only be complicated and confounded by unilateral action on our part. It can only be settled by the United Nations since it is a problem of vital concern to the peace of the world. The amendment I propose seeks this solution. Let it be arrived at by a world tribunal prepared to examine and evaluate competing claims to get at the facts and to do equity. Let the United Nations decide and let the United States be the leader in championing this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after paragraph 5, insert "*Provided, however,* That the President, notwithstanding the assistance furnished to any country hereunder, is directed to initiate proceedings, unless such proceedings have heretofore already been instituted, to bring to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, any situation which threatens the territorial integrity or political independence of any country assisted hereunder and makes necessary the maintenance of fully mobilized forces by such country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of my amendment at this moment to juxtapose the choice before the committee and that is the reason this is brought up as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California. My amendment says that we shall aid Greece and Turkey now, but simultaneously with such aid the President shall take the action provided by the Charter of the United Nations in cases where a situation exists likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and this is exactly such a situation. The gentlewoman's amendment proposes that we shall wait a year, giving the Security Council an opportunity to decide this issue before we do anything. Obviously, if we wait until that time, we will be defeating the purpose of this particular legislation.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not wait 1 year; wait 6 months.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is very necessary that the Committee understand clearly the difference between the approach the gentlewoman from California is making to this question and the approach being made by the gentleman from New York. They both seem to do the same thing, and both seem to be something that this Committee endorses and supports, and that is to bring in at the proper time and in the proper manner the United Nations to determine the extent of these outside pressures being exerted upon the Turkish border, and to determine whether or not the United Nations is able to carry out its mandate and its authority to correct that kind of disturbance. But I believe that we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as a substitute because it does provide now that we go right ahead, as we are expected to do under the present proposal, and make this relief available, and that puts a few extra teeth into the Vandenberg amendment by assuring the world that we propose to go before the United Nations and call attention to these outside pressures, and solicit the support of right-minded people throughout the world to bring those pressures to an end. It in nowise cripples the purpose of the basic legislation but it does bring the United Nations in specifically as the Vandenberg amendment would do it more generally.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. May I point out that there is a doctrine in this legislation. The legislation itself, insofar as Greece and Turkey are concerned, it has been clearly shown, is a stopgap. It is designed to stop a situation which it is said cannot be controlled in any other way. But the doctrine that is in this bill is the Vandenberg doctrine. What is that doctrine? It is that while we keep the situation in the world from deteriorating further we at the same time, though we are the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, subject ourselves to the judgments of the United Nations. We demonstrate in this way our faith in the United Nations and our will to make it the strongest force for peace among the nations. The League of Nations was wrecked because no powerful nation would accept as binding upon itself the judgments of the League. We must not repeat that mistake.

The Vandenberg amendment is a condition subsequent; in other words, it says that when the United Nations asks us to stop assisting any country because it is unnecessary or undesirable we will do so. But this amendment is a condition precedent, because we say at the same time that we go in and do something which we have to do, which there is no one else to do, we invite you, the United Nations, to consider our action, the situation which brought it about, and what can be done to deal with that situation. That is the purpose of my amendment, and I believe it is part and parcel with the Vandenberg doctrine.

May I call the attention of the Committee to the provisions of the United Charter itself which envisage this very situation. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter, read as follows:

3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. We are coming to the aid of Greece and Turkey because we say there are threats to their territorial integrity or political independence. Those are exactly matters with which the Charter charges the United Nations, and therefore under this amendment we have both lines of action going forward together. We stop deterioration of the international situation which cannot be stopped now in any other fashion, and at the same time we subordinate ourselves to the judgment and activities of the Un.ted Nations by asking it to proceed in the same situation. This has already been done in Greece. The charges by Greece that her northern neighbors, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, have invaded her northern border are under investigation by a United Nations Commission. The same thing has not been done in Turkey. If the external pressures on Turkey are too subtle for detection by the United Nations, then those pressures are too subtle for detection by the United States. Therefore, the United States should agree that there are external pressures that may be considered by the United Nations, while the United States comes forward with the material means by which the condition of the countries it proposes to assist can be stopped from further deterioration now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. As I understand it, what it does is to take away the curse of unilateral action and bring about a more multilateral action on the part of this country in connection, insofar as possible, with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly my intention.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But we do proceed without referring it to the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; we refer it to the United Nations and proceed at the same time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In that respect, is it not a good argument from the standpoint of Russia to say that we are the aggressors?

Mr. JAVITS. No, sir, because we submit ourselves to the mandate of the United Nations. How can an aggressor submit himself to the United Nations and still be considered an aggressor?

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

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

Mr. BLOOM. I understood the gentleman to say that we proceed according to this act and at the same time we place this entire matter in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. Or the General Assembly.

Mr. BLOOM. The Security Council, according to the Charter, is the only part of the United Nations that has a right to proceed in this manner. There must be some danger. This matter we are proceeding on now is an internal matter. It has nothing to do with an outside danger, like the border episodes that exist today in Greece. Nothing like that exists in Turkey. You cannot at the same time proceed under the legislation we have before us now and ask the Security Council of the United Nations to proceed. That is impossible, because as soon as we go to the United Nations and ask them to proceed with reference to Turkey, then we are a party to it. If we make a complaint to the United Nations that the peace and security of the world is threatened by the actions in Turkey, we are destroying everything.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes. I should like to have this cleared up.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Turkey has requested of the United States that we go in and help it at this time. If we say to the United Nations as to Turkey, "This is not a unilateral agreement at all; you take this in your Security Council and act upon it there," we are destroying everything we are trying to do for Turkey.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two difficulties in the argument just made. One is that the President of the United States came here and invoked our aid for Turkey specifically on the ground that Turkey was being submitted to such external pressures as to imperil her integrity and political independence. External pressures, as I said before in my argument, cannot be so subtle that they can be detected only by the United States and not by the United Nations.

The question is also raised as to whether the United Nations could act. The United Nations Charter itself settles that question. It draws a clear distinction between disputes to which the gentleman referred and situations. Article 34 states:

> The Security Council may investigate any dispute or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the General Assembly may consider such a matter, for article 10 states:

> The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter.

Also article 11, paragraph 2, states:

> The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations.

One further very important point—in the General Assembly there is no veto power. If the United States proceeds in the General Assembly, the veto power of any great power raises no difficulty.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. With reference to the external difficulties of Turkey, they are merely this: That the Turkish Government has been compelled for years to keep a large army on the border because it is threatened, not on the border by Russia, but far away from the border, and Turkey is always afraid that Russia is going to come down into Turkey. That is why she has been put to this tremendous expense to keep this large standing army on the border for years.

Now, you differentiate between the General Assembly and the Security Council. If you want to do anything at all, you cannot go into the General Assembly with this. You must go into the Security Council. If we go into the Security Council and it is at the request of the Government of the United States, we foreclose ourselves from voting in the Security Council on this measure.

Then, you will have to get the other three powers in the Security Council to vote; otherwise, you are foreclosed yourself. Therefore, Russia will come in and beat you because you have no voice in it at all in the Security Council.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the points that the gentleman has raised. We must remember that U. S. S. R. has demanded from Turkey the right to fortify the Dardanelles jointly with Turkey. There are constant radio broadcasts into Turkey from the U. S. S. R. keeping Turkey on the anxious seat in this war of nerves. Those are the very reasons we are going to render assistance. The United Nations Charter in the articles I read enables the United States to proceed before the General Assembly if it does not want to go before the Security Council on these issues.

May I also point out that the Vandenberg amendment waives any effect of the veto in the Security Council on the action of the United Nations regarding this assistance program.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Was this amendment presented in the full committee that the gentleman is now offering and, if so, was any disposition made of it?

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment which has been here presented was presented in a different form carrying the same idea, however, before the committee. The committee at that time by a division rejected it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, may I say with reference to the Dardanelles, to which the gentleman has referred, that that is an entirely different question. In the dispute about the Dardanelles, Russia is the only nation that is concerned with the dispute who has not even replied to any suggestion which might be made with reference to the Dardanelles. Russia does want to go into the Dardanelles in one way. She wants to have her forts and men there. When she gets that, she will be in Turkey. Then, it will be too late to think of any legislation of any kind and you are beaten. There isn't any question about the Dardanelles situation. The gentleman is wrong. He knows that Russia is the only nation that has not yet suggested any statement or any kind of condition on which the Dardanelles should be operated in the future; and that is a positive fact.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the founders of the United Nations would favor very much the proposition that the United Nations should on the application of the United States, as a most devoted follower of the United Nations, act on this proposal.

Everything that has been said here indicates that there is external pressure on Turkey; and that is the only reason we are assisting. It cannot be economic difficulty in Turkey, as the gentlewoman from California so eloquently explained. The only reason we are going forward with this bill at all as to Turkey is on account of external pressure on her. If that is the reason and if the pressures are not so subtle that we can detect them, then they are not so subtle that the United Nations can fail to detect them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman there is one substitute amendment pending. Another substitute may not be offered until that is disposed of.

Mr. BENDER. May I offer an amendment to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute may be offered but not another substitute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

At last we have come to the meat of this whole situation. That is, do you want to proceed as outlined by the United Nations? Do you want to use the procedures and the facilities of the United Nations and make a multilateral approach to this problem, or do you want to make a unilateral approach? It all boils down to that. When all of the scare of communism, all of the cry that Turkey is in economic distress is cleared away, that is all there is to it. We know that Turkey's gold supply has gone up during the war from $45,000,000 to $245,000,000. She has got rich during the war by sitting still and not playing with either side, in spite of some of the things that have been said. She remained neutral and it was a profitable enterprise for Turkey. Now we come to the crux of the situation. Do we believe all the glittering pledges and promises that we made in the United Nations? Do we stand for the principles of collective security, or are we ready now to throw the United Nations in the ditch, and, by omitting to send to her this problem, say we are ready to go on our own and guarantee the sovereignty and integrity of every nation in the world, beginning first with Greece and Turkey and then going on to Korea, Indonesia, India, and on and on? Are we, a Nation of 140,000,000 people, to take over the great burden of policing the world, or would we like to have some help from the 47 nations or the 51 nations which have been supporting us in the United Nations? This is not the first problem that has been put up to the United Nations. Let me call to your attention the fact that there have been four. Lebanon-Syria was one problem. A complaint was made that the British and French troops were remaining in the country, contrary to the Charter agreement.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I cannot yield. Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution expressing confidence that British and French troops would withdraw, and in May they were withdrawn.

In Indonesia there was another complaint which the Council, after consideration, decided against investigating.

In Spain there was another complaint, with a like result.

In Iran there was a complaint that Russian troops had not withdrawn from Iran, and in April Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution to the Security Council asking Russia to withdraw, and on May 6, according to the report of the Iranian Government, Russian troops withdrew from Iran.

So we have four precedents of serious international situations arising. Those situations were referred to the Security Council. Action was taken on them. This is the second anniversary of the United Nations. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] helped to write those principles—those principles of multilateral approach to the problems of the world; of collective security. And you are departing from the sober principles written therein in this Greek- and Turkish-aid bill.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have only 5 minutes.

This is the crux of the situation. Let us get down to it now. Do you believe in the United Nations? Do you want to support the principles of the United Nations? Or do you want to go alone?

I did not talk on the atomic-energy resolution. I am a member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Atomic Energy. I do not want to talk on it now. I know, maybe, a little too much about it. I saw the explosions at Bikini. I visited the Japanese cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I know that we have the bomb. I do not know whether Russia has it or not, or whether she will have it within a year's time or whether it will take longer.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes, that I may ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to know whether we will be allowed the same liberality when some of us come to speak in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question the Chair cannot answer.

Mr. LEMKE. Very well. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In the countries to which the gentleman referred I believe he stated troops were present. That is an entirely different situation from what we are debating here today. There are no foreign troops in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sorry but I cannot let the gentleman take all of my 2 minutes. There are certain conditions——

Mr. BLOOM. But I asked that the gentleman might have an additional minute that I might ask him a question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In each of the countries the gentleman mentioned there were foreign troops and that is why it came to the Security Council; but here there are no foreign troops involved.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman deny the fact that situations can be brought to the Security Council without the presence of troops in the respective countries?

Mr. BLOOM. But the gentleman did not say that. The gentleman is right, a member nation can bring anything it wants to the Security Council.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right; the gentleman has answered. That is all I asked the gentleman to answer.

Mr. BLOOM. But there is no similarity between those situations and the present one.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is a similarity in that an international situation arises at this point and when it arises any nation in the world can bring it to the attention of the Security Council. It does not have to be exactly the same situation. It can be brought to the Security Council by any member of the United Nations, and that is where it should be brought unless you want to embark upon a unilaterial imperialistic program similar to the kind of program which has brought on every war in history. Here at last we have an opportunity to work through a United Nations organization and approach these things in a multilateral way. We say the United Nations is impotent, it is too weak. Mr. Chairman, how is it going to get strong unless it is provided exercise?

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that it be read in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York:

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and Turkey."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "these countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "or Turkey."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 18, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it goes beyond the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if the page references are to the substitute amendment or to the bill.

Mr. BENDER. They are references to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the page references and line references describe the substitute amendment or what?

Mr. BENDER. They describe the substitute amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York to that part of the bill which has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get this clear. We have a pending amendment and we have a substitute for that amendment. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to the substitute. The amendment consists of several references to pages and lines. Are those pages and lines a part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as a substitute?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, they are part of the bill, which has already been read.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not constitute an amendment to the substitute and the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last several words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with any legislation attempting directly or indirectly to have this bill channeled toward the United Nations, we have to realize if that is done, for all practical purposes, this legislation and its effects and purposes will be defeated. As I view the situation, we are not bypassing the United Nations or its Charter.

The Charter of the United Nations does not authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." Both Greece and Turkey have solicited our aid for the speedy recovery and independence of those small countries. President Truman in his message to the Congress specifically said we are not bypassing the United Nations.

Let me briefly review the history. On at least three occasions the Greek problem has been presented to the Security Council, two times by Russia, when they claimed the British troops in Greece were a threat to peace, a charge which the Council rejected both times. It was presented again by the Greek Government on the ground that Russia's Balkan puppets—that is, certain Balkan states that are Russia's puppets—were waging an undeclared war against the Greek territory. On the latter charges a United Nations commission was appointed and they have been in Greece for some time. They have made investigations and they have made a report.

In connection with some remarks made by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who would want to create the impression that the guerrillas are patriotic, fighting people, are not either Communists or controlled by the Communists, I call his attention to a report already made by the commission showing that the Communists in Greece were trained in Yugoslavia—that is the guerrillas—and also that the manual of arms which has been used by the Greek Communists or guerrillas was printed in the Greek language by the Russians in Moscow. My friend apparently has failed to keep in touch with current history.

The report also shows that the fighting along the northern border continued despite the presence of the United Nations commission in Greece.

We also must keep in mind that the Charter provides:

The members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

What is happening? There are Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland. We will not talk about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. There is no more talk about their independence. I hope they will ultimately regain their independence. There are Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, admitting that from a military standpoint the latter has to gravitate to the East, but they belong to the West. We know what that means. We can interpret that language when we read it, coming from the head of that government.

Now, this threat against Greece. Greece and Turkey are like an apple, so geographically situated. You cut the apple in half. You cannot let one disintegrate and expect to save the other. You have to consider both parts together. You might just as well quit if you assist one and not the other. It is like cutting an apple in half and expecting to save one-half against the forces of destruction.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. A vital question in my mind is, Are we, by this, bypassing the United Nations organization? Does the gentleman contend that we are not bypassing the United Nations by this measure?

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to discredit or bypass the United Nations by this move and want to make sure we are not doing so now. Does the President of the United States make that clear in his message to the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The historical facts support that position. Now, let me continue. Back of Greece, what is there? Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is gone. We might just as well face the facts. I am not anti anything. I am pro in what I believe. I am pro-American; I am prowestern civilization. I believe in a civilization that all who believe in a Supreme Being possess. That is what our civilization is. Whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, we have and believe in the western civilization and what it stands for.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. MORRIS. The question is this: Does not the gentleman know that the committee itself in its report says that some of these bands are bands that we armed during the other war? That is shown on page 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not change the situation at all. That does not change at all one statement that I made concerning the United Nations Commission, because in that war, in the war against Hitler, we armed anybody who would or was fighting Hitler. We were crossing the bridge with anybody in order to lick the first enemy and the immediate devil. Now, let us face the situation.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. One gentleman said a while ago that the present King of

Greece was pro-Fascist and was in England during the war. If he had been pro-Fascist he would never have been in England during the war.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a frank observation worthy of consideration.

But, let us go further. If Greece goes, Italy goes. If Italy goes, Europe is gone. Now, we have to face these facts realistically. If we just sit back and remain inactive, then Russia, with its onrush of international communism, simply takes over country after country with its minority forces, militantly operating, by any means that they can employ to obtain control of a government, and when they do, they liquidate the decent elements within the government. Tito is in Yugoslavia, a step across the Adriatic from Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is bound to go. That means the control of the Mediterranean. If there is one thing we have learned from history it is that the country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the country that controls Europe controls Asia and Africa. History has indisputably portrayed that lesson to us based upon hard experience.

What are some of the reasons why we are not bypassing the United Nations? Neither the United Nations nor any of its related organizations are in position to render the kind of help required, and even in the time necessary. The United Nations has no military force to enforce any decisions made by the United Nations organization. In the meantime, help cannot be given because the United Nations organization and its agencies have no money and could not loan money to either Greece or Turkey until security was assured. That is one of the conditions precedent to an international agency's lending money to any government, that security must be assured before the nation can receive a loan.

When an emergency exists, and everyone who studied the facts knows that the United Nations cannot act to meet the emergency, by our extending emergency aid we are not only acting in our national interest but are helping to establish the conditions which alone can enable the United Nations to function at all.

The United Nations is pretty much like the Thirteen Colonies were under the Articles of Confederation; that is the way I view it. We have to strengthen it. The United Nations is more or less impotent now, and it is impotent due to one country's failing to cooperate with understanding.

We have no imperialistic designs. Not so long ago the Members who serve here and in the other Chamber passed a law giving the Philippines their independence. Most of the Members here now were here then. Certainly, the United States is not imperialistically inclined when we are the first great Nation in the history of man to give up voluntarily territory of which we were possessed.

We have to act affirmatively. The challenge is direct. It is a challenge to our way of life. Nation after nation is being taken over. The way it is going, we have reached our last line of defense from the angle of our civilization in Europe. We cannot afford to let Greece go. We cannot separate Turkey from Greece because of their geographical location. This involves Austria, it involves Germany. We know why the last conference at Moscow was a failure. They wanted to sap and destroy Austria economically. They would agree to Austria being a free nation, but it would not allow Austria any economic ability to maintain its freedom. The Russians have taken everything out of the area of Germany over which they have control, and they are now trying to sap the areas under the control of the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, I hope these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to all the amendments and to make a statement which I have here to make.

Mr. Chairman, before this very illuminating debate ends, I should like to take a few moments to present my views of the foundation principles of the United Nations Organization and its relation to individual countries and to this particular problem. However, at this point I have a communication of the utmost importance which I wish to read, bearing upon the amendments now before us.

Personally, I hope that all three of these amendments will be defeated, and that we will not festoon this legislation with all kinds of unworkable suggestions, all of them coming from high motives and a desire to settle the problem, but as a practical result lowering the efficiency of the legislation and making it more difficult to enforce than it is now.

I have here a communication from Senator Warren Austin, with whom I was associated during the preparation of this Charter, and who I think you will all agree with me is one of the soundest and sanest thinkers in this Nation. He has been appointed by our President to represent this Nation in the United Nations Organization as our chief ambassador.

Yesterday I sent him a telegram asking him, if he did not consider it prejudicial to his official position, if he would be willing to inform the House, in this time of confusion, of his views on the reference of this legislation to the United Nations. He said, in answer to my telegram:

NEW YORK, *May 8, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

In answer to your telegram:

In my opinion the United States program for aid to Greece and Turkey does not (repeat) not bypass the United Nations. On the contrary it would be a most essential act in support of the United Nations Charter and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

The United States took the initiative in explaining the proposed United States program to the United Nations Security Council; my statements of March 28, 1947, and April 10, 1947, set forth in full the reasons necessitating the American-aid program and the relationship of this program to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

I informed the Security Council on behalf of the United States that the United States will immediately register with the United Nations for publication by the Secretary General copies of agreements connected with the execution of this program which may be entered into between Greece and the United States or between Turkey and the United States.

The Security Council, on the initiative of the United States, is already acting on that aspect of the Greek question with which it is now prepared to deal—the conditions on the northern Greek frontiers.

No organ of the United Nations can at this time provide financial and military assistance to the Greek Government of the emergency character required.

The proposed American program will assist in restoring stability and security in Greece and maintaining them in Turkey. When stable conditions are restored in Greece it should be possible to provide such further financial and economic assistance as might then be required through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and related specialized agencies.

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to yield to me for some questions. I asked him whether he was convinced that the enactment of this measure would not be bypassing the United Nations organization and he gave me his prompt and positive reply that this does not do so. He further called attention to the President's message to the effect that this move does not indicate our intention to side-step the United Nations. To me that was gratifying assurance, for I want our Nation and our Government to continue to foster, to support, and to utilize properly and fully this new international organization which we helped make.

Now that we have heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the committee, read the letter from Senator Austin, our representative in the United Nations, to the effect that this move is not contrary to or inconsistent with our solemn duty as a member nation to the United Nations, we may feel further assured. My feeling of confidence in General Marshall as Secretary of State and of Senator VANDENBERG as one of the builders of the long-hoped-for United Nations organization deepens my assurance that they are not planning to do anything to the detriment of this young organization which is the hope of the world.

I have all along felt that the American Government made a colossal blunder when our Government repudiated the League of Nations a quarter century ago. It seemed certain to me then and still does seem certain that the power and influence of the United States was actively needed after the First World War to make the League of Nations effective, and we denied it then by our "act of omission." Destiny seems to have given America another chance to play her full and rightful part as befits her place in history. Opportunity did knock again and after a second terribly costly war we did join with more than 50 nations in organizing an international body to achieve justice and to prevent war. And now if before that babe is out of its swaddling clothes the Government of America repudiates it, not by an act of omission this time, but by a deliberate act of commission, it would be a far greater blunder than before. If the passage of this bill

means that America is "Driving a dagger into the heart of the United Nations organization", as has been claimed, I cannot support this move, for I am sure the American people do not approve anything that weakens, and will not permit anything that destroys the effectiveness of the United Nations organization. America will not desert this hope. That is why I have sought the assurance we have just received.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and the substitute be again reported by the Clerk.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill to give aid and assistance to war-devastated Greece and some financial support to Turkey. These two countries are strategically located overlooking the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Turkey controls the Dardanelles. The independence of those two countries and their freedom from Russian domination are of vital importance to the future peace and security of the world.

We must not appease the Communists by bowing and scraping when our legitimate actions and policies are opposed by them. Those people recognize strength and firmness.

The passage of this bill will encourage free people in their resistance to the forces of communism. It will, in my opinion, be a deterrent of war and a promoter of peace. The appeasement of Japan and of Germany during recent years, so fresh on our minds now, led only to war. Let us profit from history, repudiate all evidence of isolationism on this subject and here uphold the Truman Doctrine as the symbol of hope and encouragement to free people to maintain their freedom and their national integrity.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no legislative proposal ever submitted to the Congress since I became a Member on January 3, 1939, has caused me as much concern as the matter now before us; namely, a bill to implement President Truman's foreign policy as submitted to the Congress on March 12 of this year.

Not a day has gone by since President Truman addressed a joint session of the Senate and House that I have failed to devote some part of the day to thought or study of this proposal. I recognize the importance of the decision we will make here in the House this week.

Those who urge that we vote for an appropriation of $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey have been quite frank in stating that this should not be considered as a loan. It will be an outright grant. Nor do the proponents any longer claim that it is a relief bill in the usual sense of the word "relief." It has been admitted that about 75 percent of this appropriation will be spent for military equipment and supplies. It is also admitted that we will provide military personnel to serve as advisers for the Greek and Turkish Armies.

This proposal came as a shock to me. It is such a radical departure from what I envisioned would be the United States foreign policy following VJ-day. I recognized then and now our responsibility to aid other nations who as a result of the war badly needed food, clothing, medical supplies, seed, fertilizer, and so forth. Recognizing this responsibility, I voted last week against the motion that prevailed to reduce the foreign relief appropriation from three hundred and fifty to two hundred million dollars. I wanted to lean over backward in my effort to support fully the efforts of our Government to render relief to the hungry people abroad. Greece will receive a large part of these relief funds.

I said a moment ago that this program is so different from what I thought we would work out through the United Nations organization. It was my hope that we would unite with all other peace-loving nations of the world in a United Nations organization, and one of the first objectives of the UN would be to prevent any country from interfering with the sovereignty of any of its neighbors.

Some argue in connection with this legislation that we are not bypassing the United Nations organization. I just cannot understand that reasoning. We very definitely are embarking on a unilateral policy. No other member nation of the United Nations is participating with us in our effort to strengthen the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. We are going it alone, and the consequences will be ours alone.

It has been said during this debate that we must supply this military aid to Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism. If that be the real reason for this appropriation, just how far will this program lead us and what will be its ultimate results. Are we going to provide funds to strengthen the armed forces of every nation in the world now threatened by the spread of communism? Certainly communism is a threat to France, to Italy, to Belgium, and even to the British Empire. Certainly no one will contend that we have the resources to make huge military grants to each of these powers.

I am not at all concerned by the charge that has been made that those who oppose this appropriation are alining themselves with Henry Wallace or that the opponents of this measure are sympathetic to Stalin's ambitions. In coming to a decision I have considered only the effect this foreign policy, if approved, will have on the future of the United States and on the United Nations' program as proposed in its Charter.

I have received a substantial number of letters on this Greek-Turkish aid proposition since President Truman first proposed it. With one exception, no one has written to me in favor of the whole program. Some urge "relief for Greece." Others propose that we send surplus military equipment to Greece and Turkey but no military personnel. Some favor aid to Greece but positively no aid or assistance for Turkey. Most of the people who have written to me and others with whom I have talked feel very strongly that this whole matter should be handled by the United Nations.

If, as the proponents of this legislation say, the United Nations is not prepared or strong enough to take over this task, that organization could be strengthened. I cannot understand why the United States acting alone is stronger than the United States acting with even a majority of the nations making up the United Nations organization. No member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has as yet explained how Russia could make use of her veto power to prevent other member nations of the UN from acting to prevent Russian expansion. After all, was not the real purpose of the United Nations to maintain world peace through force if necessary?

Very little information has been given us upon which we could base an intelligent decision. I finally decided to vote no on this proposition; and in reaching that decision, I have followed the dictates of my own conscience, after using to the best of my ability the brain with which I have been endowed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue the remarks I began yesterday but which I did not have time to complete.

We have heard a lot said about our foreign policy but I still do not know what our foreign policy is. I did not know during World War II what it was, nor did any of the men in my outfit, nor any of my six brothers with whom I served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II.

I expounded a foreign policy yesterday that is new to this House but one which I believe will work, that is that the United States maintain its armed forces so strong that we will be in a position where the other nations of this world will have to appease the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of Members on this floor talk about the League of Nations. I have heard a lot of people over the country say that if the United States had just joined the League of Nations after World War I we would have prevented World War II.

I heard the distinguished minority leader last night insinuate that very same thing, that if we had only joined the League of Nations it would have prevented World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I refute the argument that if we had joined the League of Nations with 100,000 men, no Air Force, a scrapped and depleted Navy, that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito would have listened to us; but I say to you that had we joined the League of Nations, built a great Air Force, maintained our military power, then the chances are we would have prevented World War II.

The United Nations will not work today unless the United States of America maintains its armed might; and I say that in times of modern warfare to talk about the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, one or two bombs would neutralize the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, or the Panama Canal. The only force that we can make sure will preserve the peace and security of the United States of America, as I said yesterday, and repeat today because I sincerely believe it, and the past history of the world proves it—is an Air Force that can strike at any portion of the world, an Air Force capable of dropping and willing to drop any weapons known to modern man. Knowing that we will use these weapons the Russians, realists that they are, will listen, but they will listen to nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Page 2, line 11, after the words "in an advisory capacity only", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and add the following: *"Provided, however,* That not more than 100 such personnel are to be utilized in either country at one time under the terms of this act without further authorization from Congress."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very clear. It simply is to put into legislative language the understanding that has been agreed upon informally between the War Department and the various committees of the House and the Senate which have been dealing with this particular legislation. Many of you have been worried, as many good Americans outside of Congress have been worried, lest this aid to Greece and Turkey take on the aspect of an expeditionary force. That is not the intention at all of the administration spokesmen who sponsored it.

We have received the most solemn assurance that human beings can give that that is not their intention, that the only purpose of military men being sent to either Greece or Turkey is to advise and to counsel so as to enable their military people to learn to use the types of weapon which they are going to buy from us or perhaps be given by us.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the hearings in this connection. If you will look at page 108 of the hearings and follow me as I read the testimony you will see what I am driving at. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was interrogating Secretary Patterson about the size of this military contingent and Secretary Patterson stated:

Secretary PATTERSON. I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate.

Then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] proceeded:

Mr. VORYS. Does that cover both Greece and Turkey, the estimate of 10 to 40?

Secretary PATTERSON. That would only be in the case of Greece.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder about Turkey.

Secretary PATTERSON. In the case of Turkey, it would be comparable. We do not at all have the detailed knowledge in the case of Turkey that we have in the case of Greece. I think I indicated that in my statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Secretary, following up the line of questioning identified by Mr. VORYS, I think it would be very comforting to the American public if we could put something into the legislation which would spell out the facts you have talked about today about a military mission.

The language is a little indefinite.

That is as to the matter of a limited number of military personnel. Then I asked him this direct question:

Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?

Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

The Secretary says specifically he has no objection to that kind of limiting amendment. I appeal to you now as Members of a body having coordinate responsibility of government, along with the executive department, to measure up to your joint responsibility and write into this legislation those facts and understandings and agreements which the executive departments have given us in connection with this bill. Most of you have made campaign statements registering your desire to stop blank check legislating by Congress. Well the time has now come to do something about those statements. By writing in a number limitation such as I propose we measure up to our responsibilities and we retain added congressional control of both our foreign and domestic policies.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Was the amendment which the gentleman is now offering offered in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. It was discussed in committee, but I think it was not offered.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman quoted Secretary Patterson. Is it not a fact that later on in the testimony the Secretary said that he thought it would be unwise, and that he made a mistake when he said he did not see any objection to limiting the number?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find such testimony in the hearings, I will be happy to have him read it to the House. I am unable to find such testimony.

Mr. RICHARDS. Did not the Secretary later on change his position?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find anything in the hearings to indicate that, let him read it. I cannot find it there.

Let me point this out. I feel this way about this amendment. The War Department comes to us frequently as it does to the Committee on Appropriations and says, "We want some money to run the Department." I do not think we should give them an unstipulated amount simply because we have confidence in the War Department, as we all have. I think the Congress has the responsibility to place limitations on that amount, and I think we have the responsibility to place limitations on the amount of power which we vacate as a legislative body. We are vacating some authority in this bill necessarily, and I am simply asking that we limit the amount of power that we vacate in this matter of sending military personnel abroad in this bill to 100 men to each of the countries, because Secretary Patterson has said those are all the men that he intends to use; twice as many as he intends to use, in fact. Let us therefore put in writing as a part of this legislation this limitation which can always be changed should necessity arise by subsequent action by the Congress.

My plea is simply against writing blank-check legislation unnecessarily. It is a bad habit to get into and we should avoid it when we can. We have an opportunity to do so now. I urge your support for this clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise mainly in order to propound a question or two to the author of the amendment, if I may have his attention.

Is the gentleman sure that this amendment was not considered and voted down in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure. I say, it was discussed in committee. I do not recall that it was voted down, because the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered a substitute, and I am not sure that either of them were voted on. It may have been.

Mr. JARMAN. Is the gentleman sure that Secretary Patterson did not later on say that he made a mistake when he said, "No."

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure about any mistake Mr. Patterson may or may not have made. I am only sure about what appears in the printed record, and I am sure he has not said anything on the Senate side or the House side to contradict that.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is not sure that he did not hear him say that?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am sure that I have not heard that he did not have any objection to any kind of limitation exceeding 100 men.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is sure that he did not hear him say later on that he was opposed to it, is he?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know what the gentleman is driving at. I ask the gentleman from Alabama the same question I asked the gentleman from South Carolina, if he has any reason to think there is other testimony in the record, let him read it to the Committee. Here is the sworn testimony of the Secretary on page 108.

Mr. JARMAN. I will answer that by saying we had many executive sessions.

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

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

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that the specific question was asked of the Secretary in executive session and the Secretary said that he did make that statement in the opening meeting at the time, but that he wanted to change his mind, and he said that he would prefer not to have the number of people limited in the bill. That was in executive session. That is why it is not in the record.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. My remembrance of the Secretary's testimony is that his original agreement upon the size of the mission in Greece and Turkey would be predicated upon whether or not the mission now there, the British mission, would remain, but I very definitely remember, and I agree with the gentleman, that the Secretary said it would be most unwise, in the second hearing, to tie the hands of his Department or of the Navy Department in reference to this point.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I ask my colleagues of the House, please, do not tie the hands of our departments in an important matter such as this, in view of the testimony we have about it here today.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. May I say that in my opinion this is a crippling amendment. If we have any confidence left in the President of the United States and in the State Department and in General Marshall, we should not put this amendment into this bill.

Mr. JARMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman who is one of the ablest members of our committee, and I might add that we should not do so if we have any confidence in the Secretory of War, who is—well, I will not say what party he belongs to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was present at the hearings when the Secretary of War said he saw no objection to such an amendment limiting the number of military advisers to be sent to Greece and Turkey. Then I was ill for a few days and missed two committee meetings, but I certainly did not hear until just now of the reported retraction of his statement. However, if the Secretary of War later came before the committee in executive session and asked that we not put any restriction of this sort in the bill, which would leave the door open to an expeditionary force, that is all the more reason, I think, why the amendment should be adopted.

I am for this bill. I have crusaded for 16 years against appeasement of any country expanding its territory by aggression. I spoke the best I could for this bill on yesterday and will again if I get a chance. But what I am for is our aiding free countries struggling to maintain their independence, by our sending over material assistance and selected officers and men to review and screen the needs and requests and to see that the assistance we send is well used. I cannot for a moment support the bill if perchance by any stretch of interpretation of language it could permit an expeditionary force, or even a battalion of our armed forces to go into these countries either in addition to British troops or in substitution for British troops. If the day should come when that sort of thing is needed, I feel that those in charge must come again before the Congress and make their case. If they make a good case, Congress presumably would support it. But I cannot go along with any other interpretation, and I am constrained to support and urge the committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

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

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

Mr. KEE. The gentleman well knows that the bill provides that these military men we send over are to act in an advisory capacity only. By no means could that interpretation be stretched to mean combatants.

Mr. JUDD. Then, what possible objection can the gentleman have to putting into the bill that which would so enormously reassure the people of America. I think we would pick up a great many more votes here in the House of Representatives, if all were sure military personnel is to be limited to a definite number of officers and men for training and by no possible construction include, to use the gentleman's word, combatants.

Mr. KEE. The objection I have to it is this. The Secretary returned to the committee after he made the statement quoted by the gentleman from Minnesota and said it would be crippling to his Department if they wanted to send a few more advisory men, and asked us not to insert any limitation.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman object to 200, then?

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

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

Mr. BLOOM. It was stated at the time, if I remember correctly—this was in executive session; perhaps I should not say that—it was stated that if they thought of sending a battleship over there and they had more than a hundred men on that ship, according to the bill, they could not send the battleship over there.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly the gentleman is not suggesting that sending battleships would come under the authorization of this act. Of course, they could be sent by the Commander in Chief for visits under his present authority.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not mean for military purposes or for war purposes, but they could not go over there if it could be construed that they would send that many people on one ship.

Mr. JUDD. This reads "in an advisory capacity only." Surely we would not be sending over a battleship in an advisory capacity.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman was talking about combatant troops.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly right. I do not know exactly the attitude of the former chairman. He says, "I am telling you what happened in an executive session here or an executive session there." I believe an executive session is an executive session, so I am not going to discuss those matters. But let me say this: My amendment says, under the purposes of this act, limit it to 100. It has nothing to do with a battleship, because sending a battleship over there is something else. I am talking about the purposes of this act and the 100 limitation which Secretary Patterson said is twice as many men as he needs.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not talking about battleships or soldiers being sent over there. That is not in the realm of possibility under this bill. What I wanted to ask the gentleman is this: Would it not be ridiculous to embark on a courageous policy such as is proposed here today and spend $400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money under a limitation that only 100 military advisory personnel could be sent, and then tell the Secretary of War or the President that even if he deemed it necessary he could not send 150 men over there to see that that money was wisely spent?

Mr. JUDD. I will state to the gentleman that I am willing to amend the amendment to increase the limit to 200. I certainly do not want us to be crippled or hampered in doing well what we are authorizing. My point is that we must not authorize more than was told us or than we have told the House and the country is the purpose of this bill. It is to make our people sure that we will not under this bill be sending over any large groups. I know that we do not intend to do that, but a great many millions of Americans are more disturbed on this point than on any other.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment is just one more illustration of the feeling that a great many people have that if we only tie our own hands we are safe. I say this with considerable reluctance because I have a very high regard for the gentleman from

South Dakota. He is a good friend of mine. But over the years in this country there seems to have been a feeling on the part of many fine citizens that we should be fearful of our own power and that, therefore, if we can shackle Uncle Sam we are really going to be able to have peace.

In the first place, the British mission in Greece—I do not have the exact figure before me—I believe numbers around four or five hundred. If they for some reason or other have to withdraw, under this amendment we could not provide the personnel to take their place.

I believe that the reason for this amendment is the fear that some incident may arise between some American in uniform and—some Greek guerrilla, perhaps—which would arouse in us back here a desire to pursue the matter with explosive consequences. I would just like to say that one of my oldest friends was a naval attaché in Warsaw, a colonel in the Marine Corps. He was murdered and I do not recall that there was much about it in the press.

I would like to say further that you do not avoid trouble by simply limiting the number of military personnel. A civilian can be a cause of disturbance just as readily as a man in uniform. I believe that the men in uniform that we have to worry about are not the Americans. I believe that it is time that we made our meaning entirely clear, and that if we are going to pass this measure we should not handicap those who are charged with its execution.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman spoke about shackling Uncle Sam. If this bill passes, do you think we are shackling Uncle Sam by giving $400,000,000 under this program?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly do not.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call the attention of my friends the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the specific language of the bill, which is very plain and capable of only one construction. I quote:

by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries in an advisory capacity only.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts stressed that language.

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

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I got the implication from the gentleman's remarks, which I might add were very frank, that these forces that we are sending over might possibly replace the British who are there now numbering about 500, I believe.

Mr. LODGE. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. They are not forces. These are men we are sending over to screen military and naval demands and to act in an advisory capacity only, according to the language of the bill. The British have a large mission there, and it might become advisable or necessary, in view of the fact that most of the equipment will be ours, that the British retire some of their men and that we take their place.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Are the British there in an advisory capacity or in a shooting capacity? Are they armed or are they just advisers?

Mr. LODGE. The British mission is there in an advisory capacity. The British forces which consist, I believe, of a brigade—about 10,000 men—are there for policing purposes.

Oh, the mission is there, naturally, not in a shooting capacity. The purpose of the mission is not to shoot. The purpose of a soldier is to shoot.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But if we go there we will shoot.

Mr. LODGE. No. I am talking about combat troops.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They will be armed, will they not?

Mr. LODGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am afraid he has not quite got the distinction in mind.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that under the present language we could have an adviser in every company in the Greek Army or even in every squad?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose it would be impossible for any lawyer to draft a contract or a law that could not be abused by someone who wanted to do so.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD to the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Strike out the figure "100" and insert the figure "200."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to limit the proper activities of the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy in carrying out this act which I feel involves what may ultimately be almost a life and death matter for the United States. I mean just that in all seriousness. But I cannot believe we ought to pass this piece of legislation without making crystal clear to every mother and father and citizen in the United States exactly what we are doing. I cannot believe, on the basis of any testimony I have heard, that they can rightly object to a limitation of 200 by the War Department and 200 by the Navy Department. That seems to me a generous estimate of what "a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only," could mean. So I hope that many who have been opposing this amendment to limit to 100 will accept it on the basis of 200. It seems to me it improves the bill.

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

Mr. JUDD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. This is the first time in my life I ever heard of any missionary advocating that this country send military men to try to Christianize people. I have never heard any missionary or a church advocate that we should send only a hundred or 200 armed men into any country to try to aid and assist them in a Christian way. I hope the gentleman will eliminate all armed men that we are talking about sending into Greece and Turkey, and send more missionaries and more medical missionaries over there.

Mr. JUDD. So far as I know no one has suggested we send military men to any country to try to Christianize people. We are suggesting that it is right and proper and sensible to send military men to threatened peoples to help them retain their independence instead of allowing them to be murdered or enslaved as people have been wherever Communists have taken over. It so happens that my own church has had missionaries and medical missionaries in Greece and Turkey for many decades. Does the gentleman think he can send missionaries to any people dominated by Russian communism? If the gentleman will examine the record of the person who is speaking, he will discover that all during the 1930's, when I was taking fragments of American scrap iron out of the bodies and brains of innocent Chinese men, women, and children, I was trying my best to get my country to adopt a policy of not helping an aggressor, a policy which would prevent murder of the people of Asia and of the United States. I am for this bill because I believe it will prevent, or greatly reduce, the murder of people in Europe and probably of Americans, too. I think that is a worthy cause for a missionary, especially a missionary doctor, to support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has just said this is a question of most vital importance to the welfare of our country. He is correct in that. But if his statement is true, why shackle the United States? If the amendment limiting the number of this kind of personnel to 100 is bad, then it follows that a limitation of 200 is bad. I think it would be unwise for the Congress of the United States to embark on a policy such as we propose here today, costing $400,000,000, and then to say to the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, "You must go over there and carry out the purposes we have expressed in this legislation, but you are limited to 100 or 200 of a certain kind of personnel that it is absolutely necessary for us to have on the ground to make this program a success."

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The phraseology of the bill is "a limited number and in an advisory capacity only." These phrases have got to be considered together. "Limited" means the minimum number

necessary to carry out the policies of this act.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope this amendment and all amendments to it will be killed.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The word "limited," to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers, means absolutely nothing unless Congress exercises its right and authority and describes it in certain terms. "Limited" could mean 100,000 as well as 100 or 200. It all depends on who is administering the act. We are defining the word "limited" as meaning not more than 200 to act in an advisory capacity.

I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is what the British say they are doing with 10,000 men in Greece, acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize, of course, that a logical argument can be made from that angle, but what does the gentleman have to say about the phrase "advisory capacity only?"

Mr. MUNDT. I say in answer to that that the British say their troops are over there solely in an advisory capacity, yet they have 10,000 of them there. I suppose they are advising the people to maintain law and order.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill contemplates that part of the aid to be sent to Greece may be such things as airplanes and tanks.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, how can we expect to train these people in the use of this mechanized equipment with 100 men or 200 men? I do not think it can be done. We have got to have mechanics and servicemen.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is absurd to think so.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering if the gentleman had figured out in dollars and cents the cost of 100 or 200 or many more? And also I think it is important that this membership should know that we are not talking in the terms of the brigade of British soldiers that are there in camp, we are talking only in terms of permission.

Some of us have felt very deeply troubled because there was no limitation in this, because of some of the rumors that have been going about. I believe it is because of that that this amendment has been offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. If we could reassure the people of this country that what we are sending into Greece is a mission, not troops; that it is a limited mission and that we do not propose to permit the situation to become such that the army could use the $400,000,000 and nobody else get anything the people would feel better. The point and purpose of this proposal, as I see it, is not troops but it is economy of various kinds, bankers, specialists, and so on.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that somebody is letting the cat out of the bag. One of the things which really concerns the people of America in the consideration of this legislation is this question of military personnel. The bill says "a limited number of members of the military services." How many constitute "a limited number"? I think the best evidence on this point is to be found in the hearings before the committee at page 351 where the following statement is made:

> Secretary Forrestal suggested before the committee that perhaps at the outset 3 or 4 naval officers and possibly 20 or 25 men would be sufficient for the limited purpose of advising the Greek authorities. Secretary Patterson indicated a rough estimate of approximately between 10 and 40 Army officers might be adequate for similar purposes.

They are only supposed to serve in an advisory capacity.

The Mundt amendment raises the figure to 100 men in Greece and 100 men in Turkey. In the substitute amendment presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] the figure is raised to 200. This is a limitation which the fathers and mothers of America want. I am sure that much of the correspondence Members of Congress have received on this bill is to the effect that the people of the country are generally in favor of giving relief to the starving women and children of Greece, but they are afraid of the military features of the bill.

I do not care whether you call members of the military services advisors or not. It is very easy under this loose language to have 15,000 or more advisors on the ground. It seems to me that the statements made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as to the number of men actually needed as advisers should bear great weight. The hearings specifically state the number they need. The amendments proposed therefore are generous indeed and we should write the limitations into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in order to allay the fears of the fathers and mothers of America it is my firm conviction that a definite limitation as to the number of military personnel and advisors that are to go into Greece and Turkey, should be written into the bill. Therefore I shall support the Judd substitute and if that fails, I expect to support the original amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Preferential motion offered by Mr. BENDER: "Mr. BENDER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, you have a demonstration of how hell will break loose in Greece and Turkey in the way hell has broken loose here in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Apparently there is a difference of opinion as to what this person heard and what the other person heard. One thing I know is that day before yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and a number of other gentleman were in my office at which time there was present a young lady who was employed by UNRRA in Greece and who was shot by British bullets in Greece.

You are going into a shooting business when you go into this thing. When you go into this on the $400,000,000 basis, you are just beginning. For example, this story has been kept out of the newspapers, and so far there has been a successful attempt to keep it secret, but I understand that behind the walls of the State Department there is great excitement and frantic scurrying around over the report that American equipment for five full divisions of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army in China has fallen into the hands of the Chinese Communist forces.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I expect there is considerable agitation in the State Department. But this is just the sort of thing which we can expect under the Truman doctrine of sending military supplies to unrepresentative regimes on the theory of stopping communism.

All we will accomplish is to promote and prolong civil wars. Yes, we can send American materials of war to Greece and Turkey, to every trouble spot in the world—but we will wake up to find that the same thing is happening to it as is happening in China.

If this is the State Department's way of maintaining American prestige and security in the world—by dropping American taxpayers' money down the drain—I say it is a very poor way indeed.

This bill provides that two-thirds of the money is to be spent for military equipment to engage in civil war in Turkey and Greece. Now you are talking about sending 100 men or 200 men. What difference does it make? Hell will break loose just as hell is breaking loose on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Foreign Relations as the result of the controversy over this matter.

My friends, we are advocating that this thing be handled by the United Nations. That is not isolationism. I heard the distinguished gentleman from

Texas last night make an eloquent appeal against isolationism. Well, it is isolationism to engage in this unilateral program of ours when we have the United Nations to work through. Why not refer this matter in just that way?

I say that we are not going to be rushed into immediate passage of this measure if we have to sit here all next week. I trust there are a sufficient number of persons on the floor of this House who are interested and wish to be heard. We have good amendments on the desk here. We have amendments that should be considered in the manner in which we consider amendments on other measures.

This is the most important measure that we have had before us since I have been a Member of Congress during the past five terms. No other legislation has been as important as this. No other legislation will involve us in so much trouble, in so many heartaches, in so much bloodshed, as this measure will. I trust that we will consider this and not give this thing the bum's rush which obviously is attempted here in considering this amendment in 5 or 10 minutes. Let us take plenty of time. We can stay here from early morning until late at night. The majority leader said, "How about your amendments?" I said, "I am going to offer every one of them." He said, "Do you think we ought to meet in the morning at 10 o'clock?" I said, "You can meet at 9 o'clock and you can sit until midnight; you can meet on Saturday and you can meet on Monday and consider this thing the way it should be considered and not in a slipshod, haphazard manner."

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My point of order is that on the pending amendment the period of debate is 10 minutes; 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, if someone claims 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if no member of the committee or anyone else desires to rise in opposition, I seek recognition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, according to the rules defined by the distinguished gentleman, the point is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not press the point of order.

Mr. EATON. I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why do we not vote on this amendment now?

Mr. EATON. Of course, that is what I want to do. Everybody understands what this does. It kills the bill. If we want to kill the bill, let us vote on it and decide now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 37, noes 127.

So the motion was rejected.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement to limit debate on these amendments. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think it was generally understood that everyone was going to be given a chance to debate this bill and the amendments thereto. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would not press his unanimous-consent request because I do not like to be in the position of objecting. I think every Member that is on his feet ought to have 5 minutes to speak on these amendments, because we are getting into the same situation here as we did before, of turmoil, of everybody hollering to vote, vote, vote, and not listening to the debate. I think it would be a good thing under the conditions if the Committee rose.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that there would be no effort made as we progressed here a reasonable period of time through today, and tomorrow, if necessary, to limit debate in the consideration of this measure. The gentleman from New Jersey indicated in connection with his request that debate be limited to 10 minutes on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto that he wondered how many wanted to speak. I am quite sure he would be perfectly willing to amend his request. It is not a motion, it is a request subject to objection. No one wants to force anyone to object. If those who want to speak will rise and so indicate, then the time can be adjusted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that on this amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; and the amendments thereto. That does not limit debate. If everyone who wants to speak will rise, I am quite sure the chairman will amend his request in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The request as it stands is for a limitation of 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from New Jersey care to amend his request?

Mr. EATON. I would be glad to do so. I want everybody to have a chance to have his say. How many wish to speak on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a tally by the Clerk shows 14 Members have arisen.

Mr. EATON. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of both the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I have a like amendment at the Clerk's desk which would limit the military personnel in either country to 100. I mentioned that earlier in the debate today. It is not particularly material whether the number be fixed at 100 or 200, but certainly it seems to me there should be some limitation on the number of military forces which we send to these two countries.

The Secretary of War testified at page 108 of the record, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that anywhere from 10 to 40 military personnel is the present estimate in Greece and a comparable number in Turkey. Following that, he was asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I quote:

> Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

Now the point is made that on some other occasion, at some other place, he corrected this testimony and asked, in effect, for no limitation whatever on the size of the forces which we might send to these countries. I have the highest regard for our distinguished Secretary of War and am very anxious that none of my remarks should in any way be construed as critical of him. I am sure that he would be, as many of us would, the last one to take any step which would involve this country in armed conflict. He has been a fighting soldier and knows what war is. I realize, too, that considerations of security may require that not all of the testimony which was given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be spread upon this record. It is only natural that the Secretary of War, in the discharge of his duties, should prefer to have complete and uncontrolled discretion.

If these amendments should fail I shall still vote for this bill for the reasons I have given earlier today. But it is my sincere hope that a majority will see the merit in the proposal which has here been made, for I cannot escape the feeling that we, as a Congress, are charged with a heavy responsibility to see to it that nothing is done to alter the essential character of the legislation which we are about to adopt.

No one from the distinguished committee which reports this bill, no one in the unanimous report of the parallel committee in the other body, has indicated to us that it is the intention to send any substantial numbers of American officers or men to either of these countries. The committee report, here, at the bottom of page 4, says:

> Combat forces are not to be sent to Greece or Turkey. The military assistance provided in the bill is to consist only of arms and

other supplies for the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. These supplies are to be provided on the basis of investigations and recommendations by small military missions sent out by the United States in an advisory capacity only. Testimony of Government witnesses indicates that the military mission to Greece would probably not exceed 40 and the naval mission would probably be less than 30. In the case of Turkey it is expected that the missions would not be larger.

It is in reliance upon these assurances, given to us in entire good faith, that many of us are supporting this measure. Those assurances, I know, will still hold good if these amendments are defeated. But it seems to me that we should, by the adoption of one of these amendments, make it crystal clear to the mothers and fathers and wives of the young men of this country that we have not embarked upon a militaristic venture, that forces are not being sent to these countries to fight, that they are not shooting soldiers, but simply advisers to the appropriate authorities in these two countries.

The point is made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that the words "limited" and "advisory" in section 1, paragraph 3 of this bill should be accepted as sufficient indication of a limitation. I may say to the gentleman that during my service in the China-Burma-India theater we were supposed to have a limited number of military personnel in China for, if not advisory, at least, training purposes only. But that number ran into thousands and thousands of officers and men. For the most part, and with few exceptions, they were not there to fight a shooting war, but for advisory and training purposes of the Chinese Army. I know nothing of that kind is intended in this present measure. If it were, I would never support it. It would be a negation of the first point made in my remarks earlier today that this is a step toward peace and not toward war. But my point is that the people of this country are apprehensive and we should give them the assurance, by clear language, that no such purpose is envisioned by this legislation.

As I said before, I should not want to undermine this bill by supporting a crippling amendment. I do not consider these, Mr. Chairman, to be such. They seem to me to be clarifying provisions which should merit our favorable response.

I regret that I find myself in disagreement on this point with the distinguished chairman and majority of the members of this committee which has labored so assiduously over this bill. I could not be easy in my conscience, however, were I to oppose an amendment which simply, as I construe it, says that we mean by this bill to carry out exactly what the committee has told us in their report, nothing more and nothing less.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree with me also that when a man of the responsible position of Secretary of War, not just in an offhand remark but through a discussion of several pages of hearings insisted that he does not expect to use over 40 or 50 men and says he does not object to a limitation of 100, certainly he would not object to a limitation of over 200. Yet, there are those who say they have heard whispers in the dark that he does object. There is still time before we vote to go to the telephone and call him and then tell the House in public that he wants no limitation. I do not think he is going to say that. Congress has a responsibility in this matter.

Mr. KEATING. May I say to the gentleman, if the Secretary does mean that, there is certainly no evidence before us to that effect, which I am sure he, as a distinguished former jurist, would agree we should have, to form the basis for any decision to oppose these amendments. In the absence of any such testimony, we should accept the record before us to the effect that about 70 military and naval personnel in both these countries is the number contemplated.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate committee brings out the same point. I think the country has the right to have the assurance of Congress that we are supporting the Secretary of War in his suggested limitation, but let us not have any more blank checks. They can become dangerous and expensive experiments.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman entirely and thank him for his helpful comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

We certainly ought not continue to try to fool the American people, try to soft-soap them and give out sop to the American people that we are entering into this thing of the United States becoming the world policeman and that we are going to limit it by legislation to a hundred or two hundred men. What is the purpose of this bill? One of the purposes is to furnish military aid to equip and train a Turkish Army of about 500,000 men. We are going to send tanks and guns and everything else that is necessary over there to equip the Turkish Army. Now, we are attempting to salve the American people by saying there is not going to be any war come of this, because we are just going to send a hundred or two hundred men over there in an advisory capacity. Does that make sense?

I am opposed to this bill, but even so, if you are going to pass the bill I do not want to hamstring the people who are going to put the legislation into effect by saying, "You can have only 100 or 200 people to go over there to spend all these millions of dollars in Turkey." This legislation is a military project. No one denies that. I cannot just understand how my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, and the gentleman from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT, for both of whom I have the greatest respect, could offer such amendments as these if they are genuinely for this bill. It would be the same thing if we would say to the President of the United States, "We are going to declare war on Russia tomorrow but we are going to limit you as to military strength. You can have only three or four divisions to fight the war with. We think that is enough." We ought to be frank about this thing.

Now, under this bill we are going over there. What for? To fence Russia in. Is anyone so gullible as to believe that such an undertaking is a job for 100 or 200 men?

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is taking a consistent position. At the top of page 108, when the Secretary was asked about the number of men, he said:

I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate. We base that in part upon the assumption that the British Military Mission will continue in Greece for the time being at least.

But if that estimation does not come to pass, what if the British Mission does pull out? How many men would you need then?

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I think the gentleman is correct. It seems to me to be child's play to get up here and say we are genuinely for this thing, we are going into this all-out Truman policy to police the world if necessary, but we are going to limit you to a couple of hundred men.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you hear the Secretary of War before your committee the other day testify that the United States was going to be the boss of the world?

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not remember that; but this policy, of course, contemplates just that.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to heartily commend the gentleman on his very statesmanlike attitude. He is opposed to the bill; but if it is going to pass, he does not want the President to be hamstrung. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question. I wonder if it would have made any difference whether we had a law on the statute books prohibiting the sending of over 20,000 men abroad on the day of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman's question answers itself, of course. You can tell the American people that we are going to send their boys over in an advisory capacity but when the first American boy is shot everyone knows that the American people, of course, will then spend all the money they have and all the men they have and then the third world war will be under way. That is the reason I am opposed to the bill, and certainly I am not going to try to soft-soap the American people now by saying that we are going to send only a hundred or two hundred men.

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not also a fact that if we are going to stop Russia and if it is going to do any good, we have got to convince Russia that we mean it; and we will never convince her that we mean it by sending a few men over there and then saying we are not going to back them up.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

If my friends who are supporting the Truman policy of having America police the world, and take on all comers who disagree with Mr. Truman all over the world and who favor this sort of military alinement, they should frankly tell the American people that they are backing the policy with every dollar we possess and with the lives of every American son who can tote a gun.

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

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to granting military aid in any form. It will be a dangerous precedent. I do recommend, however, that any money spent in either country should be used to build schools, hospitals, missions, and so forth, and to feed the hungry.

I believe in relief and reconstruction.

I agree with Paul A. Porter, chief of the American Economic Mission to Greece, in that outside assistance is required for the survival of a democratic Greek state and we must make available funds for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

I have always favored a foreign policy of friendly relations with all countries and domination by none.

Why now this sudden anticommunistic action, when we permitted the division of Poland and the overrunning of the Balkans by the communistic forces, in fact, aided them; permitted placarding and the dissemination of material and propaganda in Italy so that in the last election the Communists polled 1,250,000 votes; informed the world through our action in the United Nations Assembly in that we condemn General Franco, who is the only man that has been and still is fighting communism?

Communism cannot be fought with money or bullets. It can be fought successfully only by feeding the people, sheltering the people, making them feel secure and free of fear and want.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, am not in favor of this bill due to its military-aid clause, and therefore will vote against it.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the attempts to define what "advisory capacity" means from a military point of view. Let me tell you it is absolutely meaningless.

I have seen the preliminaries of two World Wars in which this Nation has been engaged. I remember the maneuvering very well, as, being an adult in the naval service, I knew that I should be an active participant in them. Mr. Chairman, the present set-up is the same in substance as those which led up to World Wars I and II. In both cases we gave powers to the President which permitted him to get us into the war without the consent of the Congress. The Congress believes that it has the sole power to declare that a state of war exists for this Nation. It is merely fooling itself—suffering under a delusion—for in both of the two great World Wars we have fought the Nation was in the war under Executive directives before the matter was put up to the Congress. The Congress was merely a rubber stamp; it only confirmed what was already a fact—that a state of war existed. Are we going to do that again by granting this blank-check authority in this bill? Are we going to allow the administration to maneuver us into a position from which there is no way out except war or backing water in the face of the world? Are we going to send unlimited military personnel to get us embroiled in European squabbles? I know that the bill says that military personnel shall act in "an advisory capacity only." But just what does that mean, anyhow? Are American military aviators sitting in the observers' seat alongside the pilot in a combat plane advisers or combatants? Are American naval officers on board a fighting ship which may be sunk by the enemy advisers or fighting personnel? You know the answer as well as I do. They are combatants, and there is no other way to look at it. They are just as much combatants as were the American Army aviators who were sent to China to fight against the Japanese while we were still neutral.

Military and civilian personnel occupy quite different places in the category of reasons for international trouble. Civilians can be expended without any great accounting therefor, but military personnel abroad are recognized as clear-cut representatives of the nation they serve. When the time comes that some of the "members of our military services" who are acting in "an advisory capacity only" are killed in combat with Soviet forces we shall howl for vengeance and the fighting part of the third world war will be right on our doorsteps.

Perhaps we think that the probable gains justify the risks we shall assume. In that event I have no criticism. My sole object is to bring the terrific risks of this bill to your attention.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Gladly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman from Oklahoma made a statement to the effect that the reaction in this country would be terrific if only one American were killed in this undertaking. Last summer when Yugoslavia shot down six of our American flyers, there was nothing done about it. They were not even brought before the International Court of Justice of the United Nations for an accountability of their actions. I doubt very much if there is going to be any arousing over this situation since we passed that incident over.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman satisfied if we are to take action to stop communism in Greece and Turkey that we ought to immediately take it from a military standpoint?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I would not quite say that. I am very much distressed about where we are going from here, that is all.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I concede that the proposition to make these loans to Greece and Turkey is such that even the closest friends could differ about it.

I criticize no Member of the Congress for voting for this proposal, although I intend to vote against it for what, to me, appear compelling reasons.

We are given only two little glimpses, so to speak, of this whole proposition, the final pattern of which may be, and probably will be, a third world war. If this eventuates, we would have to fight alone and unaided. There is not a nation in all Europe which could or would engage in another war at this time to help us even though they were so inclined. This time they would expect us to do it all—finance it, fight it, and feed them while doing it. The result undoubtedly would be an impoverished America left depleted of its resources, insolvent, confused, and bewildered in a world of chaos.

The administration—and I refer, of course, to the executive branch of the Government—has not seen fit to be frank with us. They have not informed us as to what the whole of this new foreign policy is, or what it involves.

We are asked to extend loans which we must concede are military loans to be directed explicitly at preventing the expansion of Soviet despotism throughout Europe, Asia, and the Orient.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of propositions on which the Congress and the American people are entitled to enlightenment before this proposal is voted on.

In the first place, is this the first step in a move to actually stop Russia, even though it may lead to another long and bloody war?

In the second place, if it is the first step in a move to force the iron curtain back to the borders of Russia, does anybody know what the total cost may be in blood and money? The American people have been told nothing about these two problems.

If this is a proposition to stop Soviet expansion in Europe, $400,000,000 is a mere drop in the bucket, and when the demands of all other nations—if this program is embarked upon—have been met, the cost will not be hundreds of millions but many billions of dollars. If

it is not to stop Russia, then we are embarking upon a course repugnant to every American tradition. Our reward will be the hatred and the enmity of those we seek to help. Finally, we will have to pay all the costs and do all the fighting, whether we stop Russia or not.

If we are going to stop Russia, what are we going to do about all the nations which are now behind the Stalin iron curtain—nations like Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, honest little Finland, Estonia, Russian-occupied Germany? The American people have been given no light on that question.

If we are going to make these loans to stop Russia, how much more are we going to have to lend to Great Britain? How many more billions are we to lend to France? How many more billions must we hand to Italy? How many more millions must we lend to China? What are we going to do about India? What are we going to do about Palestine?

To embark upon this program, even though we do not engage in war in the next 15 or 20 years, means the maintenance by the United States of America of a national defense stronger than that of any other war machine in the world, at an expense which would constitute a further crushing burden on our taxpayers for the next 10 generations. The administration has given us no light on that problem.

If we embark upon this new course, which constitutes a complete and radical departure from our traditional American policy, and furthermore, an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, are we prepared to finance all the countries of the world? Are we prepared to police with troops all the countries we would have to subjugate? On these grave questions the administration gives us no light.

If we embark upon this course, we will either hand over more multiplied billions of our money in gifts—they are not loans—to be administered by foreigners with the result that large portions of these hard-earned billions will be stolen, and that other portions will go to finance Soviet puppet governments in satellite states as has already been the case with UNRRA. Either this, or else we will have to police with special commissions of Americans, both military and civil, the expenditure of these billions in such countries. If we do that, then we shall have adopted the British colonial policy and an imperialistic technique whether we like it or whether we do not. The administration has given us no light on that subject.

Are we going to have to maintain a great standing Army, an extensive Navy, manned by American boys and girls under compulsory military service, in order to provide troops constantly to police the rest of the world while we shell out the money? The administration has given us no light on that subject.

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

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, of course, but I told several of our people that I thought the Committee was going to rise around 5:30. I spoke to the Speaker. I have not yet spoken to the majority leader or the Chairman of the Committee. I wonder what the majority leader would think about that.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. We tried to get some limitation on the debate simply for the purpose of determining how many wanted to speak. It was indicated that we might run as long as 70 minutes, and on that we concluded to go along and see what might develop. There are different opinions as to whether we might proceed to vote on this amendment if the time could be shortly concluded, but if it cannot, then certainly there should be no reason to hold the Committee late tonight, because I propose to have the Committee come in at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it would be a merciful thing that, when the gentleman from Michigan completes his 5 minutes, the Committee might rise.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if, pending that, we could reach an agreement on how many more want to speak.

Mr. RAYBURN. There were 14 a while ago.

Mr. BLOOM. There are three on this side that are not here at the moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the matter is under the control of the Chairman of the Committee, but if he sees fit to have the Committee rise at the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, certainly that would meet with my approval.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, whatever the answer to these questions may be, I feel very deeply that the American people should be given at least all possible information, if not definite answers, before we, their representatives, are asked to vote to commit our Nation to this course.

Before taking this step, I believe we should again look at the money we ladled out in lend-lease while we sent our millions of troops into the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Pacific theaters of war, from which hundreds of thousands of them never returned.

I think we should remind the American people that previous experience tells us that these so-called loans are not loans at all: they are gifts. I think, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the American people ought to be reminded that these loans are not just pieces of paper; they are not merely disks of metal. They represent our raw materials, which are rapidly disappearing; they represent the wealth, the real wealth; they represent the toil and sweat and the energy, the very lifeblood of our American economic structure and of our American citizens: goods and services, manufactured goods, toil and sweat and energy and wealth pouring out of this country, never to return.

How long can the American people endure this constant drain upon their resources? The administration has given us no hint of the answer to that momentous question.

Mr. Chairman, how long can one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million Americans labor and sweat to feed the hungry peoples of the rest of the world, to rebuild shattered agriculture and the shattered industry of the other nations of the world? Is there not a grave danger that, instead of rescuing the rest of the world from starvation and ruin, we may so deplete our financial and material resources that we will go down to ruin and chaos with them? The administration gives us no light on this question.

Every economist in this country knows that the great depression of the 1930's was an aftermath of the First World War. The billions of dollars and the loans and expenditures which we made in that war and after that war were not repaid. These debts will never be repaid. Those loans represented goods, raw materials, energy, sweat, and toil, and they took so much of the lifeblood out of our American economy that, when the European nations repudiated their debts, our economy was prostrated by exhaustion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the time when we should review the costs in money we have already poured out—the billions, yes, the hundreds of billions, we have already spent in foreign wars. I, therefore, shall include as a part of my remarks a statement from the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945, showing the amounts foreign nations still owe the United States from World War I. That amount in the aggregate is $14,000,000,000. Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement showing how the expenditures of $50,500,000,000 given away by the United States in lend-lease was apportioned between nations.

Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a short statement showing how the United States settled lend-lease at an 89-percent loss.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the RECORD also a statement showing the quotas for the International Monetary Fund for the countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference.

Following that, I desire to insert an article from the Washington Post of yesterday, May 7, 1947, showing that the United States is the only nation permitting the World Bank to lend its money while the other nations that agreed to put money into the World Bank have not done so.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a statement showing how the International Monetary Fund functions. The administration has given us no information lately on the condition of this fund. The American people are entitled to know what has happened to the $2,750,000,000 we have put into that Fund.

Next I desire to insert in the RECORD a table showing the countries which received aid from UNRRA. I also desire to insert in the RECORD a short article showing how Americans have made generous

contributions to foreign peoples even outside of UNRRA.

I now want to introduce a statement showing as of March 8, 1946, how many foreign assets other nations possessed in the United States—and they run into the billions—while we are being besieged with demands and pleas for loans and for charity by almost every government in the world.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on Sunday, March 30, 1947, an article in the Times-Herald, under the signature of Lloyd Norman, showed that we have outstanding, outside of lend-lease, $9,280,000,000 in loans to 58 foreign countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to close my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "Where's the Money Coming From?"

This information should reach the people of the United States, because it is the citizens of this country who will have to do the fighting and the dying, as well as the paying, if there is another war. Our people, for generations to come, must do the paying for all this even though there is never another war.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I cannot vote for this proposition and be faithful to my solemn oath of office.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945]

FOREIGN NATIONS STILL OWE UNITED STATES FOURTEEN BILLION FROM WORLD WAR I—THIS DEBT WILL NEVER BE PAID

Foreign countries still owed the United States $14,791,340,307 in World War I debts on July 1, 1945, the Treasury said yesterday.

"Total indebtedness" includes unpaid principal, interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements, and interest accrued and unpaid under the agreements.

The United States has forgiven no World War I debts.

The following table includes total payments, by countries, of principal and interest on the debts. The debts of Russia and Armenia were not funded, however.

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal paid	Interest paid
Armenia	$27,391,079		
Belgium	503,579,077	$19,157,630	$33,033,642
Czechoslovakia	175,072,336	19,829,914	304,178
Estonia	24,491,700		1,248,431
Finland	8,574,063	1,157,868	5,847,626
France	4,606,635,664	226,039,588	260,036,302
Germany (Austrian debt)	26,024,539	862,668	
Great Britain	6,415,664,782	434,181,641	1,890,667,175
Greece	36,873,535	983,922	3,143,133
Hungary	2,740,938	73,955	482,924
Italy	2,652,213,409	37,464,319	63,365,560
Latvia	10,114,980	9,200	752,349
Lithuania	9,064,140	234,783	1,003,172
Poland	306,497,824	1,287,297	21,359,000
Romania	74,926,280	4,498,632	292,374
Russia	448,079,238		8,750,312
Yugoslavia	63,396,719	1,952,000	636,059

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 16, 1946]

FIFTY AND FIVE-TENTHS BILLIONS SPENT BY UNITED STATES IN LEND-LEASE

(Verbatim excerpts)

The extent to which the United States shouldered the production burden of World War II was made evident * * * in a Treasury Department report revealing the grand total of lend-lease as $50,596,698,000.

In reverse lend-lease the United States received a total of $7,000,387,000.

* * * the British Empire and Soviet Russia were the principal beneficiaries of America's aid.

A total of $31,367,559,000 worth of the weapons and tools of war went to the British Empire, and lend-lease assistance to Russia totaled $11,266,642,000.

The United States received from the British Empire in reverse lend-lease a total of $6,319,792,000, and from Russia a total of $2,212,000.

The report covers lend-lease operations from March 11, 1941, through August 31, 1946.

Besides the British Empire and Russia, top recipients of American weapons, supplies and services were:

France and possessions	$3,230,660,000
China	1,557,399,000
Netherlands and possessions	246,000,000
Belgium	153,235,000
Greece	71,526,000
Norway	52,216,00
Yugoslavia	32,027,000

The American Republics received a total of $459,410,000, Brazil being the No. 1 recipient with a total of $332,919,000.

Aid to the British Empire included more than $3,000,000,000 worth of ordnance and ordnance stores, $6,000,000,000 worth of aircraft and aeronautical matériel, $3,000,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, $5,000,000,000 worth of ships, and $2,000,000,000 worth of miscellaneous military equipment.

Russia received more than $1,569,000,000 worth of aircraft and air equipment, $1,770,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, $1,256,000,000 worth of ships, and $789,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

Over all, the United States sent to its allies $8,559,000,000 worth of aircraft and air matériel, $7,044,000,000 worth of shipping, $6,327,000,000 in tanks and other vehicles, and $4,382,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

UNITED STATES SETTLED LEND-LEASE AT 89 PERCENT LOSS

(By Jack Doherty)

(Verbatim excerpts)

A Senate committee probe of the Anglo-American $650,000,000 lend-lease settlement began * * * with revelation we are getting back less than 11 cents on a dollar and with charges that United States methods of surplus-property disposal abroad are contributing to a system of cartels.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, told the Senate War Investigating Subcommittee that the settlement turned over to the British Government at cut prices stores of goods which the British could then dispose of at a profit.

FERGUSON and Senator Mead, Democrat, of New York, pointed out that Great Britain had forbidden direct sales to Britons of surplus property by the United States, even though the goods were located in the British Isles. This left the British Government the only practical customer for surplus goods and strengthened British bargaining power, they charged.

Subcommittee Chairman Tunnell, Democrat, of Delaware, said in an opening statement that the writing off by this Nation of the $6,021,164,850 British lend-lease account for $650,000,000 will probably set a pattern for settlements with other nations whether we like it or not.

He produced figures showing that with the settlement now an accomplished fact, the United States settled for 8½ cents on the dollar for unconsumed lend-lease stocks worth $5,552,144,850.

The United Kingdom also received $351,000,000 worth of surplus property which was still in the possession of American forces there, Tunnell said. This part of the account was settled for 17 cents on the dollar.

The third part of lend-lease settlement was on goods in the pipe line at the end of the war, for which Great Britain agreed to pay $118,000,000 of a balance of $118,020,000.

Quotas for International Monetary Fund for countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia	200
Belgium	225
Bolivia	10
Brazil	150
Canada	300
Chile	50
China	550
Colombia	50
Costa Rica	5
Cuba	50
Czechoslovakia	125
Denmark	(1)
Dominican Republic	5
Ecuador	5
Egypt	45
El Salvador	2.5
Ethiopia	6
France	450
Greece	40
Guatemala	5
Haiti	5
Honduras	2.5
Iceland	1
India	400
Iran	25
Iraq	8
Liberia	.5
Luxemburg	10
Mexico	90
Netherlands	275
New Zealand	50
Nicaragua	2
Norway	50
Panama	.5
Paraguay	2
Peru	25
Philippine Commonwealth	15
Poland	125
Union of South Africa	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,200
United Kingdom	1,300
United States	2,750
Uruguay	15
Venezuela	15
Yugoslavia	60
Total	8,800

[1] The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the fund after the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign the agreement but before signature takes place.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, page 546.

Subscriptions to the Bank for Reconstruction and Development allocated to countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia	200
Belgium	225
Bolivia	7
Brazil	105
Canada	325
Chile	35
China	600
Colombia	35
Costa Rica	2
Cuba	35
Czechoslovakia	125
Denmark	(1)
Dominican Republic	2
Ecuador	3.2
Egypt	40
El Salvador	1
Ethiopia	3
France	450
Greece	25
Guatemala	2
Haiti	2
Honduras	1
Iceland	1
India	400
Iran	24

Iraq	6
Liberia	.5
Luxemburg	10
Mexico	65
Netherlands	275
New Zealand	50
Nicaragua	.8
Norway	50
Panama	.2
Paraguay	.8
Peru	17.5
Philippine Commonwealth	15
Poland	125
Union of South Africa	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,200
United Kingdom	1,300
United States	3,175
Uruguay	10.5
Venezuela	10.5
Yugoslavia	40
Total	9,100

[1] The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the Bank after Denmark accepts membership in accordance with the Articles of Agreement.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, p. 550.

[From the United States News of July 6, 1945]

HOW THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND WILL FUNCTION

1. Forty-five nations pour $8,800,000,000 in gold and various currencies into the Fund. United States puts in $2,750,000,000 in dollars; Britain, $1,300,000,000 in pounds; Russia, $1,200,000,000 in rubles, and so forth. All put in some gold.

2. Nations then get together to decide what each currency is worth. Dollar must be valued at $35 an ounce for gold. Pound is likely to be $4.03; Canadian dollar, 91 cents. Values will be determined by agreement between Fund and members.

3. Members then agree to stop using money to regulate trade, to abandon currency warfare. They have 3 years to make adjustments, and, after 5 years, currency controls are supposed to be removed.

4. World trade resumes. A British importer wants to buy United States automobiles. He gets his bank to buy dollars with British pounds, so he can pay the United States factory for the shipment.

5. But many British importers may clamor for dollars, more dollars than England has. Then England goes to the Fund to buy dollars with more pounds. She can buy $325,000,000 a year—one-fourth of her total original contribution in pounds.

6. England cannot buy dollars from the Fund, however, without using some of her own gold and dollar reserves. The agreement is that, for each dollar bought from the Fund, England will use another dollar out of her own reserve.

7. Also, if British sales in the next year produce a surplus of dollars or gold, half of the increase must be given to the Fund in exchange for the Fund's pounds. This need not be done unless Britain's own reserves exceed her Fund quota.

8. Fund levies a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent of the amount of dollars bought. After 3 months, interest begins at one-half of 1 percent a year for 9 months, and steps up to 4 percent after 4 years. Meanwhile, Fund will try to correct British trade balances.

9. Before Britain buys too many dollars from the Fund, however, she will want to lower the value of the pound so as to make British goods cheaper and increase sales in world markets. She can lower the pound as much as 10 percent—to $3.63—after consulting the Fund.

10. If this doesn't correct the situation, the Fund can allow England to reduce the pound still more. But England can't make the cut unless the Fund approves, and the Fund can approve only if a cheaper pound is considered necessary.

11. Finally, all countries may be like Britain in this example and rush to buy dollars. That would make dollars scarce in the Fund. The Fund then can ration United States currency among members, and members then can act to protect their own dollar reserves.

12. The trade of each country is supposed to balance over a period of years, which will bring a balance in Fund accounts. If this doesn't happen, the International Bank will make long-term stabilization loans to reach a balance.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1947]

UNITED STATES ONLY NATION THAT LETS WORLD BANK LEND ITS MONEY

United States alone among the 44 nations in the World Bank has agreed to let the bank use its subscription payment to lend to other nations, an authoritative source said yesterday.

The other 43 say they are not in a position now to have their currencies lent out to other nations. This hold-back was described as unimportant at this particular time, however, since none of the nine members asking $2,553,875,000 in loans wants anything but United States dollars.

The bank's stock of subscribed dollars will be only $721,392,500, even after the United States finishes its subscription payments 3 weeks from now. The only way the bank can add to them in the near future is to get dollars from private American investors.

The bank is preparing now to borrow from these investors, so it will have more to lend to members, by selling—probably sometime this summer or fall—its own bonds in this country, in denominations as small as $1,000.

FRANCE FIRST IN LINE

Before then, and probably this month or next, the bank is expected to begin making loans out of its subscribed capital.

France is reported in informed quarters to be first in line for a loan, although it is more likely to be $200,000,000 than the $500,000,000 she applied for. Denmark, which wants $50,000,000, is described as due for a loan soon also.

The hold-back by virtually all members in permitting the bank to lend their currencies does not greatly worry officials of the bank, well-posted sources say, because the officials hope their permission will be given by the time their money is wanted.

The hold-back is attributed to the fact that many of the members were hard hit by the war and, at a time when they feel they must borrow to stage an economic comeback, they also feel they are in no position to put out money to lend.

NOT READY TO EXPORT

When a nation's money is lent out, it serves as a sort of ticket to buy in that country, and the hold-back members are said also to take the position that they aren't yet able to produce enough goods to sell freely for export.

Hold-backs in permitting the loan of subscribed funds are authorized for members under terms of the Bretton Woods agreement under which the bank and its twin, the World Monetary Fund, were organized a little over a year ago.

Members can hold back on that part of their subscriptions put up in their currencies, but not on the 2 percent of subscriptions they were required to pay in gold or United States dollars.

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1946]

TABLE OF UNRRA AID

(Verbatim excerpts)

Following are tables from a report of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. They break down the amount and kind of assistance furnished each of the principal beneficiaries:

Shipments program through Dec. 31, 1946, in thousands of tons

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear [1]	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation [2]	Unclassified [3]	Total
Greece	1,306	27	9	287	693	727	3,049
Yugoslavia	1,084	73	20	161	695	352	2,385
Poland	67	3	2	17	42	25	156
Do	806	80	27	386	493		1,792
Czechoslovakia	608	40	24	267	404		1,343
Italy	1,844	105	14	410	7,238		9,611
Austria	365	4	1	164	47	177	758
White Russia	72	6	1	44	22		145
Ukraine	209	19	2	41	112		383
China	1,094	155	37	558	907		2,751
Other programs	57	90	5	6	4	34	195
Total	7,512	602	142	2,341	10,657	1,315	22,569

[1] Includes textile raw materials.
[2] Includes coal and all raw materials except textile raw materials.
[3] Military shipments and items awaiting specification.

Shipment program through Dec. 31, 1946, in millions of dollars

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear [1]	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation [2]	Unclassified	Grand total
Greece	164.0	35.0	10.3	50.8	40.9	57.0	358.0
Yugoslavia	139.6	75.9	21.6	40.0	109.4	43.0	429.5
Albania	5.5	5.4	1.9	6.6	7.1	2.0	28.5
Poland	180.5	84.5	30.0	80.0	99.0		474.0
Czechoslovakia	107.0	29.5	26.5	33.4	73.6		270.0
Italy	195.7	55.9	16.0	29.5	127.4	.5	425.0
Austria	54.0	2.0	1.5	19.1	9.0	31.7	117.3
White Russia	28.9	7.4	1.2	5.7	17.8		61.0
Ukraine	100.2	21.7	2.8	17.4	46.9		189.0
China	131.5	95.9	41.3	80.0	186.3		535.0
Other programs	14.3	23.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	15.1	58.3
Total	1,112.2	436.2	155.6	363.5	719.9	149.3	2,945.6

[1] Values, f. a. s.
[2] Includes textile raw materials.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 11, 1946]

AMERICANS GENEROUS EVEN OUTSIDE UNRRA

(By Robert Taylor)

Verbatim excerpts

United States citizens have contributed out of their pockets, for foreign relief, one-third as much as their Government invested in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The figure you most often see is the $2,700,000,000 which the United States put into UNRRA's treasury—three-fourths of the total UNRRA budget.

The one you don't hear about is the $925,000,000 for voluntary contributions from September 1939 until this spring.

* * * * *

At the time the President's War Relief Control Board quit business last March 31, 596 private agencies which had registered for foreign war relief had collected funds and supplies amounting to $597,621,366.

UNRRA received another $150,000,000 in voluntary contributions.

In addition, the American Red Cross dispensed $32,000,000 for emergency civilian war relief in foreign countries between September 1939 and last June.

Also, the Red Cross handled distribution of another $146,000,000 for other agencies, most of it coming out of allocations of Federal funds and material.

The resulting total of more than $900,000,000 is greater than the amount all other nations contributed to UNRRA.

Heaviest collections in the voluntary aid campaign were by the American Jewish Joint Distribution committee, $48,840,231; United China Relief reported $40,316,755; United Palestine Appeal, $32,511,604; and American Society for Russian Relief, $27,707,859.

In 1939, Polish relief ranked highest; in 1940, 1941, 1942, British; in 1943, Russian, and in 1944 and 1945 international causes got two-thirds of all contributions.

Since the War Relief Control Board ended, the State Department, at the request of President Truman, has maintained a Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Private foreign aid groups may register voluntarily with this committee, providing they agree to file their programs, budgets and audits.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

FOREIGN-OWNED ASSETS IN UNITED STATES TOP THIRTEEN BILLIONS, TREASURY SAYS

(By Walter Trohan)

Foreign-owned assets in the United States totaled almost $13,000,000,000 on June 14, 1941, and most of these assets are not only intact, but have greatly increased in value since that date.

This was disclosed * * * by the Treasury Department with the publication of a census taken by the Department's Foreign Funds Control Division. The census data will be used in unfreezing foreign-owned assets over which the division exercised wartime supervision.

The gross total of all foreign-owned assets in the United States as of the census date was $12,739,000,000. Included were such assets as deposits in American banks, investments in American securities and enterprises, interests in securities and trusts, real estate and other types of property.

Ownership in these assets was vested in 160,000 sources—individuals, partnerships, corporations and governments. These are spread over every country in the world.

The Treasury Department estimated that the foreign-owned assets have increased in value to approximately $14,000,000,000 from 1941 to December 31, 1944, exclusive of gold earmarked for foreign account. Earmarked gold more than doubled in that period going from $1,916,000,000 to $3,937,000,000. The total of foreign assets and gold as of December 1944 was approximately $18,000,000,000.

Foreign deposits in the United States rose by $373,000,000 and stood at $4,031,000,000 as of December 31, 1944. In addition, foreign countries purchased more than $1,500,000,000 of United States bonds between 1941 and 1944. The Treasury said changes in foreign holdings of long-term assets could not be determined easily, but it was estimated that net foreign purchases were 120 millions from 1941 to 1944.

* * * * *

Enemy-owned assets totaled $519,000,000. Of this Germany owned $198,000,000; Japan, $160,000,000; and Italy, $130,000,000.

Of the total of almost thirteen billions of foreign-owned assets, five billion three hundred fifty-two and four-tenths millions are charged in the census to the British Empire. * * *

Of the British total, three billion two hundred and thirty-eight and nine-tenths millions is charged to the United Kingdom. * * *

The foreign-owned assets charged to the United Kingdom included $281,000,000 in bullion, currency, and deposits. The British own $441,000,000 in American securities, hold $677,600,000 in enterprises and $1,441,600 in miscellaneous assets. * * * The French empire owns $1,081,000,000 of American assets.

Canada, next to the United Kingdom, is the largest holder of American assets at $1,742,800,000. Next is Switzerland with $1,210,600,000, and next is the Dutch Empire with $1,164,700,000.

Soviet Russia owned only $28,100,000 of American assets.

"WHERE'S THE MONEY COMING FROM?"

(Digest of an article in the January 1944 Monthly Bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, discussing a new book carrying the title headlined above, by Stuart Chase)

(Verbatim extracts)

Mr. Chase gives full support to the "owing it to ourselves" argument about internal debt, and plumps unreservedly for the theory of the compensatory economy—that is, where the Government takes responsibility for maintaining full employment by spending freely and running into debt in periods of depression, and siphoning off purchasing power and retiring debt by taxes in periods of boom.

The war has demonstrated, Mr. Chase argues, that the country can, if it only makes up its mind to do so, lift employment payrolls, and production to peak levels. (The trouble with pump-priming in the 'thirties, he says, was that the Government never spent enough.) After seeing that the Government can spend money all out and put people to work for war, Americans, he observes, are going to be hard to convince that the Government cannot do the same for peace. * * *

Discussing in his new book the question where the money to support Government spending is coming from Mr. Chase says:

"The question of where's the money coming from has one answer in the case of the individual, and quite a different answer in the case of all individuals united in a Nation. * * * If you have no money, you cannot buy that beautiful new car. Period. But if you, and all your fellow citizens, want to buy a beautiful new river development project or a beautiful new war, there is nothing to stop you from doing so. * * *

"In your collective capacity you can put men and machines hitherto idle to work. When this pool is exhausted, you can transfer manpower from making cars to making tanks. You can issue claim checks (money) for the new war production, and then tax them back or borrow them back in a closed circuit. You can buy your war and its costly equipment right up to the limit of the nation's manpower, machine-hours, and materials. There will be no difficulty about the money. * * *

"Except for our fears and financial traditions, the same formula can be followed in peacetime."

Analyzing this argument, it will be seen that it comes down basically to the same philosophy as that embodied in the statement that we need not worry about a national debt that is "owed to ourselves." * * *

In the passage cited above, the author appears to assume a smooth, almost automatic, flow of funds from the Treasury through the processes of production and distribution and back to the Treasury by way of taxes. * * *

This argument is obviously similar to the National Resources Planning Board proposition that "costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield." * * * The process sounds easy and simple; the difficulty is that funds do not flow from the Treasury into the economy and back to the Treasury in the smooth and automatic way that is suggested. * * * It is generally recognized that government spending means either bigger and bigger deficits or higher and higher taxes. * * *

This raises the exceedingly knotty problem of who is going to pay the taxes. * * *

In other words, the formula for where's the money coming from appears on analysis to be less simple than it sounds. Evidently there are reasons other than mere fears and financial traditions to be considered. Discussing the thesis that government spending and building up of debt need occasion no concern because the money spent or paid out in debt interest remains within the system, Dr. Albert Hahn, former chairman of a large provincial bank in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Germany, writing in the Banking Law Journal for July 1943, points to some interesting similarity with arguments circulated in Germany during and following the First World War. He says:

"To everyone who lived through the German inflation, this argument arouses strong, but very unpleasant, memories, for it is obviously identical with the dictum formulated in Germany during the First World War, 'The money remains in the country.' This dictum provided the solace to the conscience of German authorities as they followed the lax fiscal policies which resulted in inflation and the misery that came in its wake.

"But what of the statement itself? Is it true? It is not only true—it is too true. It is a truism like the arithmetical equation that 10 minus 10 equals 0. This argument, of course, can be applied at whatever level of government debt one might choose to mention, anywhere from $1 to trillions and trillions." * * *

The theory of the compensatory budget or compensatory economy, as Mr. Chase puts it, has gained a wide following over the past decade. * * * It represents a mixture of economic defeatism born of hard times, and of an exhilarating sense of having discovered something new from the experience of seeing at last what really big-scale government spending can do. * * * All * * * share in common the view that it is the government's job to keep the economy operating on even keel at full employment, injecting purchasing power into the system by increased public spending and investment as private spending and investment falls off, and following a reverse course as the cycle changes. Implementing government spending, Mr. Chase advocates a highly flexible tax system—one designed to penalize idle money and drive hoarded savings into spending or investment when the economy needs stimulating, with a shift over to some form of spendings taxes when things begin to go too fast and need restraint.

Admittedly, here is a very interesting blueprint for permanent prosperity—if it would

work. Actually, it is difficult—even with the most sanguine stretch of the imagination—to see how it could work.

In the first place, it is impossible to turn public expenditures and taxes on and off like the spigot of a water pipe. Much less is it easy to alter on short notice the structure of the tax system at the behest of economic planners bent on using it as the lever to control business cycle fluctuations.

While it is usually easy enough to expand Government expenditures—appropriation bills are almost invariably popular—it is quite another matter to contract them. * * * The result is that every period of big spending leaves the Government on a permanently higher level of costs, with more debt and more taxes. * * *

And comparable difficulties arise as to taxes. While plenty of people like to see Government expenditures increased, nobody really like to see taxes go up. * * * Despite the most compelling reasons for tax increases in wartime, both to pay for the war and to sterilize surplus purchasing power, we have witnessed the spectacle of months of wrangling over tax bills; and not even yet have we a tax program that is truly anti-inflationary in the sense of going to the heart of the problem of reaching excess income where it is being created. * * * Politics has dominated. * * *

If we are unable or unwilling to tax adequately in wartime, when the need is so clear and when there is a spirit of patriotism to help, what chance would there be in ordinary times of raising taxes on large masses of people to cut off a perfectly good boom which everyone was enjoying and would doubtless like to see continue indefinitely?

Mr. John Chamberlain, literary critic of the New York Times, expressed the difficulty very well when, in reviewing Mr. Chase's book, "Where's the Money Coming From," he said:

"What bothers me is the failure of people to see the implications of Mr. Chase's ideas. If there is to be deficit financing in a 1933–39 period, there must be high taxation in a 1940–43 period, when the economy is booming. Yet Congress, at the moment, shows no willingness to tax with any rigor. I suspect that this is an almost unchangeable fact of human nature, this unwillingness to pay off in good times what has been borrowed in bad times. When it's raining is obviously no time to mend the roof. But when the sun comes out we don't want to mend the roof either. Things are too pleasant on the ground."

Mr. Chase concedes in his book that his system would require a "serious psychological adjustment" about taxes. "Americans", he says, "traditionally regard taxes as a burden and a waste if not an outrage." But, says he, "If they want a compensatory economy and not something much more radical, they will have to change their ideas and begin to think about taxes the way they have been taught to think about insurance. You pay now in order to avoid calamity later."

Perhaps Americans ought to think about taxes that way; but will they? Maybe, before piling up a lot of debt on the compensatory spending theory, it would be a good idea to know.

A second, and even more basic, objection to the compensatory budget idea is that it vastly oversimplifies the problem of maintaining economic stability. It would be a fine thing indeed if all that was needed to keep the economic machine hitting on all cylinders at just the right pace would be turning on and off the stream of funds from the Public Treasury. But it would be well to pause and think a moment of the full implications of this doctrine.

What it means, first of all, is applying a single specific—Government spending—to all the ills to which the economic system may fall victim. * * *

What it means, secondly, is attempting to shift to the Government responsibilities that in a democratic society must rest primarily with the people. * * * Why should anyone worry when the Government underwrites everything? * * *

The fact is that society cannot function under a system that encourages irresponsibility and indiscipline, and which protects everyone from the consequences of making mistakes. * * * Necessity is the mother not only of invention but of adjustment. Except as there are incentives and pressures to eliminate sources of disorder, sore spots in the economy tend to get sorer and sorer, until finally the treatment breaks down. * * *

The argument that because we willingly pour out great sums to win a war we can do the same in peace is by no means original with Mr. Chase. * * *

It is true, as Mr. Chase says in the first quotation cited above, there will be no difficulty about raising the money. * * * The real question is, What are the consequences of this kind of finance? * * *

"Where did the money come from?" asks Mr. Chase, pointing to the vast military programs of Russia, Italy, Japan, and Germany. "Where did Britain and America get it for their colossal war outlays?"

We know the answer to that. They got it out of varying degrees of credit and currency inflation, coupled with taxation beyond anything ever dreamed of before and unprecedented regimentation of their people. * * *

When we hear it said that because this and other countries can "afford" to spend great sums for carrying on the war, we can "afford" to spend in peace, we have to bear in mind that the ultimate consequences of this war spending are not yet known. The chemist does not stop in the middle of his experiment and draw final conclusions as to the results. * * * It is a question of what the cost will be in terms of inflation, taxation, and the kind of an economy we are going to have.

In war, we spend money and run into debt, not because we can afford to * * * but because * * * almost nothing else matters. Even though we knew that the spending of these sums would eventually bring national bankruptcy and financial chaos, as it has done for many warring nations in the past, we would still do it. * * *

The economy in war is not and cannot be—at least in a democracy—a criterion for the economy in peace. War represents a tremendous distortion of normal peacetime values and practices and ways of living, and there is no warrant for assuming that because certain things are done in war they can be, or ought to be, done in peace. * * *

What has been said is not to imply that the Government should not give assistance in times of economic crisis. * * *

The main point to be stressed is that * * * we be thoroughly aware of what we are doing, and not mistake palliatives for cures. Real curative measures consist of making adjustments, discovering and eliminating bad policies and practices, cleaning up weak spots, and so forth, so that the economy can get a new start. When government spending comes to be used as a substitute for such essential—though often painful and unpleasant—processes, it becomes a menace instead of a help.

Nor should it be supposed that in taking the road of Government spending we are necessarily avoiding "something more radical", as suggested by Mr. Chase. Government spending tends to be like a drug, in that it takes larger and larger doses to get results; and all the time, debt and taxes get higher and higher. There is no surer route to statism than by the way of the tax collector, for when private enterprise ceases to become profitable and lags, the state takes over. One of the factors handicapping recovery in the thirties was the draining off of the source of risk capital by taxation, together with the large slice of the profits of successful ventures taken by government. * * *

In going forward with whatever relief programs may be deemed necessary and desirable from time to time, let us do so with eyes open to the limitations and dangers of such measures. Let us not be misled by any assumption that "because we did it in war we can do it in peace," or delude ourselves that we can keep ourselves afloat by pumping out Government money for all sorts of projects, and increasing debt, so long as "the money remains in the country", and "we owe the debt to ourselves."

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an amendment to the pending bill which I propose to offer tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The amendment referred to is as follows:

Page 4, line 22, after the period add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3a. There is hereby created the Foreign Funds Control Commission which shall be an independent agency of Government directly responsible to the Congress.

"The Commission shall consist of three members—a Director, the Comptroller General, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

"The Director shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term of 5 years and shall serve until his successor has qualified. The Director's salary shall be $15,000 annually. He shall be a natural-born citizen of the United States. He shall have had a broad experience in the administration of Government funds and without previous prominent affiliation with any major political party.

"The Commission is hereby directed to administer all funds hereafter granted by the Treasury of the United States or previous grants if directed by the Congress to foreign countries, their nationals and agencies of whatever kind or nature.

"The work of the Commission shall be organized under no less than three general divisions (1) the executive under the supervision of the Director, (2) audit and accounting under the supervision of the Comptroller General, and (3) investigation under the supervision of the Intelligence Branch of the Treasury.

"The Director is hereby authorized to engage such personnel, to acquire such office equipment, accounting records, printed matter, and office supplies as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"The Director shall have the assistance of other Government departments such as the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines and Mining, Bureau of Fisheries, State, War, Navy, Treasury on matters generally coming within the scope of the respective department's functions and to the end that the best expert advice obtainable may be at the service of the Commission in administering the funds so granted; and it shall be the duty of the said agencies to cooperate in every practical manner possible.

"The main office of the Commission shall be located in Washington, D. C. Field offices shall be established and operated in whatever country is given a grant and shall be maintained in operation in that country for whatever time may be required to properly administer the funds so granted.

"The Commission shall submit quarterly reports of its administration to the Congress which shall be published for the general information of the taxpayers and bond buyers of the United States."

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our very able and outstanding colleague the Honorable JOHN TABER, a Representative from New York and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has been very highly commended by Arthur Krock in an article which appeared in the New York Times on May 6, 1947. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Krock's article:

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR—CONGRESS ECONOMIZER IS TARGET OF MANY, AS WERE HOLMAN AND MANN EARLIER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The way of the transgressor is a primrose path compared to that an economizer in Congress must tread, and Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn, N. Y., provides the most prominent current illustration of that fact.

As chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, he suggests a Pilgrim father in the savage wilderness as he strives to check and reduce the ever-growing costs of government, for every time he swings his axe in the Federal fiscal forest he is the target of arrows from all directions. But they seem to bounce off him harmlessly, as far as diverting him from his purpose is concerned.

At the moment Mr. TABER is under fire from marksmen of all sorts as he seeks to lop off or cut down this appropriation or that. The aim of some is as good as their individual objectives, when the latter are considered separately from the general retrenchment program with which Mr. TABER is firmly dealing. The aim of others is not so good, and their causes are motivated by self-interest or an exaggerated idea of the importance to the Nation of the Federal project they are trying to save from the chairman's axe. But this is always the case when any real attempt is made to retrench Government spending.

Groups of the general public are interested in protecting various Federal activities from abolition or sharp reduction through the use of the appropriating power of Congress. But Mr. TABER is certain that the public as a whole wants billions sliced from the President's budget of $37,500,000,000 and will approve this result without too much concern over details. He does not, however, expect to become a popular figure in Congress or outside it—watchdogs of the Treasury never do. He does not look for any official rewards or promotions—watchdogs of the Treasury rarely attain them. But he does not seem to mind.

In this respect Mr. TABER resembles two other Treasury watchdogs who served in the House and were successful defenders of the funds supplied by public revenue. One was William S. Holman, of Indiana, the other was James R. Mann, of Illinois, and both, like the Representative from Auburn, were members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Holman, who was elected by his rural Indiana district to Congress 16 times in 40 years, was born on that frontier in 1822 and as a Jeffersonian Democrat applied himself to project the Virginia statesman's ideas into the industrial age that succeeded the agricultural. A historian records that, in Holman's view, most people were poor and highly taxed; Federal spending benefited those who least needed help; one outlay bred another, and in the end swollen bureaucracy would destroy democratic institutions. To save money he even opposed expanding the Library of Congress and improving the Capital City, for when economy becomes a legislator's main purpose in life he often fells a tree in trying to clear out the underbrush. But Holman's struggle against waste, extravagance, and purely political spending saved hundreds of millions to the taxpayers.

Mann was a later figure in congressional history; he lived until 1922 and he served a Chicago district from 1897 until he died. He had a hand in railroad regulation, the pure food and drug law, measures to restrict corporate abuses and the White Slave Act that bears his name. But it was as Speaker Cannon's agent, and then as minority leader, in blocking loose, extravagant, or otherwise bad legislation that his great public service was performed. Much in this category died at his hands, because of his ability, the consequence of incessant study, to find the weak spots in bills, and the amount of money he saved the American people cannot be estimated.

Mr. TABER is taller and more portly than these earlier watchdogs but he has the same grim expression and saw-edged voice that goes with it. He looks and dresses like a banker-farmer, doesn't talk off his own particular subjects, runs his committee with a hard hand, takes little interest in the party line except when on appropriations he draws it, and is the terror of all bureaucrats. Their fear of him is as great as his distrust of them, for between him and them it must be continuous war to the knife if he is to enforce real economies in Federal spending.

The New Yorker will reduce the budget effectively if that can be done by any leader in Congress over the massed and shifting opposition this effort always encounters. Those who support his general objective are constantly breaking away in favor of some particular project, but he realizes that every time he yields to one such group he will have less influence in combating the next. Therefore, some good enterprises will suffer with the bad at Mr. TABER's hands.

But if there are to be any important cuts in Federal spending, this consequence is inevitable under the present system—until or unless a President comes along who will really take the lead in economy and real budget reform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign the Republican Party made 10 campaign pledges. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a magazine article showing how those pledges are being definitely and actively fulfilled.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made over radio station WHDH in Boston.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the State Department to me dated May 5, 1947, and also some telegrams to the Department of State from Ambassador Smith from Moscow to the Secretary of State dated June 11, 1946, which were referred to in debate today in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFEAT THE "WOOL GRAB" BILL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous threat to the security of every American family is the steady and alarming increase in the cost of living.

Every household is worried about this problem.

As prices go up, up, outstripping incomes and leading us inevitably, unless checked, to that explosive point which is followed by business collapse, unemployment, and despair, Americans are anxiously wondering what we, their elected representatives, are doing to forestall disaster.

In the Congress this week there appears a bill, S. 814, already passed by the Senate and amended by the Agriculture Committee of the House, which will, if passed by the House, give spur to the inflationary menace.

The wool-price-support program is due to expire unless legislation is approved to extend it, but under the proposed bill, it will be extended and intensified to the point where the Government will lose, industry will suffer, and every consumer in the United States will pay through the nose.

Our domestic wool growers were never able to supply one-half of the raw-material needs of our manufacturers of worsted cloth. Furthermore, they could not supply them with the long-fiber raw wool necessary for quality worsteds. Even when given tariff protection, domestic sheep raisers cannot do the job.

But when they seek preferential treatment over all other agricultural commodities, as in this bill, it is time to call a halt. Wool needs some support, but no more than that given 160 other agricultural items, which is 90 percent—except cotton which is 92½—of parity for 1947–48. Parity is a Government index of farm-operation costs, similar to the cost-of-living index. The wool growers want 100 percent of parity.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman to say that no other crops had a support of more than 90 percent?

Mr. LANE. I understand, with the exception of the one I mentioned, 92½ percent. I stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that flax, for example, has a support price of 150 or 160 percent of parity. I think others can be found in that same category.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Why our extensive worsted industry and its workers, which suffered from substandard conditions for many years and only recently arrived at steady production, good wages, and good profits, should be asked to bear the burden is beyond all semblance of economic justice.

We believe that the Government has done more than enough for one segment of our economy—the wool growers. We cannot afford to keep on sending good money after bad. In spite of a 34 cents per pound tariff, foreign wool—and better wool—imported from 23 different countries, can still be sold at less than the support price which the Government is paying to wool growers in the United States. Uncle Sam is presently stuck with a 400,000,000 pound wool surplus which he can't get rid of. And he bought it at above-market prices. On this program, to date, he has lost over $38,000,000 without counting the increased costs to consumers from artifically supported prices.

Now, through the proposed legislation, he is being asked to shell out another $100,000,000 through indirect subsidies to wool farmers by outright Government purchase of the 1947 and 1948 wool production in the United States at the highest prices over a 27-year period.

As if this weren't enough, we are now being asked to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lay an additional import fee on foreign wool, over and above the 34 cents per pound tariff already levied. This new impost, up to 50 percent ad valorem, can be added at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is altogether too much power to give to any man, and especially at a time when so many other controls, justified only by the emergency of war, have been dropped. It amounts, in effect, to a nationalization of the raw-wool industry.

Clinton M. Hester, of the National Wool Trade Association, estimates that the subsidy "means a minimum of $1 extra cost on at least 75,000,000 wool garments bought annually by Americans."

The imposition of these import fees would curtail wool imports, resulting in a contraction of manufacturing and a drop in employment, bringing sudden and severe deflation to many of our industrial communities.

This dangerous precedent could well open the door to high-tariff logrolling for other commodities, which, at the present crisis in the price structure, could plunge us headlong into a depression which would rock the foundations of our constitutional government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I can see why the gentleman might feel it is unwise to start delegating power to the members of the President's Cabinet, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under section 22 of the AAA Act the President already has those powers that are in this particular bill. They have never been exercised by the President in that way, but he has the power at the present time.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Representatives of our State Department, at the Geneva Conference, are negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. There is a distinct possibility that these agreements will lower the tariff on woolen textile manufacturers.

In Massachusetts, the heart of our textile industry, the workers were, at one time, among the lowest paid group of industrial workers in the country. By dint of persistent efforts and cooperation among management and labor and government, we have built up this depressed industry to the point where it is turning out the finest fabrics in volume. The industry is showing a profit and is paying an average wage throughout of $1.20 an hour, in keeping with the progressive standards of American enterprise. This contrasts sharply with the 35 cents per hour average in English textiles, and even lower wage rates elsewhere.

We cannot survive a double squeeze exerted by a lowered tariff permitting woolen products manufactured by other countries with cheap labor to compete in the home market, and jacked-up costs for the wool our industry needs, which will result from 100 percent parity on the domestic clip, plus increased import fees on the better wool we require, and get, from abroad.

Traders, industrialists, workers and consumers will fight S. 814, Report No. 257, until its final and well-merited defeat.

It is not that we are closing our eyes to the case for the domestic wool growers. In a spirit of compromise, fair to both sides, we recommend and will support a measure along the lines of the Herter bill.

This would give a Government guaranty of support to wool farmers at 90 percent of parity, equal to the support of other agricultural commodities. It would permit free-enterprise merchants to go on with the job of purchasing, storing, preparing, and distributing the domestic wool clip, as they have done successfully in the past. It would take the Government out of the wool business, where its performance has been a dismal failure during the postwar years of 1945 and 1946.

During that period, a huge stock pile was accumulated in spite of a record demand for wool. This was not due to foreign competition, because tariff protection amounted to 35 percent of the value of domestic wool. The workings of the parity law had no effect on the situation until late 1946. Poor judgment by the Government is alone responsible.

S. 814 would extend and aggravate the dangers to trade and industry. It would fix the price of wool for 2 years at over 100 percent of today's high parity, and could be 130 percent or more should parity drop to wartime levels, as is confidently expected. Under S. 814, losses to the Government and the taxpayer would be enormous. It would stymie private enterprise and force the Government to be the only buyer of wool. And once the Government gets the wool, it cannot dispose of it except at a loss.

Such ill-advised legislation might well tip the scales of our whole economy from recovery to collapse. Once the chain reaction for preferential treatment sets in, it is hard to stop.

The American consumer is demanding that we do everything in our power to bring about a gradual reduction in prices.

Here is the test of our abilities and our intentions.

In the fight against inflation, the defeat of S. 814 is imperative.

REDUCTION AND CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have received reports from Members of Congress and from people all over the country inquiring about the reduction and curtailment of postal services. I have been advised that postal workers are reporting to the public that service is being curtailed as a result of economies being effected by the Eightieth Congress. In several instances, this is being developed into a partisan attack on the present majority in Congress.

I do not believe that this campaign was originated in the Post Office Department in Washington, for high officials of the service have advised me that the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill did not necessitate any curtailment of essential services. I regret that there has been any aspect of partisanship in the matter, and I am sure that where this has been injected it has been entirely on local levels. Yet because the issue has been raised I feel that I, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Post Office appropriation bill for 1948, must take cognizance of the charges that have been made, not only in defense of the majority party, but also of my colleagues on the minority who served faithfully on the subcommittee, who approached the question of appropriations in a nonpartisan manner, and who joined in submitting a unanimous report to the House. The bill was not amended on the floor nor by the full committee, and on March 11 the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill passed this body by a unanimous vote of 387–0. I therefore make it clear that it is my desire solely to state the position of the House, both majority and minority, in answering political charges that have been made against this bill.

In some localities carriers have advised the people whom they serve that deliveries will be made less frequently, or will be curtailed entirely, because insufficient money was appropriated. In the Post Office Department's appropriation bill for 1948, the House approved an appropriation of $295,300,000 for city delivery service. This is $7,300,000 more than

was available for this service in the current fiscal year. The amount passed by the House represents a reduction of only one-tenth of 1 percent from the budget requests, or only $338,000 less than the President asked for. Obviously such a small reduction from the estimates would not have the effect of curtailing any carrier service.

I do not believe that it is the policy of the Post Office to curtail service, for the First Assistant Postmaster General made this statement to the subcommittee in February of this year:

During the war it was the policy of the Department to restrict city delivery service to the minimum requirements that will meet the bare needs of the public. Following the termination of the war the Department has been restoring this service to prewar standards as rapidly as practicable. Indicative of this is the fact that the number of regular city delivery carriers increased from 57,993 as of June 30, 1945, to 65,770 as of June 30, 1946, an increase of 7,777.

I have every reason to assume that postal officials in Washington are giving active consideration to the restoration of prewar delivery service, and I feel that the Congress is and has been cooperating with the Department in this respect. It is not only because two deliveries a day are a convenience to the public that such service should be restored as rapidly as possible, but also because mail held over night presents a storage problem for the local post offices, and facilities for this storage are not always available.

This House also has been most generous to the Post Office Department in providing for post office clerks. Even in the face of the Nation-wide demand for economy, the House increased the amounts granted for delivery service, and also placed the largest single increase in the bill, $9,784,000 over the 1947 figures, for clerks in first and second class post offices. For this purpose $487,000,000 was placed in the bill, a reduction of less than one-tenth of 1 percent, and this is in addition to $24,000,000 for clerks in third class post offices—about half a million dollars more than granted in 1947.

It can be pointed out that during the month of March 1947, 2,529 people were added to the Post Office rolls, and 1,794 of these were in the bureau of the First Assistant Postmaster General, who has charge of clerk and delivery service.

I do not believe that the propaganda being put out now about curtailment of service due to insufficient appropriations made by the Republican-controlled Congress is inspired by the active authorities in the Post Office Department here in Washington.

The appropriation bill to which I am referring is the bill for the fiscal year 1948, which starts next July 1. The Post Office Department is at present running under appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 which were passed by the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress, and on page 1881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 10, 1947, you will find the boast of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that the Post Office subcommittee last year cut much deeper into the budget estimates for the Post Office Department than did this year's subcommittee. On page 1886 you will find this statement by the former chairman of the appropriations committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], now ranking minority member:

As has been said, this bill cuts the estimates for the Post Office Department only $14,000,000. Why, we cut the Post Office budget last year $19,000,000. And this is not the most significant feature of it. They are cutting the $14,000,000 this year from a budget which exceeds $1,500,000,000. Last year we cut $19,000,000 from a budget of only $1,200,000,000.

Further along, the gentleman makes this statement:

You cannot point out a single dismissal in the entire Post Office Department.

And then he says this:

I deplore and deprecate the reckless and profligate extravagance of these spenders who now refuse to cut the budget on a $1,500,000,000 estimate as much as we cut it last year on a $1,200,000,000 estimate.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] then asked this question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

Do I understand that in this bill which provides for 490,000 bureaucrats in the Post Office Department not one bureaucrat is cut off?

And Mr. CANNON answered:

Not one single bureaucrat. Not a single Communist. Not a single boondoggler. Of all the teeming hordes of parasites and chiselers and loafers and fan dancers and subversives we were told last November were infesting the Department of the Government, not a single one is being separated from his soft job in the entire Post Office Department. Every one of them is being retained by this bill—at the largest salaries ever paid in the history of the Government.

It is obvious that these members of the minority did not think then that there would be a curtailment of service under the 1948 bill. In fact, they objected that we did not cut more deeply and curtail some services.

And they also point out why there is any difficulty with the postal service today, and why in part it has been necessary for the Eightieth Congress to pass two deficiency appropriation bills to enable the Post Office to struggle along till June 30. If postal service is being curtailed today, my friends, it is because the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress did not grant sufficient funds, and if the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had not approved two deficiency bills for the Post Office all service would have been drastically curtailed and severely crippled.

THE WOOL SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about this wool situation. First of all, I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts to the fact that the bill he is opposing was sent to the House by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson, and was referred by our distinguished Speaker to the Committee on Agriculture.

I am sure that if he would look at the other side of this picture he would not really take the position he takes here today. I personally feel that the embarassing wool situation is a result of the war. The first accumulation or stock pile we had in this country came as a result of the war. The first 300,000,000 pounds were brought over here from Australia to be kept safely so that the Japs could not get hold of it. We seem to forget the commitments we made to the rural people. Some people appear to think that those commitments are scraps of paper. There is too much of that attitude in the atmosphere at the present time. If any administration—I do not care what administration it is—desires during wartime to make definite, certain commitments and certain promises, then when the war is over say, "We are not going to follow them out," they can, if they so desire, take that position. I do not subscribe to such a position.

There is no reason to get into any partisan or political controversy in connection with this wool problem. This accumulation of 460,000,000 pounds of wool came as a result of the war. The wool people were promised a price that may seem high to some people, but it must be remembered that wool never skyrocketed like some other farm products did. It was frozen at that time. The price was frozen for the purpose of providing wool for the war. We cannot just walk out on the wool people. While wool showed a 14-percent advance in price, some other farm products doubled in price.

I say, in all fairness, if we are going to bring this wool bill on the floor and make a political football out of it, I am sure a lot of people are going to have a red face because, so far as the Republicans are concerned, we are trying to get our good Democratic friends out of a mess that they got themselves into. They should not be criticized for being in the mess either. I think every one of us owes an obligation to try to get rid of this 460,000,000 pounds of wool with the least possible loss to the United States Treasury. We should be sure that we do not ruin the sheep business in America too.

I say that for several reasons. First, we have not any forty or fifty million dollars to lose; second, if we go to work and lose forty to sixty million dollars on this wool program, together with the $90,000,000 loss we sustained in supporting the potato price, part of which loss was due to maladministration, we might as well forget the whole Steagall amendment and the whole support program. Do you, my colleagues, wish to run out on the Steagall amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I hope when this bill comes on the floor of the House every Member will approach it from the standpoint that it is a war casualty, that we can get rid of that stock pile without any great loss to the United States Treasury;

that we should make a nonpartisan approach to iron out the problem.

I have listened about how wonderful this imported wool is, but I call attention to the fact that the wool which the boys in the American Army wore was domestic wool. It was good enough for them. If it was good enough for them it is good enough for the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if and when the wool bill comes on the floor I hope we can approach consideration of it in such way that the bill will be passed unanimously; we need not think about any particular segment of this country but think about the welfare of the United States Treasury, the welfare of our country and about fulfilling the commitments we made during the war to the rural people of America. They have performed their work well and for the best interest of America we should religiously follow every commitment of the Steagall amendment.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF VE-DAY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular coincidence that on this the second anniversary of VE-day we find ourselves still concerned about the plight of this troubled world.

Two full years have come and gone since our victory over Germany, which was followed a few months thereafter by a like victory over Japan. Surely all of us had a right to hope for peace, especially after the expenditure of such unprecedented quantities of both human life and wealth.

We have now for some days been debating the pending bill, which provides for financial assistance to Greece and Turkey, with the hope that we may thus further stay the hand of aggression and ultimately secure the peace we so much desire.

It is not easy to decide what position one should take concerning this important matter. We cannot take snap judgment in order to properly decide this important issue. We must not only call upon our own strength and wisdom but rely upon God Himself.

Our decision on this matter may, for all we know, determine the future of the entire world.

Years ago the poet Lowell gave us these lines:

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

These lines seem to be most appropriate at this time. The passage of this bill is by no means absolute assurance that the free countries of Greece and Turkey will survive, but, in my judgment, the failure to pass the measure will mean that the ever-expanding influence of communism will engulf these countries.

Turkey and Greece constitute the ramparts of democracy along the Mediterranean shores and we dare not longer sit supinely by and allow time to be swallowed up by communism where not even a semblance of freedom would be left.

Some weeks ago the President in a personal message delivered to us in this very Chamber pointed out the gravity of the international situation with reference to the spread of communism. The Senate after full and thorough hearings has already passed this measure. Our present great Secretary of State, a man with as comprehensive knowledge of world affairs as ever lived, has repeatedly urged the prompt and speedy enactment of this measure. Whether to follow or not to follow the President's program for aid to Greece and Turkey is a fateful and difficult decision to make, but the decision must be made and I am convinced that to decide against this measure would mean that we have all but forfeited our last hope for eventual universal peace.

We are standing today almost alone in this confused world demonstrating that a living, working democracy can live.

Our Nation alone holds out the hope for dispelling the fears for the future which now besets the world. We are leading the peoples of this earth by precept and example to that state of security and peace for which our sons have given their lives.

Ours is the responsibility for preserving and extending democracy and freedom. That responsibility cannot be shirked. Great Britain's international influence and power has been seriously impaired. We must take our rightful place of leadership. We can only exercise and discharge our responsibilities if we are alert and strong, and if we stand determined against the spread of communism.

The passage of this measure today will give heart and courage to our friends around the world. Our affirmative action will restore faith in democracy as a dynamic power for good throughout the earth. We must by our acts here and now further repudiate isolationism and appeasement in a world where these policies have and are leading us down the road to war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), from May 8 to May 13, 1947, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 8, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act 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;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

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. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. An act to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. An act to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

663. A letter from the Chief Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a certified copy of the special findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion of the court in a case that was decided May 5, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

664. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; without amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3376. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend section 73 of the Organic Act of Hawaii, relating to opening of agricultural lands for settlement; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3378. A bill relating to the completion of Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3379. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act to include embezzled vehicles and aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3380. A bill relating to the computation of Federal grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 3381. A bill to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the educational benefits granted therein to veterans of World War II to the widows and children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3382. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to remove the obligation of employers in certain on-the-job training programs of reporting payments of overtime salaries or wages to veteran trainees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3383. A bill for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3384. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3385. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3386. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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 Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 149, a bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2180, a bill which extends to Puerto Rico the benefits of the Reclamation Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the housing laws in such manner as to allow the occupancy of housing units by families other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John A. Hogg and Mrs. Leona Pearl Hogg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3390. A bill to provide that the name of Fred S. Knisley be added to the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

469. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 33 citizens of Unadilla, Dunbar, and Syracuse, Nebr., urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

470. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mr. R. A. Sjobery, secretary, Federated Shop Crafts, Aberdeen, S. Dak., and 151 other signers requesting support to defeat H. R. 2169 and H. R. 2310, which propose to amend the so-called Crosser amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

471. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of South Jersey Association of Water Superintendents, urging a restoration of the authorization for the United States Geological Survey to do ground-water work and that adequate funds be appropriated for such work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

472. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of the Englewood Zionist District, Englewood, N. J., relative to the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. By the SPEAKER: Petition of a New Haven emergency committee for displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 2910, the Stratton bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

474. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

475. Also, petition of the Model Agri-Pisci-Poultry and Cattle Farm, South Arcot district, India, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the availability of funds for a farm-trust plan in India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose wisdom our finite minds cannot comprehend, we rejoice in the revelation which Thou hast made of Thyself as the guiding intelligence and the overruling Father.

Grant that in all the deliberations and decisions of this day we may be sensitive to the leading of Thy spirit, holding our own desires in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will. We pray that we may appropriate with increasing tenacity of faith the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

May it be the goal of our aspirations to attain unto the likeness of our blessed Lord. Help us to hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction when the chasms which divide the members of the human family shall be bridged by friendship, and all the barriers which impede the progress of the Kingdom of Brotherhood shall be supplanted by the kind and gentle spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.