Without assuming to approve this entire section of a technical bill, we applaud the determination of both Houses of Congress to restore this balance.

Something must also be done to give the Government power to deal with strikes that imperil the national safety or welfare. We do not think, however, that the Senate Committee has done much better than the House in handling this delicate problem. It would permit such strikes to be halted by injunction upon request of the Attorney General after he has had an investigation made by a board of inquiry. An injunction might remain in effect 60 days and the Board in that period could subject the parties to the pressures of publicity. An election would finally be held, if no settlement were otherwise effected, in which the employees would be asked if they wished to accept the last offer of their employers. Then the injunction would be discharged and the President would report the whole proceedings to Congress. Surely the Senate can do better than this in creating a protective device that will save our economy from paralysis and at the same time be fair to employees and employers alike. We hope that the Senate will subject the bill to the same rigid scrutiny that it gave the Greek-aid bill, with the single purpose of effecting improvements without weakening any of the safeguards now recognized as being essential to make collective bargaining work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana has given a rather comprehensive and clear explanation of the provisions of the substitute and of the distinctions between it and the bill reported by the committee.

The substitute was sent to the desk only a short time ago. Of course, Senators have had no opportunity to examine it or to attend in large numbers to hear the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

Therefore, I wonder whether it would be inappropriate to suggest the reasonableness of having the matter go over until the Senate resumes its session at 11 o'clock on Monday, at which time debate on the substitute or upon the committee bill may be resumed. I should like to address the Senate at that time upon the subject.

I wish to repeat what I said a while ago, that I personally think the debate upon the substitute and the bill should run certainly through Monday. At any time after Monday, beginning with the session on Tuesday, I personally shall be ready to vote on the substitute or on any amendments or upon the question of the final passage of the bill. I think it not unwise or unreasonable that the Senate debate at least through Monday, or have the privilege of debate at least through Monday, the substitute or any other possible amendments to the bill itself. Neither the proponents nor the opponents of the main bill have had any appreciable time to address themselves to the bill as a whole or to the substitute as a whole, which in an affirmative way present alternative approaches to the problem.

So, Mr. President, at this time of the night I see no necessity for detaining the Senate, when Senators have not had an opportunity to read the substitute or to hear the explanation which has been made of it. So I wonder whether the acting majority leader will be disposed to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday. If so, and if it is consistent with the pleasure of the majority leader and of the Senate, I should like to address myself to the substitute and to the bill, beginning with the session on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure in my own mind that the suggestion made by the able Senator from Florida is fair. I think the substitute should be debated, and I think we should look it over.

In view of the request which has been made and in view of the inability to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the time for voting, if agreeable to the Senate I should like now to suggest that the Senate take a recess until Monday at 11 a. m.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that I hope the Senate will take a recess at this time, and that the substitute will be printed.

I had not expected to speak on this subject; but in view of the form into which I think this proposed labor legislation is shaping itself, I shall desire to speak after the Senator from Florida and other Senators who may wish to speak are heard from, because I do not think it worth while for the Senate to pass a labor bill which will mean absolutely nothing to the American people.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. AIKEN introduced Senate bill 1263, for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1264. A bill to extend the time within which alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces may be admitted into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 1, COLCHESTER, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Prudential Committee of Fire District No. 1, of the town of Colchester, Vt., I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill. I request that an explanatory statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Vermont will be presented in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1263) for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., introduced by Mr. AIKEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

In 1941 the fire district was in the process of building a new sewer line as a WPA project. At the same time the Army was seeking new sewerage facilities necessitated by the expansion of Fort Ethan Allen, which borders upon the fire district. The Army and the fire district entered into an agreement whereby the Army was to take over and complete the sewer line for the district in consideration of the district's allowing the Army to tap onto and use the sewer. In this agreement the Army reserved the right to repair and did in fact repair one break in 1943.

In the latter part of the same year other breaks occurred which the Army would not repair. The district subsequently made the repairs, at a cost of $10,562.07. For this expenditure the district was reimbursed by the Congress by Private Law 473, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 13, 1944.

Again in 1946 breaks occurred in the sewer which were repaired by the district. The total cost was $30,190.16 and it is the purpose of this bill to reimburse the district for this sum.

The Army has heretofore admitted that these numerous breaks were caused by the failure to use proper construction methods originally.

I have consulted with the Office of the Legislative Counsel and they have informed me that, in their opinion, this bill is not banned by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, inasmuch as this claim arises from the contract between the Army and the fire district and therefore is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 12, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, as we tread the aisles of life, make us one with our fellow men—one in faith, one in sacrifice, and one in endurance. As Thou dost teach us the larger meaning of human life, make us humbly glad to live in these challenging times; may we not shun, but glory, in the pain which provides the elements of victory, thus making the wrath of man to praise Thee.

Do Thou bless our Speaker and the Congress. In these hours of honest striving, enable them to fulfill their highest aims, that contentment may abound with industry and that all may be brought within the circle of peace and happy hearthstones. O fashion all lives, from the humblest to the chiefest, putting virtue above success and devotion to our Lord above every other loyalty. Use us in enriching the lives of others and by our ministry bring them to the heights. In the name of Him who said to all men: "Our Father." Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News.

GREEK-TURKISH AID

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, right after President Truman delivered his message to the Congress, asking aid for both Turkey and Greece, I realized that this would be the most important and far-reaching problem we in the Congress would be asked to decide this session. For this reason I immediately brought this matter to the attention of my constituents through my next news letter. In that letter I tried to give an unbiased opinion and asked for comments from those who had studied the problem. The letters that followed that request were very encouraging. I was pleased to learn that many of my people had already given serious thought to this drastic change in our foreign policy. The majority of my constituents favored our giving aid, but a large percentage felt that the United Nations should not be bypassed.

As the debate on this bill continues, many feel that the United Nations, imperfect as it is, must be given the opportunity to determine what is the best procedure. From the beginning I have supported the United Nations organization, hoping that this representative group would become so strong and effective we might forever be assured of everlasting peace. Millions all over the world, I am sure, have that same hope. Let us not be ready to throw the United Nations out of the window until we have given it a real test and a fair trial. However, if it is proved during the debate that action is imperative and that the United Nations cannot at this time take care of this proposition, I feel I shall vote for the bill because I believe its passage is essential for our national security. As a nation, we cannot afford to sit back and rest on our laurels. This is a world problem, and as the leading nation in this world, we have our responsibilities. We, as a nation, have talked of preserving liberty, of promoting democracy and freedom. History has proved that we cannot sit back and accomplish these things. Personally, I do not believe the passage of this bill means war. Quite to the contrary, I believe it expresses the willingness on the part of our great country to fight totalitarianism, and this fact will stamp out the threats calculated to destroy liberty.

HAS UNCLE SAM FORGOTTEN OUR OLD FOLKS?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering opening the Public Treasury to send $400,000,000 overseas, much of which, according to plan, is to be used for developing the resources, economy, and for relief of the peoples of foreign lands, some of whom did not join with us in the recent war. The United States since the war's end has made available for world aid $21,058,422,818, as follows:

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
World Fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain, Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,422,818

Would it not be good judgment while considering this huge expenditure for the Congress to grant some relief to the old folks here in America as well? There are in excess of 10,000,000 American citizens over the age of 60 years, many of them in want and distress, yet the Congress has denied their appeals down through the years for some relief. Many of them receive a stipend of old-age assistance of less than $10 per month and the average is a little more than $25 a month, while living costs are mounting skyward. I urge consideration of H. R. 16 now while these funds are still available to give some ray of hope to our old folks at home. Let us bring the bill out on the floor for a debate and passage.

GREEK-TURKISH AID

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district want to stop communism and want to give reasonable aid to the peoples of Europe. I have not participated in the debate of H. R. 2616, known as the loan to Greece and Turkey, as I felt certain others here were more qualified to speak on the subject. So for 3 days I have sat and listened, and have come to the definite conclusion that this undertaking, which would give $400,000,000, including an unknown amount of military aid to Turkey and Greece, is the first step in a program which would eventually become world-wide in scope. Further, I am convinced that this administration is again starting on an over-all plan to extend aid, both financial and military, to Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, China, Korea, Iraq, Arabia, Iran, and possibly some other countries, including Russia. We are again starting to use American dollars and soldiers to settle the political and domestic quarrels of a foreign nation, which is contrary to American tradition.

In my opinion this contemplated program will cost ten to fifteen billion dollars, and might possibly lead to war. I recall what Mr. Churchill, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, said before the Second World War, and I quote: "Give us the implements and we will do the job."

Certainly this program is open to criticism. Government officials are not taking the people into their confidence. Why does our State Department not tell the true and full picture of where this program might lead? The people will have to contribute every dollar, and if the worst should come—if war should develop as a result of the clash of ideologies—the people would have to do the fighting, the suffering, and the dying.

Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress has an obligation to support his conscience and his own convictions, and some of us, at least, have a deep conviction that this bill, H. R. 2616, the loan to Greece and Turkey, is going to lead us right down the road to bread lines, bankruptcy, or to war all over the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

OUR NEW FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, the message of President Truman to Congress on March 12, 1947, promulgated a new American foreign policy, in proposing to extend financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey, and to asume new political responsibilities in the Mediterranean area.

This new step imposes upon us, as American citizens, a grave responsibility and because of our special interest and knowledge of the conditions in the Near East, I would like to present certain important facts for the serious consideration of our Government, and point out the far-reaching implications of the proposed new foreign policy in the Near East.

We saved the world from Hitlerism at a cost of $300,000,000,000 plus the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives of our American youth. Now we are asked to save the world from communism at a cost that can neither be estimated nor predicated. This first request of $400,000,000 is only the beginning. It means that President Truman's new foreign policy will also mean that Uncle Sam ac-

cepts the role of world policeman; that from now on he will have to furnish the military might required to stop trouble wherever and whenever it arises in any corner of the world. It will mean that he has taken over the responsibilities and obligations that we had hoped a strong United Nations organization would assume and carry.

During the last days of World War II conflict we had appeased Russia and permitted her to disseminate propaganda throughout eastern Europe, Greece, and Italy, thus dominating the greater part of that section of the world. Her power was felt in Italy and aided materially through UNRRA, startling the world with its 2,250,000 votes in the last election.

Let us not forget that this work was carried on in Italy before the very eyes of our military government, the very entrances to their offices were placarded with "Vote Communista." No attempt was made then, nor since, in behalf of Italy, to ward off this communistic trend. Why now the cry to save Greece and Turkey? Is it to save England's face or the oil fields of Iran and Iraq for the rich promoters? How much easier it would have been to help Italy after she became a cobelligerent, with her problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation, rather than now by the cry, "Help Greece and Turkey to save Italy."

The proposed Italian peace treaty, which is before the Senate today, is a drastic one and should not be ratified. If ratified in its present form, Italy will be rendered helpless before her Communist dominated neighbor Yugoslavia, whose dictator, Tito, is a Charlie McCarthy of Stalin.

Thus the provisions of the Italian peace treaty, that the United States has agreed to, go absolutely contrary to President Truman's announced foreign policy in connection with aid to Greece and Turkey. On the one hand we strengthen Stalin's hands by weakening Italy, and on the other hand we propose to strengthen Greece and Turkey in order to block Tito and Stalin. Does this make sense? Can Uncle Sam ride with the hounds and run with the hare at one and the same time?

Communism cannot be fought with bullets. To defeat communism you must prevent hunger and starvation. You must feed them, shelter them, and clothe them. Have we done this for the people of Italy? If we had the votes in their last election would have been 2,250 instead of 2,250,000 Communist votes.

If America is sincere in fighting communism, why then did she, through the action of her representatives to the United Nations, vote not to recognize Franco? Why does she still give aid to the communistic forces in the Far East?

I believe America can enhance her prestige and win the admiration and respect of the people everywhere only by championing the cause of justice and decency.

Wake up, America. Watch your step. You might be sowing the seeds of World War III.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously 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. 53]

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Preston
Battle	Hand	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Bland	Hart	Sabath
Bonner	Hartley	St. George
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Camp	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Jensen	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Kennedy	Somers
Cox	Keogh	Stanley
Crosser	McDowell	Taylor
Curtis	McGarvey	Thomas, N. J.
D'Alesandro	Macy	Thomason
Davis, Tenn.	Maloney	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Dingell	Meade, Ky.	Wilson, Ind.
Dirksen	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Fellows	Mitchell	Wood
Fisher	Morrison	Worley
Fuller	Norrell	Zimmerman
Gifford	O'Hara	
Gossett	Owens	
Grant, Ind.	Ploeser	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, many Members have asked me about the program in respect to the consideration of this bill and final action thereon. So, I have asked for this minute in order to announce for the information of the Members that the consideration of the bill will continue through the day. If it is not finally concluded this evening, consideration will continue on tomorrow. However, it is hoped that there will be sufficient and ample time for discussion of all matters in connection with the bill and amendments during the day so that action can be concluded this evening.

CONGRESS WILL HONOR THEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, that the ideals of American youth are still secure and sound foundation material upon which the future of the American Government may rest with confidence was demonstrated here Tuesday when Dick Smith, Virginia Marakle, Ruth Pigott, and Virginia Lanham, four Western High School students of Washington stopped their ears against the godless ideology of communism that was being preached to them in a lecture and got up and marched out of the school building as a fitting rebuke to the speaker, a Mrs. Lewis, the Russian-born wife of a former American envoy.

The spirit of Paul Revere was exemplified, and their patriotic action will arouse millions of Americans throughout our land to the dangerous inroads communism is making into our schools and colleges. Here is a story the press and the motion-picture industry of the Nation should spread before all the people. It will help to clean the Communist cells and rat nests out of our institutions of learning.

Congress, the representatives of the people, will honor these four fine young people in a fitting ceremony Tuesday afternon at 5 o'clock in the Ways and Means Committee room. It is said that Speaker MARTIN and other congressional leaders will eulogize their actions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "In the Nation," by Arthur Krock.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Tablet.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper items.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a copy of a letter from a constituent to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address Our Stake in Greece, delivered by Mr. Paul A. Porter before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two telegrams from officials of the city of Shreveport.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the agricultural program.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram he received from, and a telegram he sent to, the North Adams Chamber of Commerce.

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 there were pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and an amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be again reported.

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

There was no objection.

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."

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD to the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Strike out the figure "100" and insert the figure "200."

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third day that the House has spent in the consideration of this legislation. If we go over to tomorrow, many of our Members would be forced to be away. I sincerely hope, and I believe it is the hope of us all, that we can get through this bill today with plenty of time for all the discussion of the bill that is necessary.

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

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever come before the Congress. If, in order to get a vote on this bill today, they are going to try to rush it through, the Nation will suffer irreparable damage I think you should continue this for a week or a month if necessary. I do not think you ought to try to close it today. It ought to continue until the American people know what is happening.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this is very important legislation, but I believe that the intelligence is so high in this body that we ought to be able to solve the problem in 4 days. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to go on until the end of time.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MERROW. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want the people of my district and the people of the country to know that I am vigorously supporting this legislation without crippling amendments because of its political, strategic, and, if you please, especially because of its military aspects.

I wonder what we are afraid of. The security of the United States is at stake. There are no longer any frontiers. Our interests are global. What has happened during the past few years? Mr. Stalin and his associates have expanded as rapidly as possible. They have spread communism wherever and whenever possible. They have organized Communist Parties in every country where it is possible to organize them, including our own. They have not kept their solemn agreements, including Potsdam, Yalta, and the Atlantic Charter. They have not lived up to the spirit of the United Nations.

Furthermore, in reference to Greece, Moscow-controlled Communists are ready to take over. In connection with Turkey, Russia has demanded bases on the Dardanelles. From the activities of Russia it is apparent that the Soviet Union is on the road to world domination.

I would like to know how much longer this country is going to be insulted by those who are in control of the Soviet Government before we are willing to take firm action. How much longer do both sides of our face have to be slapped before we are willing to take a stand?

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Would not this amendment or either of them be an appeasement of Russia and tie the hands of our administration?

Mr. MERROW. Exactly. I am glad the gentleman has made this observation. We tried appeasement through the 1930's. We tried to appease Hitler, and we failed. Since the end of World War II we have been trying to appease Soviet Russia, and we have completely failed. In addition, the Russians have deadlocked every conference, and now they hope that we will become weary with exhaustion and finally begin to make compromises on principles.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The outside limit of this amendment is 200 men. Russia has more spies than that in this country now.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly. She has the largest land army in the world. I wonder if it is not possible for us to learn from the all too recent bitter lesson of history. When Mr. Hitler invaded the Rhineland, many said it was no concern of ours. We were not willing to do anything about it. We insisted that we would keep out of European difficulties. I say, if we had had the Truman doctrine then, a doctrine which I hope will become the American doctrine, we probably would have avoided World War II. This is recent history. Within the last few years we have seen history repeating itself.

We are attempting to limit the number of military men we are to send to Greece and Turkey. Whatever number is necessary to send in order to stop the Russian march to world domination ought to be sent. We ought to take an immediate stand.

The alternative to action in the Mediterranean area is too horrible and too awful to contemplate. If Turkey falls, as has been said again and again, then the eastern Mediterranean will go and finally the Mediterranean will become a Soviet lake. All of Europe will be under the control of Russia. This will mean trouble and we will not have the time for preparation we had in World War II. There will be no England or France to give us time to get ready. One of the best things we can do in this country is to establish and keep a strong Army and a strong Navy. Yesterday I was glad to hear someone make a plea for a strong air force. I have often said we should maintain air supremacy at all costs. I believe that firm and resolute action now will save millions of American lives in the future.

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

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order to answer the gentleman's questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree absolutely with the gentleman's statement with reference to appeasement. However, would it not be much more forthright for us to ask for mobilization of our forces now?

Mr. MERROW. That may be; and if you are willing to do that, why should you oppose this bill and advocate crippling amendments?

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I assume the gentleman would also favor the proposition of stopping any shipment of essential materials to Russia or any country dominated by Russia?

Mr. MERROW. Well, the gentleman may be talking about the recent lend-lease agreement, which is another subject. We entered into solemn agreements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly, the gentleman has stated that Russia has broken every agreement she has made with our country.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And still the gentleman wants us to go through with the other agreement.

Mr. MERROW. I did not state that I wished to go through with the agreements. I think they should be carefully considered and if it is necessary to stop communism, we should stop shipments.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we are to try to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, why do we not go out to the Uline Arena where there are 400 of them right now in our own city?

Mr. MERROW. All right. I am willing to stop communism in the United States, but that is no argument against action to halt the march of Russia to world domination. If Europe falls and the Mediterranean and oil of the Persian Gulf is cut off, the United States is in peril.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The substance of your remarks, as I understand them, is you think that war with Russia is inevitable. If you believe that, why do you not ask for a declaration of war?

Mr. MERROW. I do not think it is inevitable, but I think the passage of this measure will undoubtedly prevent war with Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are starting it now.

Mr. MERROW. If Russia thinks this is a declaration of war, then let her make the most of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. That is what you want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, toward the close of debate yesterday, according to page 4820 of the RECORD, there are 14 of us who, I thought, were going to be given time to speak on this amendment. I just mention that, because I hope we will not be shut off in this move to hurry this bill through. Are those 14 men still to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. However, the Chair will state that no request was submitted. The request was withdrawn.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry on the matter of procedure?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly will.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee stated this morning that he hoped we would finish this bill today. He also said he would like to have an opportunity for those who have not yet been heard to be heard; yet the first move when we started the debate was for a member of the committee to ask for two additional minutes. Now another member of the committee is recognized. I am very glad to hear him, but I am wondering if Members other than members of the committee are going to be heard. I will ask the chairman of the committee to answer my question.

Mr. EATON. That, I think, rests on the initiative of the Members themselves who want to be heard. I decline to accept responsibility for parceling out the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But under the rule, the Chairman perforce must recognize members of the committee first.

Mr. EATON. The chairman of the committee did not make the rules and declines to accept responsibility for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but he does have some restriction, I suppose, over the members of the committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, how much of my time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute of the gentleman's time has been consumed.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, unless some other Members of the House are going to be recognized other than members of the committee, I will have to object to future requests of this nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his time for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for the balance of his 5 minutes and for two additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope to nail down these two amendments that have been submitted to tie the hands of the American Government and to keep our representatives from exercising good administrative sense either now or in the future under the future circumstances as they arise.

Why do I say I am against these amendments? Because they say to the world—and they are sponsored by very fine members of our Foreign Affairs Committee—that they tie the hands of America. Why not include in the amendments a similar provision that would bind Joe Stalin's hands? If they would modify the amendments and say that they are going to bind Joseph Stalin just as they are going to bind the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of State and the President, then I, too, would be for the amendments.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It seems to me like an invitation to Joe Stalin to come and get us. In effect it says: "Come and get us. We are over here helpless, innocuous, inane; come and get us."

Mr. FULTON. That is a very fine statement, Judge.

It was the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], who said on yesterday:

> It seems to me that this amendment is just one more illustration of the thought a great many people have, that if we only tie our own hands we are safe.

Maybe we had better be talking about someone else's hands rather than trying to emasculate our own foreign policy.

I am against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and against the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], for another reason: The numbers 100 and 200 suggested by each of these men in their respective amendments have no relationship to actuality, they have no relationship to any reason. They are numbers just taken out of the air because they said: "Well, Secretary Patterson estimated 10 to 40." The gentleman from South Dakota said "I will double it," and then the gentleman from Minnesota came along and said: "I will double Mr. MUNDT's figure." Now, if you are just going to reach around and pick figures out of the air you are going to tie the handcuffs on yourselves without knowing their size.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman read the language on page 4 of the committee report, in the paragraph headed "Kind of military assistance proposed." The committee made this official statement to the Congress and the world:

> Testimony of Government witnesses indicates that the military mission to Greece would probably not exceed 40, and the naval mission would probably be less. In the case of Turkey it is expected that the missions would not be larger.

Is that picked out of thin air?

Mr. FULTON. All right; then why did the gentleman say "200"? Why did not the gentleman stay closer to 40?

Mr. JUDD. I was allowing for emergencies that might arise. I do not, as I said yesterday, want to limit in the slightest degree the United States. But the Congress which has the responsibility under the Constitution for declaring war ought to make clear to the country in the bill itself what the limitations are that the Congress of the United States is placing on the military of the United States in line with what the committee states in its official report is its understanding of those limitations.

Mr. FULTON. The trouble with the gentleman's estimate is that he is only taking into consideration little emergencies. He is not taking the big ones into consideration.

If we will notice the reason for putting these amendments in, and if we will look at them the way the gentlemen themselves look at them we may get an idea. For instance, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said in committee:

> I think it would be very comforting to the American public to have this limit.

The gentleman has forgotten that it will be comforting to Joe Stalin and a lot of people over there too.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says:

> I think we could pick up a great many votes here in the House of Representatives if we were all assured and voted for these amendments.

I disagree with the gentleman from Minnesota on that and will not change

this bill to pick up votes. We take it the way it is or leave it. We have to look the problem straight in the face and not avoid it by amendment. We better meet the issue and not try to hang a little sweetmeat on the bill to attract votes. I am not here to attract votes.

It has been brought out by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that the Secretary said one thing. However, the Secretary came back to an executive session and said he had made a mistake. The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], a member of our committee, very ably brought that out when he said yesterday that the Secretary stated in the second hearing it would be most unwise to tie the hands of his Department and the Navy Department in reference to this point.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] said she is for these amendments because the purpose of the proposal, as she sees it, is not troops but it is economy.

People do want to economize. May I say that if you are trying to guess far ahead on economy in the future in a world such as we have today, you better try to do some real guessing.

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?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I shall not burden you again by my suggestions in regard to this bill, and I think I shall not, but it lies deeply in my heart the thing that we are considering at this time, and I felt impelled to say what I have said and now feel impelled to speak again. The difference between you and me is simply this: I am not alarmed like you who are supporting this bill are. Christianity has been a religion in this world for about 2,000 years, yet less than half of the people of the world have accepted it. No philosophy, whether true or untrue, is going to sweep this world like you say it will. Communism is not going to make the inroads that you say it will.

I respect your sincerity; I know you are honest, honorable, and upright men and women; I know you are capable men and women; I know you want to do the right thing; but, in my judgment, you are doing the wrong thing. My judgment is that you are filled with fear and hysteria that has been superinduced by publicity to the point where you have lost your heads and you are going to do an unseemly thing because of all this propaganda. Now, that is my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experiences in my own life that have taught me some things.

For instance, I was a kid 18 years old and I enlisted as a soldier in the First World War. I fought in half a dozen of the bloodiest battles ever fought in that World War. They told us most every day in the newspapers that the Germans were cutting the arms off of Belgian children, crucifying Canadian soldiers, pitching up children and catching them on their bayonets. I got over there and found that none of that was true.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of this Committee, I call your attention to the fact that when people become alarmed, when they become scared, when they become so zealous about a situation, they always overstate the case, and the case here is being overstated, I tell you. Logic teaches me that communism cannot defeat democracy. If we will just sit steady in the boat and serve our people well in this great country of ours, if we will give them the service they are entitled to, we will stop communism in its tracks. It cannot get anywhere in the world.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that he has no fear of Russian expansion in this area. If so, if there is no desire on the part of Russia to move into this area, what difference will it make how many people we have over there? Whom will we harm? Whom will we offend? If Russia has no expansionist desires, how are you going to offend anybody by sending these people over there?

Mr. MORRIS. I did not say that Russia has no expansionist desires. Of course they have expansionist desires. But my point is, they cannot expand like you say they can. We will resist them. The people of the other nations will resist them and the world will resist them.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman means that the 200 will resist them and that the 200 will be adequate to inspire those people to stand up against the largest army in the world? Or had we not better tell those people we are going to back them up? Is not that what this is for? We are telling them we are backing them up with all we have.

Mr. MORRIS. Give me time to answer the question, if you please. I want to retain in the power of this Congress the right to declare war, and if we send them over there, with unlimited power, and do not reserve the constitutional right to declare war, we do not know what kind of an incident is going to happen, and they could send an army over there and we would be helpless, and we may be catapulted into a war, with the hatred that so many seem to have in their hearts, with the desire that we seem to have, and I am sorry to say, my friends, but the desire we seem to have, as is exemplified here every day, is to practically run the world. That is the program we are getting into. I know our purpose is noble; of course it is. I know we are going in for a noble purpose, but we went into the First World War with a noble purpose. We were going over there to make the world safe for democracy. We were going over there to fight a war to end all wars, and I fought as hard as anybody could fight, and it is worse now than it was then.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are today considering what kind of assistance we propose to give to two countries that have asked us for help in stemming the tide of influences that is being brought to bear upon them by outside forces. We heard in the committee many things of deep interest, with which many of us were already conversant. Most of us were in agreement with the administration, that it is imperative for us to do something for these countries.

As the bill is written, what we propose is not military action. We do not propose under this bill to replace the garrison troops the British have. We have been asked for assistance in training; we propose to give assistance in training. The fact that the Secretary of War, in the beginning, said that under 50 men were all that would be needed and that he later on apparently told the committee that it would be unwise to make such a limitation seems to me to present us with a very real problem.

For myself, I should like to see this House amend this bill in some fashion to make it very clear that what we propose to send over there is a training mission and not combat troops. From my own personal knowledge of the situation, I feel that any show of armed troops at this time would very likely bring upon the world something which neither Russia nor the United States anticipates or wants. I should be exceedingly reluctant to believe that we do not have the courage to make it very clear that we do not propose that kind of action. If there ever was a moment in history that needs restraint, it is this moment. I would urge upon this House the need for great wisdom and great restraint in the action it takes at this time.

Naturally, there are going to be many interests that are going to try to bring pressure upon the War Department and the Navy Department to send troops to guard whatever is done there. I am very reluctant to have us permit ourselves the temptation of armed forces. I should like to see a very clear definition of what it is that we propose to do. It is very apparent from the discussion on the floor that the Members are not clear as to the intent and purpose in this bill, and certainly, if the Members are confused, we cannot expect the people to be clear in their minds as to what we really expect to do. For myself, I do not see this as the moment or the occasion for military troops, and I should prefer to see some such statement in the text. I do see it very much the occasion for specialists of every sort and kind, including the military, that there may be a rebirth of hope in the hearts of all the sorely-tried, freedom-loving people of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree with the very able remarks just made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. Certainly under the language of the bill, it is very clear that what she so ably stated is the intention of the Congress and of our Government.

I again read the language in the bill, and I think it is the strongest language the committee could put in other than

something along the lines of either one of the two pending amendments, which I think it would be unwise to adopt. The bill says, "By detailing a limited number of members of the military services." "Limited" is a word of restriction. It is further restricted by saying that those sent over there can act only in an advisory capacity, and "advisory" certainly is a restrictive condition or stipulation.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my very sincere and conscientious friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], and as I listened to him the thought came to my mind that we are living in a very practical world. His remarks and utterances might well be followed if this were not a rapidly changing world and if conditions were not so disturbed as they are today and if a powerful nation were not challenging the civilization and way of life that the people of other nations believe in. His remarks carry me to a dream world. I share his hopes, but I cannot come to the same conclusions as he does in view of the world conditions as they exist today.

My only interest, like the interest of every other Member of the House, is the national interest of the United States. I say it is in our national interest not to let this wave envelop country after country until it envelops all of Europe. If it ever reaches that point, it will overrun all of Asia and thus actually reach our shores.

My friend from Oklahoma disregards the fact that that advancing wave does not permit the people to exercise their free will in the selection of their government, that small groups are supported directly or indirectly, who then obtain control of the government by any means possible. When control is taken over then the decent elements who resist are either driven underground or are liquidated by the means and processes that are followed by the totalitarian ruler of today.

There is a spirit behind it—a spirit of aggression and viciousness. I picked up the newspapers of only this morning. What do we find as evidence of that spirit? We find an attack on the report of former Governor Stassen by Isvestia, by the Soviet press. That constitutes an attack on the American press. The purpose of that is not to spread propaganda in the United States because it would not have any effect except to increase our resentment. The purpose of that is to spread propaganda in other countries that are watching what is taking place between Moscow and Washington, and who are reacting to our failure to do something. The purpose of it is to spread propaganda throughout the world.

What else do we find? We also find Major General Draper in a speech today charging that the Soviet State Corporation now holds a total of between 30 percent and 40 percent of German industry in the Russian-occupied zone. That brings up the very question of the Austrian peace and why it failed. The Russians wanted to sap Austria's economic strength and thus prevent Austria from becoming a free and independent nation. They were willing to give them freedom in name only, but they would not give them the means to maintain that freedom. That is why it was a failure. They have also sapped the juice out of the lemon of the Russian zone in Germany and now they want to go into the American and British zones and sap the juice out of the lemon in those two zones. But they are not going to do it. They want to communize all of Germany. That is what is happening. But it is not happening through or by the free will of the people.

They charged us recently with having our agents in Turkey in civilian dress. The same charge was also made against the British. Isvestia made that charge. What about their agents in the United States who are American citizens? What about their agents in other countries who are citizens of that country, working in Italy and all of the other nations where people are in distress, and where a small organized group can work more effectively than they can in our country?

I picked up the New York Times only this morning and I find that Gromyko asked the United Nations to reopen the Greek case. On what ground? In a letter he made clear that he was asking to open the Greek controversy because of the decision of the Council and its investigating committee to keep a subsidiary inquiry board in the area to maintain watch on border flare-ups. That is the objection he makes and which appears in this morning's newspapers. He is going to try to reopen the Greek case, as far as the mission of inquiry is concerned, and to protest against the subcommittee continuing inquiry.

That is what we are up against—the state of aggression and a challenging spirit of a vicious nature. We have to appreciate that fact in the consideration of this bill.

I hope that this amendment and other amendments that will be offered will be defeated and the excellent bill of the committee will come out of the committee and be passed by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on Monday when I spoke at the time the rule was under consideration, I called attention to what was bound to happen to our economy in the event this legislation was adopted. Now the cat is out of the bag.

I want to call your attention to an article that appears in this morning's paper, an address by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, at Cleveland, Miss., last night. He gives you a preview of what is going to happen. I want to read for the RECORD an article which appears in today's paper, the Washington Post:

> To carry out an effective policy of relief and reconstruction implementing the Truman doctrine first promulgated in the plan to assist Greece and Turkey, he declared that there must be an extension of Government control over domestic sale, transportation, and export of such commodities as wheat, coal, and steel.

Yet Members of this House have stood on this floor and demanded that prices come down. The President himself is appealing to the businessmen over this Nation to reduce prices. Again we have further evidence of New Deal inconsistency. How long can the country take this kind of leadership?

I continue, and I refer to point 5 set out in this accompanying article:

> In order to carry out an economical and effective policy of relief and reconstruction, the United States is going to need the extension by Congress of certain executive powers over the domestic sale, transportation, and exportation of certain commodities over which Presidential war powers control is due to expire June 30.

"It is wheat and coal and steel that are urgently required to stave off economic collapse, not just dollar credits," Acheson said.

Now, mark you well this statement:

> Power to assign priorities on transportation is needed, including legislation to insure "efficient use of all shipping."

And he goes on to point out the necessity for continued control over our economy. We talk about veterans' housing, we talk about eliminating these restrictions which today are tying up our economy, yet the Secretary of State comes out with this plea for continued controls. I believe his foot slipped or else the release of his article was badly timed. He thought this bill was going to be passed yesterday, and hence he could come out and make this statement today.

The fat is now in the fire, Mr. Chairman, and so far as the economic impact of this legislation is concerned, you hogtie the American economy from now on by passing this legislation. We should have seen that very situation long ago. There are tremendous implications in this matter.

We do not have to be partisan at all; we can approach this matter from the standpoint of America. Is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything wrong in protecting our people under this legislation. Indeed not.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman. I just want to ask the gentleman a brief question. If the Acheson program which the gentleman has read, is necessary to win the peace, which, unfortunately, has been slipping through our fingers ever since the war ended, will it not be worth while?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My God! We have not won the peace in 2 years. Yesterday was the second anniversary of VE-day, and we are still struggling for peace and getting nowhere. Now we are going to extend our activities to other parts of the world.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire not more than 15 minutes ago said that if this policy led to war that Joe Stalin could make the most of it. How can we expect to win the peace by making war? Is that a sound

position? That is what he is talking about.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. This policy has been sold to America, sold by a bunch of dictators in a bureaucratic State Department. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] named it rightly when he named it a military bill. That is exactly what it is, and that is exactly what we are talking about here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We should thank the Under Secretary for his honest and forthright statement last night. Now certainly we know what is going to happen, and this 2 years after VE-day when we are praying for peace. What a commentary on our efforts in behalf of those who served in this last war! We are today, Mr. Chairman, about to take a step to declare war; and, secondly, you are going to take a step to tie up our economy from now on under Government controls from which we can never, never recover, because the program calls for a worldwide OPA, and under this bill we are going to set one up in Greece.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. And in those 2 years this Congress had piddled away $18,000,000,000 trying to buy the peace. Now we are going to buy with $400,000,000 that which could not be bought with $18,000,000,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. What is holding up the peace? Russia, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. At least we were guilty in part, because we made it possible for Russia to get to the position which she now occupies. She would not have attained it had it not been for American aid; so we are a party.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, throughout this debate one of the keynotes of the isolationist argument in opposition to the pending bill has been that if the United States wants to check the spread of communism throughout the world the place to begin is here at home.

In reply, I want to say that the only sure way to make the American democracy safe against threats of encroachment by totalitarian ideologies is to produce a social order which will provide greater benefits for all of our people than can be offered by any other form of government.

Today other nations which call themselves democracies are attempting to substitute mass social security for individual liberty, and are boasting that their governments take better care of all the people than we do in America. The only danger to the American way of life today, Mr. Chairman, lies in the remote possibility that the protagonists of these alien dictatorships may succeed in persuading the rank and file of the American people that this boasted superiority is real. To me, such an eventuality is inconceivable.

But, Mr. Chairman, modern American liberals must demand an adequate system of social security as a permanent bulwark for our individual liberties, and must fight ceaselessly to achieve this goal. Upon the success of this program the fate of the American democracy may well depend.

I assert that no government is a real democracy which denies civil liberties and suppresses individual freedom by a sovereign dictatorship. I have been deeply concerned many times, Mr. Chairman, by utterances here on the floor of Congress which sought to restrict civil liberties in America, but these were merely the expressions of individuals with a warped conception of the American way of life. The Constitution is the supreme law of our land, and the Bill of Rights in that Constitution is the greatest charter of democracy which this world has ever known.

Patrick Henry dramatized the American concept of democracy in a single phrase: "Give me liberty or give me death."

The problems which confront this troubled world today in its efforts to devise a stable plan for peace in Europe are not new. Indeed, almost identical problems with respect to Greece, Russia, and Turkey were perplexing American statesmen more than a century ago, as evidenced in the state papers of John Quincy Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Marquis de Lafayette.

The thing of greatest importance which is new in world affairs today is the historic change in American foreign policy. Twice in the last three decades the soil of Europe has been drenched with American blood. After the First World War, despite the decisive part our armed forces had played in the defeat of Germany, the Congress of the United States refused to join the League of Nations, which had been created by President Wilson. At that time a majority of the American people, including the present speaker, supported our congressional leaders in adhering to the policy of George Washington and declining to participate in "entangling foreign alliances."

Rendered internationally impotent by the abstention of America, the League of Nations degenerated into a mere debating society, whose futile efforts to preserve world peace soon became the objects of open scorn by the military dictators who sprang into power in the bankrupt areas of Europe. A famous American Senator, now dead, told me of a conversation he had with Mussolini soon after the Fascist leader seized control of the Government of Italy.

"What do you think of the League of Nations?" the Senator inquired.

Mussolini's reply was a roar of laughter.

The German and Italian dictators, emboldened by their belief that America would never interfere with their ambitions, proceeded with their program of world conquest. They enlisted the support of Japan. Great Britain attempted a policy of appeasement. The result was World War II and finally Pearl Harbor.

Then the die was cast with respect to our foreign policy in the future. The American people determined with invincible unanimity that never again would this Nation refuse responsibility for maintaining the peace of the world.

We invaded Africa and Europe. Italy collapsed. Germany was completely crushed. Japan surrendered.

But for the intervention of our armed forces, the outcome of the war would have been totally different. Russia would inevitably have been subjugated by the Axis attack. England could not long have survived. All of continental Europe would have remained under Nazi domination. Japan would have completed her conquest of Asia, Australia, and the islands of the Pacific, including the Philippines.

And today this country and the entire Western Hemisphere would be in imminent danger of attack by the mad enemies of democracy if, indeed, the attack were not already under way.

Having twice conquered the greatest threats in all history to the democratic way of life, America is now irrevocably committed to the maintenance of peace throughout the world by whatever means are necessary. Failure in this commitment is unthinkable. It would be a betrayal of our countless hero dead who gave up their lives on battlefields in all parts of the earth in the sacred belief that they were making peace possible for future generations of mankind everywhere.

It is well that those heroic dead cannot envision the tragic situation which exists around the so-called peace tables of today. America has tried to keep faith with them. America has taken the lead in organizing the United Nations, and has pledged its tremendous financial, economic, and military resources in an effort to make that organization an effective instrument of peace. America has not sought to acquire any conquered lands for commercial or political exploitation. On the contrary, immediately after the end of the war America restored the Philippines to complete independence. Our only territorial acquisitions when the final peace treaties are signed will be minor islands in the Pacific which are virtually valueless except for our future national defense.

But American efforts to establish a permanent and stable peace have been constantly obstructed by certain of our allies in the late war who, but for our military aid and financial and economic support, would now be enslaved by the Nazi tyrants. Despite the fact that we rescued them from certain national destruction, these erstwhile allies have maintained an atitude of hostility toward us in all of the peace negotiations. They have openly resented our assumption of any responsibility for the reconstruction of Europe—a responsibility which we cannot and will not relinquish. Their policy appears to be basically anti-American.

They have striven deliberately to make it impossible for us to cooperate with them, except on their own terms—terms which, in many instances, the American conscience cannot accept.

They ignore the fact that while the war was in progress they eagerly subscribed to our declaration that we were all engaged in a common fight to make

the world safe for democracy. Now that the war is over—won for them by our arms and our blood and our material aid—they repudiate our democracy and set themselves up as the sole arbiters of real democratic government.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I confess that there are various aspects of the pending proposal which I regard with deep misgivings. The United Nations represents the first great attempt in all history—an American attempt—to establish a world democracy. We must be ever mindful of the fact that not all of the nations which are embraced in this new federation are themselves democratic, and we must endeavor in every proper way to treat their opinions on world problems with deference and respect. We have a right to insist that they treat our opinions in the same manner.

I deplore the fact that our leaders of State did not see fit at first to submit the question of aid to Greece and Turkey to the United Nations. Their explanation is twofold, that the United Nations is not yet able to finance such an undertaking, and that the proposal would be foredoomed to a veto because its frank purpose is to check Communist aggression in the Middle East.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the paramount problem in the United Nations and in the whole scheme of foreign affairs today is to establish a practical working relationship between the United States and Russia. We should employ every honorable means to achieve this objective. Our diplomatic representatives say this cannot be accomplished by a policy of supine appeasement on our part, and in this position they are supported by the tragic lessons of recent history and by the overwhelming preponderance of American public opinion. But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the United Nations will be preserved and strengthened by American leadership in a mutual effort on the part of all the member states to understand and respect each other's aims and aspirations.

Perhaps the greatest deterrent to such mutual understanding and respect is the traditional secrecy of statecraft. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, we cannot hold ourselves blameless. The American people today are uncertain and perplexed as to the ultimate results of this unprecedented participation in the affairs of Europe. Confessedly, this is true even among the Members of Congress. We have been given little factual information about what we are called upon to do. The urgent admonitions of our State Department have been largely arbitrary in their form and essence. We have been told simply that the program before us is indispensable and of the highest order of urgency. An equally terse assurance that the adoption of this program will reduce the likelihood of war in the future completes the sum and substance of the information now available to us.

Enemies of the program charge that its real object is to guarantee military protection to private American oil interests in Saudi Arabia. Although it is true that oil reserves in America have been reduced to an extent which is dangerous to our national defense, measured by the requirements of the recent war, this would not seem to be a plausible reason for such a departure from our historic foreign policy. The development of atomic energy for economic and industrial uses, which cannot long be delayed, may soon relegate oil to a position of secondary importance among our national needs.

I shall vote for this measure because I know that the peace of the world depends upon strong leadership by the United States of America, and that the only way our leadership can be made strong is to back it up with the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people. Our people know that the policies of isolationism and appeasement were tragic failures after the first World War. Today they are determined to chart a new course for this Nation in the affairs of the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. It is my opinion, based on reliable information, that H. R. 2616 is the most sordid bill that has come before the House of Representatives since I have been a Member of this distinguished body. The proposal in this bill, when the real purpose of it is considered, is an insult to the people of Greece, a country that has contributed so much to civilization. Greece had a glorious history many centuries before our country was discovered. The greatest asset Greece has today is the spirit of her people, a spirit so heroic that any nation in these modern times might well and profitably emulate. You who plan to vote $400,000,000 under the pretense that it will save Greece from communism will neither add to her strength nor save her independence. It will not strengthen the character of Greece to make her a ward of the United States. Greece with her centuries of rich and noble traditions and her contribution to civilization can far better rely upon these to save her than to relinquish such a rich heritage to become the victim of a sordid commercial transaction masquerading under a proposed loan to save Greece from communism. Have the Communists been removed from our Government, from the United States, from South America? How long have they flourished here, had schools of communism, children's camps under the very nose of those who urge that our military be sent to Greece to prevent the growth of this Godless cult there? The presence of hundreds of Communists in the gallery of the House of Representatives of the United States of America during the debate on the Greek question presented a burlesque show instead of an effort to get rid of communism.

I say without fear of successful contradiction that it will be the spirit of Greece that will save her and make her independent.

This is not a relief bill for the starving in Greece. It is a gift of $400,000,000 sponsored by those who wish to provide dollars to foreign countries to enable them to buy our exports. It means that our taxpayers are to furnish money to foreign governments or their agencies with which to purchase our products. I am sure that the people in every country on the globe will be quite willing to buy our exports just so long as our taxpayers furnish the money through gifts, loans, and credits with which to do so. The foreign black-market operators will be the chief beneficiaries of all future loans, gifts, and credits made available to them by the taxpayers of the United States.

I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who has not been urged by his constituents to cut the expenditures of Government and to thus make tax relief possible.

The Appropriations Committee has been working night and day to meet the demand of the citizens for the elimination of waste and extravagance in Government; also as a consequence a substantial reduction in the Federal budget. Yet, in the face of this effort to lift the burden of taxation by cutting expenditures of a swollen bureaucracy, the Congress yields to the demand of a few powerful exporters for a continuation of the program of having our taxpayers provide foreign nations with gifts, loans, and credits to buy the goods and service of these exporters.

It may be that 140,000,000 persons in the United States wish to take on the burden of furnishing money to the rest of the world to maintain them and their standing armies, but I doubt if such will be the mature judgment of our citizens when they know all the facts.

Congress has been asked to save, but can it do so if through propaganda the public is whipped into a lather of frenzy in favor of pouring countless billions of dollars of our money into the hands of foreign nations? I again quote from the National City Bank letter of April 1947:

The accompanying table summarizes American governmental credits authorized and utilized, showing that more than $5,500,000,000 was still unused December 31, 1946:

Status of United States credits

[In millions of dollars]

	Credits authorized	Utilized by December 1946	Unutilized as of December 1946
Export-Import Bank credits	$2,300	$1,100	$1,200
Surplus property credits	1,100	800	300
Lend-lease "pipe line" credits	1,400	1,200	200
Ship-sales credits	200		
Loan to Great Britain	3,750	600	[1] 3,150
Philippine credits:			
Individual war damage claims	[2] 400		
Restoration of public property	[2] 125		
RFC loan	75		
Total	9,350	3,700	5,650

[1] Another $500,000,000 has been withdrawn since.
[2] Authorized but not appropriated.

Source: Export-Import Bank (third semi-annual report), Survey of Current Business, January 1947 and Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 1, 1947.

If we want to weaken and destroy communism, why ship steel and other

war supplies to Russia, and also feel obligated to furnish more lend-lease to her? This type of appeasement was the main tenet of the Roosevelt program in dealing with Japan. The tragedy of Pearl Harbor was the answer to the unwise policy of arming a potential enemy as well as the result of building up exports in an effort to justify the free-trade-agreement policy of the New Deal.

In the monthly letter on economic conditions sent out by the National Bank of New York under date of April 1947, reference is made to the outlook on exports:

OUTLOOK FOR EXPORTS

The President's message to Congress March 12, making a declaration of foreign policy which is epochal in its importance and urging expenditures of $400,000,000 over the next 15 months to aid Greece and Turkey, has intensified interest in the export prospect and in the influence of exports on the domestic situation. The heart of the President's statement is in the following sentence: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The possible implications of this policy are so broad that they cannot be assessed in advance of events, and any effort to translate them into a schedule of foreign loans or expenditures would be widely speculative. The one thing certain is that they indicate expansion of loans and gifts beyond the limits earlier intended.

Also within a few weeks we have had the President's request for the appropriation of $350,000,000 to finance relief in certain countries, and Mr. Hoover's report on relief requirements in Germany and Austria. All these in conjunction have raised expectations as to the volume of exports and the resulting inflationary pressure on prices. At the same time, however, reports of tightening import controls and diminishing dollar resources in many countries have prompted questions of the opposite kind, creating doubts as to whether the unprecedented foreign demand for American goods can continue.

The outlook for exports concerns everyone. Directly and indirectly, exports last year were a very large factor in the business of this country. Foreign demand for industrial products intensified the pressure on our industries. Exports of farm products, which exceeded $3,000,000,000, were a great influence, lifting farm prices and farm income, and prosperity in the farming sections was one of the supports of domestic trade. Everyone should know that without the dollars accumulated by foreign countries during the war and the loans and gifts made since the end of the war our export surplus in 1946 could not have been financed. When credits contract and dollar balances are drawn down the export balance will have to shrink, and our foreign sales will be limited more nearly to what foreign customers can pay for out of sales to us.

It must not be forgotten that our national debt is still reported as $259,000,000,000 when it is in fact more than six hundred billions. The words of Benjamin Disraeli, the great Prime Minister of England, when he sought to caution his fellow colleagues and his countrymen of impending danger, are applicable at this time in our history:

It may be vain now in the midnight of their intoxication to tell them there will be an awakening of bitterness.

It may be idle now in the springtime of their economic frenzy to warn them that there will be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive; then when their spirit is inflected by misfortune they will recur to those principles which made England great.

Those who never lose an opportunity to pay lip service to Thomas Jefferson, ignore the wise policy in dealing with our international relations. Let me quote:

We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our Government is founded, that everyone may govern itself according to whatever forms it pleases, and change those forms at its own will; and that it may transact its business with foreign nations through whatever organ it thinks proper, whether king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or anything else it may choose. The will of the nation is the only thing essential to be regarded.

The arrogance of those who assume infallibility in foreign affairs even to the extent of proposing to set up the type of government which they feel will be best for a foreign country, such as Greece with her glorious contribution to civilization is a brazen affront to a noble race. The pseudo experts on foreign affairs, under the leadership of Harold Laski, if unrestrained will eventually bring down the hatred of every sovereign nation against the United States. The New York Times, July 28, 1945, quotes Harold Laski as saying: "The period of nonintervention is over." A great American statesman, John Bassett Moore, writing on the subject of nonintervention as the cornerstone of our national policy said this:

This term was used inclusively in a twofold sense. It expressed, in the first place, nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations. In this sense, while betokening the revolutionary origin of the Government * * * it was also intended reciprocity to concede to other nations the right to determine their form of government and otherwise to manage their domestic concerns, each for itself and in its own way. In the second place, it embraced nonparticipation in the political arrangements between other governments, and above all, strict absention from any part in the political arrangements of Europe.

As recent as November 27, 1943, pages 384–388 of the Department of State Bulletin, appears this statement by Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle:

Nor have we any intention to scrap the well-settled policy of nonintervention in the affairs of other states. The policy of nonintervention in other people's affairs is and must be the first principle of sound doctrine. Unless this is the settled practice of nations, there may be no principles of sovereign equality among peace-loving states and probably no permanent peace at all.

I remind my colleagues that in the face of this it is proposed under this bill to intervene in the domestic affairs of Greece and also to intervene with our military.

Now the scene in our foreign relations has shifted. President Truman in his message to Congress March 12, 1947, said:

I believe that it is must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting subjection by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It is no wonder that the National City Bank of New York, in its letter of April 1947 in referring to the $400,000,000 for Greece and the President's message commented that it "has intensified interest in the export prospects and the influence of exports in the domestic situation."

Just how long the taxpayers of this country will wish to forego the solution of their home problems to finance exports is a question. It is a policy which if continued will bring disaster both here and abroad. The international financial commitments during the next 15 months will, if no more commitments are made, total $7,443,100,000. This sum ought to be spelled out lest its significance as a tax load on our citizens be underestimated: it means seven billion, four hundred forty-three million, one hundred thousand dollars. It all resolves itself to this: that inasmuch as the foreign countries cannot pay us in goods and services exported to them, our taxpayers pay our exporters for the goods and services for the benefit of the foreign people. Our exporters profit and so do the foreign black-market operators, all at the expense of our taxpayers. This shell game will go on until the people of the United States become aware of the danger of such financial folly and stop it; or suffer and permit the program to continue until the inevitable financial crash results. I for one refuse to be a party to this scheme of financing the whole world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to question the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] or that of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. But if everything they say is true, then these amendments should be voted down.

Why should we take this step, why should we pass this bill, and then tie the hands of the administration? Have you forgotten Pearl Harbor? Do you know what brought about that disgraceful and humiliating disaster at Pearl Harbor? It was the appeasement of Japan which enabled the Japs to come 5,000 miles across the Pacific Ocean and administer the greatest humiliation that this country has ever known.

I was in Hawaii in 1937. I protested then against the weakness of our Air Force at that time. I said then that Hawaii was unprotected because of the weakness of our Air Force. The head of the Air Forces came to me and said, "I could put my arms around you. You are the one man who has told the truth about our Air Forces here."

If we are going into this program these two amendments should both be defeated. Communism is making war on the United States now. Every Communist in America is, wittingly or unwittingly, an agent of a foreign power. They are striving to undermine and destroy this Government.

Last night the head of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, came to Washington, after just coming back from

Moscow, and compared Harry Truman, the President of the United States, with Adolf Hitler. We had representatives of the Committee on Un-American Activities there, and, of course the FBI had agents there to find out what was going on.

They tell these young men that communism is a glorious movement toward democracy. There is no more democracy—and I am quoting the words of a former Ambassador to Russia—there is no more democracy in a Communist country than there is in the penitentiary of Mississippi, Ohio, New Jersey, or any other State.

These young men are being deceived. I see they call themselves and are advertised as "the Communist war veterans."

They are being deceived and misled by the most dangerous influence, the most dangerous element, that ever undertook to undermine and destroy the American way of life and to wreck the Government of the United States. God grant that they may see the error of their ways.

Do not forget that Benedict Arnold was a great hero at Saratoga. He was a hero in Canada. But he later turned against his country and became one of the most hated traitors the world has ever known.

Has it ever occurred to you that Alcibiades and Socrates fought side by side through a Grecian war against a foreign power? I believe they were messmates in the Grecian Army.

But after the war was over Alcibiades is said to have stopped up his ears and fled from the presence of Socrates for fear that he would grow old listening to his eloquence. He joined the enemies of Greece and caused the downfall of his country.

There is no such thing as a Communist American. They are enemies of the United States. They are out to undermine and destroy this Government. They are out to undermine and destroy the American way of life. Their program has for its purpose the destruction of Christianity in every country under the shining sun. If we adopt these amendments, we say to Russia, "We will further appease you by binding ourselves not to send more than a certain number of men, or planes no matter what you may do to us."

What the witness before the committee recommended were mere suggestions, not limitations. As I understand it, they did not ask that a limitation be written into the bill.

I cannot understand how any man, whether he is for this bill or opposed to it—and I recognize the honesty of men who disagree with me—I cannot see how any man who is opposed to this legislation can vote for either one of these amendments, because I think it would be encouragement for Russia to keep on sending her spies to this country and her agents attacking Americans as they did in Yugoslavia.

We have had the best minds we could get before the Committee on Un-American Activities. We had the best witnesses we could find, and we had our investigators on the trail of those Russian spies who were finally caught and exposed by the Canadian Government. What were they doing? Pretending to be friendly to the United States while our representatives were giving way to them, they were working to undermine and destroy this country. I am one Member who would vote today to send every Communist Ambassador or Minister, out of the United States and say to them, "Unless you are willing to go back and give your people an opportunity to express themselves in an honest election, to select their own government, you need not come back here, a wolf in sheep's clothing."

Every single one of them, every single minister or Ambassador who represents a Communist country in America is virtually a spy in our midst. So, if we are going to pass this bill, let us not tie the hands of the Administration with these paralyzing amendments.

I agree that we must clean house at home—clean house and fumigate in every department of this Government. I am not saying anything to you that I will not say to Harry Truman, the President of the United States. We are at the crossroads of civilization. We are at the crossroads, if you please, of history. I do not know whether this is the proper movement or not, but I do know that unless America begins to assert herself and stop appeasing criminal Communists who are trying to destroy America and everything for which America stands, your children and mine will pay the penalty.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Would the gentleman clarify for the members of this Committee the word in section 3 of this bill, "limited", as applied to the number of members of the military services of the United States? What does that mean?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, it means what it has always meant. That is the same word that you and I studied back in the fifth grade.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I ask the gentleman this question: How can it mean what it always has meant when it actually means "unlimited"?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman wants to turn it upside down, he can make it mean what he pleases. But my understanding is that these amendments would place a limit that would entirely hamper the President in protecting this country in case of attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that there is a very confused situation here. I hope that we can clarify it by offering a substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota by unanimous consent has withdrawn his amendment to the amendment. The Clerk will report the substitute offered for the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORAND. Can two substitutes be pending at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN. No; but in this case we have only one amendment pending, that offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. The amendment to the amendment has been withdrawn and a substitute for the amendment has been offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 2, line 11, after the word "only" and before the semicolon, insert a comma and the words: "And not to include armed organized military units to serve as occupational or combat troops."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and clear. Objections have been raised to placing a limitation on the number of military personnel to be sent to Greece and Turkey under this act.

This amendment changes the quantitative limitation to a qualitative limitation. It really is not an additional limitation, it is rather a clarification of the limitation already in the bill, which now provides that we may send military personnel in an advisory capacity only. To make sure exactly what is meant, my substitute amendment merely states, "And not to include armed organized military units to serve as occupational or combat troops."

It does not exclude Army engineers, it does not exclude technicians, or Sanitary Corps; all it excludes is armed organized American military units. They may not be sent to serve as occupational or combat troops.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am in hearty accord with the purposes of the gentleman's substitute. I am perfectly willing to accept it because it achieves the objectives that we had in mind, and it writes into the legislation the intent of the committee report.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. EATON. I wish to say that I am very happy to have this solution offered. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the other Members on his side of the aisle are in accord with it?

Mr. JUDD. I may say that this does not really alter the bill. It merely clarifies the obvious confusion that exists in the minds of a great many. I cannot see how it weakens the bill. It merely makes official what it is we intend to do.

Mr. BLOOM. Under the circumstances, as far as I am concerned, I will have no objection.

Mr. EATON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I think we can vote on this and get rid of it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close at this time.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from New Jersey has moved that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to know, an amendment having been offered, if we are going to be denied the right to talk about it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The situation is within the control of the Committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is this not in violation with the agreement that was made last night with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That, of course, is not a parliamentary inquiry. The situation is within the control of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The country should know that the gag is in operation in this House.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for exactly the same thing that these gentlemen have been fighting for. If they want it withdrawn and want to talk about it I will withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may withdraw his motion.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether or not this substitute is one of those sweetmeats that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] was talking about?

Mr. EATON. I am not an authority on sweetmeats.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] read a quotation the other day from one of Daniel Webster's speeches. I should also like to read a quotation from Daniel Webster on January 26, 1830, when he said:

> When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence and before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

Mr. Chairman, that advice could very well be followed by the committee. We should take all the time necessary to debate this bill and all amendments thereto because it will be the most important bill this Congress will consider.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] quoted from the Washington Post a statement in which Dean Acheson said:

> There must be an extension of government over domestic sale, transportation and export of such commodities as wheat, coal, and steel.

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

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

Mr. BUFFETT. It was the Republican Party that went to the people of this country last fall and said they were going to end regimentation and were elected on that basis, was it not?

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for that contribution, and I was just leading up to that point. I have a clipping from the New York Times of April 27, 1946, wherein Dean Acheson is reported as follows:

> FEDERAL SEIZURE OF NEEDED GRAIN URGED BY ACHESON—ACTING SECRETARY SAYS MORE DRASTIC ACTION IS CALLED FOR TO MEET COMMITMENTS ABROAD—FOOD RATIONING FAVORED—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT ENDS LOANS ON CORN IN MOVE TO FREE 2,457,000 BUSHELS
>
> WASHINGTON, April 26.—Much more drastic action is necessary if the Government is to get wheat off the farm and on its way to the famine areas of the world, Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, asserted today.
>
> Emphasizing that he was expressing his personal views, Mr. Acheson told a news conference that the Government should go out and take the wheat and flour it needed to meet foreign commitments.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, if you pass this bill you are going back on the campaign slogan on which you were elected, "Haven't you had enough." This bill if passed will do more to bring back regimentation and rationing quicker than anything you could do. If you pass this bill, it will be a means of starting a flood of propaganda to pass excessive appropriations for the Army and the Navy thereby wrecking our chances to cut the budget substantially and reduce the heavy burden of taxes for the people. If you pass this bill, I am fearful this so-called military mission that will go into Greece and Turkey will create an incident. Did you ever stop to think that we never go to war until an incident is created? Every country fights a defensive war. It was the sinking of the *Maine* that created the incident that led us into the Spanish-American War. The sinking of the *Lusitania* had a great deal to do with leading us into World War I and the incident at Pearl Harbor led us immediately into World War II, and as soon as this military mission authorized by this bill creates an incident in Greece or Turkey, we are in World War III.

I think the majority of the Members of this Committee are for straightforward-above-the-table dealing. This bill is a subterfuge that might well take us into World War III. Should an incident occur, the tension of the people of our country would demand that we declare war.

Yes; this has far-reaching implications, and we should ponder well before we make our final vote on this bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as he does so often, the gentleman from Mississippi again today gave us a statement condemning communism. I too condemn communism. He spoke in favor of Christianity. I try to be a Christian. I do not believe that the gentleman can find anyone in this House who favors communism. I do not believe that he can find anyone who has not at least the desire, whatever may be his practice, to be a Christian. So, I ask, what of it and what do we propose to do about it?

In what is here said, neither the ability, the fairness, nor the patriotism of anyone is questioned. This Government, as I understand—was founded upon the principles that the individual had a right to worship in the manner in which he desired and that the people should have the right to be free and independent, to choose their own form of government.

Accepting those principles, where do we get with this bill? It is a bill to do what? The debate has shown that it is a bill to fight communism by, if necessary, waging war. I know I will be criticized when I ask: What business is it of ours if the people of Russia want to be Communists? I ask you in all fairness, what business is it of ours?

I do not like communism; I would like to see it ended; but if we are consistent, if we are logical, if we are willing to concede to other peoples the same right which we claim for ourselves to follow this or that theory of government, this or that form of religion, how can we send either our boys or our money to tell the people of Russia, of Turkey, Greece, or any other country, as long as they remain over there and do not endanger our safety, that communism or any other form of religion or political policy shall not be carried by missionaries or by the sword into some other country?

Are we consistent? We do not fight communism in South America; we have not fought it here at home. For 12 years I have been in this House, lived here in Washington, and I recall that the administration in power had Communists sleeping in the White House, gave them jobs in the Government, and by this means and that, by grants of

power and by grants of money, Communists were encouraged in this country and praised when they smeared good Americans. So why is it that all at once—now—all at once we turn our backs on the principle that every people shall be free to choose their own religion and their own form of government, and we say that by the sword, by war, we are going to spread Christianity. The Crusaders tried that, as the gentleman mentioned just the other day, and they did not succeed. That is not what is back of this bill, is it? Oh, no. This is a so-called bipartisan bill which will mean an act of war.

What about the Monroe Doctrine? Ever since the days of President Monroe we have said to the whole wide world that because our national security and welfare depended upon it, no nation should interfere with the government of the people of any country in the Western Hemisphere.

Now what do we say? We say we are going to stick our nose into the affairs of every country abroad, that we are going to stop communism and we are going to stop Russia at the Turkish and the Greek borders, at their frontiers. Suppose Russia said to us she was going to stop our influence in Mexico and in South America, what would we say? We would say, "Get out." We would say, "We must defend ourselves." We would declare war.

Later I will quote from the testimony of the Secretary of War before the Committee on Expenditures given the other day, which shows that the remedy for this country, that the safety of this country, depends only on making ourselves strong and then attending to our own business. His testimony shows that isolationism, if you like to call it that—I prefer to be called an isolationist or a nationalist, rather than a bipartisan or an internationalist, even though that brings the false charge of disloyalty—will keep us out of war and permit other nations, if they are so determined, to fight it out among themselves.

Believing that my first duty is to my country—I think that when we take on the burden of policing the whole world we are taking on just too big a job, and that, instead of doing something to preserve our country, we are writing the causes of its ruin in the pages of history.

Listen to the following questions to and the answers of Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson. At a hearing of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was considering H. R. 2319, which provides for the unification of the armed forces, held on the 29th of April, the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. There is one more question. You say in this statement:

"The maintenance of the future peace of the world will depend on the attitude and policies of the United States in world affairs, and also upon the measure of strength which the United States continues in the future to maintain in order to lend vitality to those policies."

Is there anything more to be added to that?

Secretary PATTERSON. Those are my convictions.

The CHAIRMAN. Just how do you arrive at the conclusion that the peace of the world depends on what we do?

Secretary PATTERSON. Well, I believe that this country is one of the leading powers, if not the leading power, in the world today, that our influence in the direction of peace, if it is backed up by the power to enforce peace, can be decisive.

The CHAIRMAN. What you mean is, if we become powerful enough, we are acting as master policemen and no one else will dare start a war?

Secretary PATTERSON. I think that if we have adequate military strength, no nation will dare attack us or will commence a major war anywhere. I believe that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is to say, we become boss policemen.

Secretary PATTERSON. Our powers have never been exercised in any offensive way. I think the whole world knows that the intentions of the United States are peaceful and not aggressive, and we are not trying to build empires or embark on a course of imperialism.

The CHAIRMAN. I was not talking about that, about our intentions, at all. What I was suggesting was that what you were saying was that if we become powerful enough so that the other nations, or no other nation would dare start a war, that not only would they not venture to attack us but as between themselves they would not start a fight because we would stand in the background ready, as Teddy said, with a big stick. That is what you are saying is it not?

Secretary PATTERSON. Practically so. I think it has been well proved in the last 30 years that a major war anywhere in the world results finally in a world war, involving all of the civilized world.

The CHAIRMAN. And while we started neither one and perhaps had nothing to do with the starting of either one, in both we came in, to end it?

Secretary PATTERSON. We were drawn in, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, drawn in then; and our power, the United States power, decided it?

Secretary PATTERSON. Yes, sir; althought we had nothing to do with the causes, directly at any rate, we were drawn, and our power proved decisive.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to repeat what was said before, your thought is now that if we will go ahead and arm and become strong enough, then, not only will they let us alone because of our size and strength, but they will not venture to fight among themselves if we let it be known that we are going to step in and quiet the quarrel?

Secretary PATTERSON. Your first conclusion, that they will not attack us, I think to be inescapable.

If the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, knows what he is talking about, and I assume he does, where is the need for this bill?

From his testimony, it seems to be the opinion of the Secretary—and I agree with that thought—that, if this country uses its resources to build up our armed services, no nation, no group of nations, will have the hardihood to attack us. Nor is it probable that any other nation will make war on another nation if it be of the opinion that, if its quarrel is unjust, the United States might step into the picture and settle the issue.

In any event it is clear that the way to stay out of war is to quit interfering in the affairs of other nations, backing up the wars started by other nations.

Instead of always becoming involved in controversies between other nations which do not directly concern us, why not once at least exhibit confidence in our own strength, in our own ability to protect ourselves?

For years, we have been deceived and proceeded on the delusion that our national existence and safety depended upon the British navy. That idea has been exploded. It has been demonstrated that the British Government depends for its security upon the United States.

All we need to do, according to the Secretary of War, to preserve the peace of the world is to continue to be, as Churchill said we were, the strongest Nation in all the world.

I am in favor of that program, but from there on out I disagree with the internationalists; I disagree with the Secretary of War. My contention is that, instead of acting as the boss policeman of the world, going hither and yon and attempting to knock together the heads of other nations in order to make them agree on a policy which we think advisable, if they are determined to fight among themselves, if world powers are to continue through the years as they have down through the centuries to fight over which nation is to control the Dardanelles, then let those nations fight it out. It is now evident that, had we let Hitler and Stalin exhaust each other, there would now be less need for assistance from us.

In what may be here said neither the ability, the good intentions, the patriotism, nor the consistency of any individual is questioned.

Ever since the days of President Monroe we have insisted that we would not tolerate any interference with or coercion of the policy of any nation in the Western Hemisphere by any nation in the Old World.

A sound reason for that policy was that we did not want and would not permit in the Western Hemisphere the existence of any power which might threaten our own security and future welfare.

That doctrine was founded upon the principle that self-preservation is the first concern of every individual and of every nation.

Our Government is founded upon the principle that every people have the inherent right to choose their own form of government, their own form of religion, worship as they may choose.

Logic, fairness, and consistency compel the conclusion that, asserting those rights for ourselves in this hemisphere, it is presumptuous for us to deny a like right to any nation across the seas.

We have long boasted that we are not an imperialistic nation; that we desire no territory; that we have no thought of aggression. If that be true, then the only excuse, the only reason, if you prefer, for our present action of attempting to confine Russia and communism within circumscribed limits is that unless we follow such course, our own national security is endangered.

It is here emphatically asserted that neither at the moment nor in the immediate future is our national security endangered. The propaganda asserting that it is and that the present move to send financial and military aid to Greece

and Turkey is one dictated by the necessity of preventing future aggression is a fraud.

The United States of America today is in no danger from any foreign power. Our danger—and it is a very real one—is that we have turned our backs upon the policies and the practices which made us what we are.

It is conceded that we are today, in every sense of the word, the most powerful nation in all the world. The very fact that the proponents of this measure call upon us to aid stricken nations is proof of our military and our productive power.

The fact that Russia was compelled, when Hitler invaded her, to call upon us for, and was only saved through, our help is evidence of her inability to wage war against us.

The fact—and it is a fact—that those who are behind this move favored contributing, and we as a Nation have contributed, billions of dollars and millions of tons of supplies to Russia is further evidence that she is in no position to successfully assail us.

Grant that her desire is world conquest; she lacks the ability to do that job and fools indeed must we be if we continue, if that be our conviction, to supply her with the means necessary to accomplish that purpose.

Every sane individual knows that we cannot, either through our dollars or our armed forces, establish Christianity throughout the world. The Crusaders tried that centuries ago. Is anyone so foolish as to think that, through another war or a dozen wars, we can destroy the Mohammedan faith, the religion of India, or the communism of Russia?

If it be the thought of the proponents of this measure that either through the expenditure of dollars or by the sword we should tell the people of middle Europe or of any other country what political theory, what form of religion, they should adopt, then we are denying to them the benefit of the principles established when our forefathers founded our Republic.

Communism, however detestable it may be, is but the whipping boy in the present situation.

We have made no worth-while effort to fight communism in South America. Here at home, in the Capital City, communism has been sheltered and nurtured and made to grow. Communism and the apostles of communism have been on the Federal pay roll and time and again over the last 10 years have received public encouragement from the administration in power.

We made no complaint, as was pointed out so eloquently and so logically by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], to stop communism in Finland or in half a dozen other countries.

The truth of the matter is that the present move is but a part of the plan to preserve the British Empire, to keep open its lifeline to the east. And, may I add, a part of a political policy to maintain in power internationalists and those who pride themselves first upon being bipartisan in foreign affairs; who have finally, through their own conceit, arrived at the conclusion that it is well—at least for them—to be bipartisan in domestic affairs.

If bipartisanship, either at home or abroad, is sound national policy, why two parties? Why Republicans?

For 14 years, the people, led astray and softened, first by excessive prosperity and easy living, then confronted by the necessity of facing a few years of hard work and thrift, have deluded themselves with the idea that they could get something—perhaps all they wanted—for nothing; that they could take from those who had and distribute to those who did not have.

Then last November came the awakening, when the people said in no unmistakable manner that they had had enough.

But, ever since January 1, they have been getting more of the same.

Two distinguished politicians and statesmen, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Dewey, and the gentleman from New York and Indiana, Mr. Willkie, thought they could ride into office by promising just a little bigger and better give-away policy. They shouted "me too." Today, their cry is being adopted by others.

Here in Congress, day after day and week after week, in domestic affairs, we have been told that we must go along because the bureaucrats or the President had inaugurated the policy.

In foreign affairs, we have been told and are being told that because some individual, either the former President or the present President or some member of the State Department, has made certain commitments, has pledged us to certain obligations, which none had the right to make or to give, the Congress and the individual Members of the Congress will be disloyal if they do not follow through. Emphatically do I deny the validity of any such argument.

The former President did not have, nor has the present President, the power or the authority to dictate the policy of our country either here or abroad.

True, the President is given certain authority with reference to foreign policy, but he is powerless to implement that policy, to make it effective, without money, and upon Congress is placed the responsibility of making or withholding appropriations.

The President has no right, in formulating foreign policy, to involve us in war, and if he makes promises or does things which of necessity lead to that end, he is acting without authority, for the Constitution also provides that Congress and only Congress, can declare war, make appropriations for war.

If this Congress has reached the conclusion that it must follow and uphold every thought of the Chief Executive, of the Secretary of State, or, if you please, of a bipartisan group of internationalists in the other body, then the House might just as well adjourn, or perhaps resign, go home, and save the taxpayers' money.

No individual in this House would start on a journey without counting his resources, determining his ability to get to his destination. Yet nowhere in this debate, so far as I have been able to learn, has anyone ever offered an inventory showing what our resources, either in money, material, or men, may be. No one, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] so ably pointed out in debating this rule, has told us where we were going, how far we were going, what we were to spend, or the purpose of this expedition.

To me it means, unless Russia is bluffed and backs down, a third world war.

It may be, as the distinguished international Republican statesman in the other body said when the organization of the United Nations was being discussed, that it is a "great adventure."

Yes, our foreign policy is a great adventure and a most uncertain one. And it may be a disastrous one. It is certain that it calls for an unreasonable expenditure of our national resources.

On another occasion, the same distinguished Member of the other body said that lend-lease was a great speculation.

Since when should the national resources of a nation, the lives of its youth, be placed on the gambler's table, even though that table be an international one?

This debate has demonstrated that the bill before us is not a measure designed to promote peace.

From its proponents at first came the forced reluctant admission that its terms were so stated as to permit military aid. As the debate has gone on, the bill's supporters have been forced by the logic of the argument to admit that it is a war measure.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] frankly stated that the bill was a war measure; that it was designed to give military aid to Greece and to Turkey and, as we all know, that is an act of war and will so be understood by Russia.

If Russia is in a position to pick up the challenge, this bill means war. The gentleman from Georgia repeated his statement that that is what it meant and stated that he supported it.

Why not be honest with our people? Why not, if this House desires to commit us to a policy which is an invitation to war, to give the administration authority to commit an act of war, why not, I repeat, have the courage to so declare? Why attempt to avoid the condemnation which an open declaration of war would bring down upon us from the American people by the passage of this bill?

I have said nothing about our ability to take on the burden of maintaining peace throughout the world by the use of armed forces. I have said nothing about our ability to pay the veterans of the third world war and their dependents the benefits to which they will be entitled at the end of that war.

I have said nothing about the impairment of our national resources through the waging of a third world war, for I realize that the internationalists, the bipartisan politicians, have control of the agencies of propaganda; that they are determined to continue the New Deal program of wasting, and of spending, of regimentation, of dictatorial government, and that any argument directed toward common sense measures, toward first considering and acting for the welfare of our own country, would be futile.

The politicians, the internationalists, the war mongers, those who profit from war, are once more in the saddle, and all that we can do is to protest and to cast our votes in the interests of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have only 2 minutes and I take this time simply to assure those who might have come in since the agreement was reached so you will know that we have worked out, after about 24 hours, may I say, a satisfactory solution to this problem which, it seems to me, brings the bill definitely back to its original objective. Let us keep that clearly in mind. Some very extravagant statements are being made in this debate. We are not declaring war on anybody; we are not sending an invasion force to Europe to line up along the borders of Russia with pistols and bayonets; we are simply trying to aid Greece and to aid Turkey to reestablish themselves, to maintain their economy, and we are doing it through a military and economic aid of an advisory and constructive nature.

This amendment, the point the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I have been working on yesterday and again today, makes additionally clear what the bill has as its original objective; that is, it does not send occupational troops, does not send organized, armed troops over there, but limits it to an advisory capacity as the bill proposes now on line 11 of page 2 and as the Secretary of War stated it is going to be and as the Secretary of State and the President have insisted. The Judd substitute gets it back to the point where perhaps more of you can support it in good conscience and let the people back home know what the bill is, because there is always a chance that in the heat of debate folks are going to get the wrong impression about a bill of this type. Perhaps this substitute amendment is unnecessary repetition of the limitations already in the bill, especially because the clearcut statements by committee members today and yesterday nailing down the real purposes and scope of this bill. In all events I now agree it is an improvement over my earlier suggestion to set up a numerical limitation.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman agree with the statement that we are going in there at their own suggestion and invitation and that we are not voluntarily going in?

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly correct. The suggestion comes from them; from Greece and from Turkey.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman recall any testimony before the committee, either in open or executive sessions, to the effect that there was any intention to go in on a military basis or any basis other than an advisory one?

Mr. MUNDT. None whatsoever. We should keep that clearly in mind. That is already in the bill; the Judd proposal would again reiterate it. We are making it clear to Russia, as we are making it clear to the people of America, that we are not sending occupational forces over there, and we increase our stature with other nations of the world when they know that we are proceeding in a traditional American manner to uphold the hands of free men in another area of the world.

There is nothing new in American history about that sort of thing. We are doing it because we recognize that the menace of communism is at their door and that it is heading in our direction. The Russians are going to look at the size of the vote by which we affirm this Presidential program to discontinue appeasement of Russia. The thing that they will look at is not the numbers of the men that we have in Greece or Turkey but they will consider what they know so well—our vast industrial capacity; the attitude of the free men of America; our vast reservoir of good will and friendship among free peoples the world over; our fleet and our Army; our atom bomb and our machine tools.

We do not have to worry that we are going in any way to injure the strength of our voice against communism by adopting the amendment which the committee has accepted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am unable to embrace the doctrine that God is not averse to deceit when committed in a holy cause. If the pending resolution is not military in character, then it is a cheat and a swindle. It is, of course, military; and, because of that fact, I favor its adoption; and because of that fact, no restraint should be laid upon those who will administer it.

It ought to be easy for this House to realize that a storm is upon the sea. The old ship of state is in peril, and we who man it should fight both wind and tide that now concurrently run against us.

Speak of it as you may, the pending amendment is an appeasement of the forces that we wish to restrain.

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

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 59, noes 99.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. JUDD and Mr. COX to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee: On page 2, line 5, after the word "paragraph", insert "*Provided*, That in the assignment of civilian personnel to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act, preference shall be given to ex-service men and women."

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the ex-service men and women in America. Many of them have inquired what we propose to do in their behalf in this bill.

This amendment does not in any way interfere with the proper administration of this gift to Turkey and Greece; it simply gives a priority or preference to veterans.

I speak as one not unfamiliar with the hardships and bloodshed of war. We have heard a lot today and in days gone by from men who have had the courage to sit across mahogany tables and plan wars. But now is the opportunity for Members of this Congress to do something for the service men and women who have actually fought these wars.

I have met a number of nurses who having served in World War II would like to have the opportunity to further their service, if it is to be on the battlefields of Greece and Turkey. I met a number of Waves and Wacs who gave their time and effort in order that some able-bodied soldier might go to the field of battle. I met and talked to a number of GI's and ex-servicemen, both officers and enlisted personnel, who came home to find that their job was gone, that the world has truly moved on and now they have no employment. There are many well qualified ex-service men and women in my congressional district who are unemployed. They would like to have an opportunity to go over and serve their country in this way. We promised these men and women we would do something for them. Our Congress made that promise.

I do not think there is any serious opposition to an amendment of this kind. I have talked to a number of Members on both sides of the aisle and they seem to think it is a good proposition.

Mr. Chairman, before we go too far into this matter, may I say that this is a sad hour indeed. The cloak of secrecy has been placed around this whole thing. All of the issues have not been aired and brought to light. The internationalists have sold the American people a bill of goods.

Why do you not tell the people that this is a military bill and that you are proposing to plunge this country into war? Why do you not tell the people all of the facts? Personally, I do not like to vote for something unless I know what I am voting for. Why have we in times gone by spent days and days in hearing testimony, bringing in great volumes of it and presenting it to this Congress? Now, we are being requested to make the most important decision, admittedly so by the proponents, that this Congress has ever been asked to make. Within a few hours or a few

committee hearings you bring it in here and ask us to pass upon the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the learning and ability of all these gentlemen, but I do say that as the days come and go if we vote for this we will see controls again, we will see the shackles of economic slavery placed upon the people of our country again, we will see the very same thing happen that we tried to undo.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about lowering the price of commodities and we talk about doing something with reference to the high cost of living. The facts are, and the Committee on Agriculture will tell you, this country is not self-supporting from an agricultural standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the Greek and Turkey gift because I am convinced that it is not in our national interest. We are in no position to undertake to finance every nation in Europe, Asia, and China, and that is exactly what this policy will lead to. We have been importing agricultural products to supply our own tables, and it would occur to me that it is now time to begin to look after our own people. We cannot afford to continue to ship large quantities of food and commodities across the seas. Such a policy will make us poor and at the mercy of strong powers that might arise. Millions of people are now feeling the direct affects of the high cost of living. We cannot have a lowering in the cost of living and at the same time continue to export both food and commodities to all parts of the world.

I fear that our action here today will lead down the road to a third world war. We are projecting ourselves into the complicated political affairs and internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. We are taking sides with a faction of the population in these respective nations. Some claim that we are only sending a military mission of some 100 or 200 men to administer the food and supplies provided for by this so-called assistance to Greece and Turkey bill. Four hundred million dollars is a lot of money, but that amount of money cannot stop communistic aggression in Greece or Turkey. In order properly to make Greece and Turkey our first line of defense it would require probably billions of dollars to build the necessary military installations, including air strips, pill boxes, improvement of docks, exporting of the necessary mechanized equipment, the installation of communication centers, the supplying of food, the equipping of a number of divisions of trained men that would actually be necessary properly to fortify Greece and Turkey. I think what we are doing here today is a serious matter, and I sincerely trust that we have not taken a step that may well lead to the repetition of past experiences. I am afraid that another world war would destroy liberty at home and abroad. In my humble judgment, the matter of assistance to Greece and Turkey should have been handled by the United Nations.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, 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?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to give the veterans a preference of employment in an isolated case where we are going to undertake a particular project in two countries. I do not believe that the American veterans of this last war or any other war in which this country has engaged want any further privileges over the average citizen in this country. We veterans have been well taken care of by the American Congress and the American people and are grateful. That is the first point.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Is it not true that under our general law now the veterans get preference without this special provision in this legislation?

Mr. FULTON. That was my second point. Under the general law already existing, under civil service, the veterans are adequately taken care of, and I do not believe that we should start the practice of hanging this veterans' preference on every bill that comes up here.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman has suggested that the veterans were well satisfied and being well taken care of. If the gentleman will just travel around over the country—and I assume the gentleman is a veteran—and look around a little and listen to the men talk, he may change that opinion. Further, what is wrong with placing a provision in here that will give the boys that fought for freedom along with you, and fought for all of us, and fought for our country this privilege? Why not give them an opportunity? Why not nail it down by this amendment so that they can be taken care of? What is wrong with that?

Mr. FULTON. I disagree. I had yielded at length to the successor of my good friend, Carroll Reece, and I feel I cannot yield any longer.

I might say that the veterans who are returning want to be citizens first and veterans second, and that we do not want always to be asking for special privileges. We feel when we have been given protection under a general act, and when we have been given very generous treatment by this Congress, that there can be little complaint.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one else is seeking recognition, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "furnish", insert "nonmilitary."

On page 1, line 7, after the semicolon, insert "and."

On page 2, line 8, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 2, line 9, strike out all down to the end of section 1.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to eliminate from this bill all of its military provisions. For years in America the Beautiful, as long as I can remember, we have been singing in our churches, "In the Cross of Christ I glory towering o'er the wrecks of time." One thing is sure, this legislation will increase the wreckage, but if this legislation is Christian doctrine then I do not know what the Christion Church stands for or represents. I can imagine how our people will feel seeing Uncle Sam arm in arm with Greek and Turkish monarchists marching down the pike and singing, "Onward, Christian Soldiers."

Mr. Chairman, wholesale hypocrisy has been practiced on the American people by the administration in the presenting of this bill for an international military alliance in the name of relief. Most of the newspapers, many of the radio commentators, and all of the State Department bureaucrats have used the word "relief." This, as I believe every person in the House recognizes, and as the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has stated, is a complete, deliberate act of wholesale misrepresentation. It is a scandal on the morality and the political ethics of the Truman administration that it should have engaged in this monstrous misrepresentation concerning the nature of the present bill before us. The sham, the pretense, the tears, the public vulgarity accompanying this monstrosity reflects on the intent of the administration.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps some Member of the House feels that these are strong words. Some Members of the House who oppose this bill have been accused of demagogy by exactly those people who in a complete spirit of Machiavellian demagogy have attempted to sell this insane military alliance to the American people under the pretext that it was giving food to the hungry and clothes to the naked.

Mr. Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, in speaking to a group of Members of the House a couple of months ago, stated that $60,000,000 would adequately take care of all of the relief needs of Greece in the next year. Herbert Hoover was sent abroad by President Truman to determine the relief needs. This was his answer.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in the House deeply appreciate the heroic sacrifices of the Greek people in the last war. If any people in the world deserve generosity and gratitude from America, it is the Greek people. They need food, they need clothes, they need economic help. I, for one, am more than ready to extend such help. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order that the genuine desires of the American people to assist the Greek peo-

ple shall not become a pawn in the hands of power-mad State Department bureaucrats, I am offering this amendment which, when it strikes from this bill all of its military aspects, will make of the present bill a genuine, bona fide, 100-percent relief bill—pure and simple.

Turkey needs no relief. It is fat, and is fat on the traitorous war profits which it squeezed from us and from its dealings with Hitler Germany. It needs no relief and no proponent of this measure has ever dared to suggest that it needs relief.

Mr. Chairman, the British for 2 years have organized, financed, and waged a merciless civil war against the great majority of the Greek people. They have taken American money to pay for their civil war, and they have used our supplies and UNRRA relief in the past to bolster up their criminal attack on the democratic rights and liberties of the Greek patriots now fighting in the mountains of Greece.

Food for the rich aristocracy of Athens and bullets for the machine guns with which to attack the democratic peasantry of Greece is not my idea of a relief bill. Long ago, in 1776, we separated ourselves from the ruthless policies of British imperialism. It would be the height of folly for us to employ on a world scale their ruthless tactics of civil war against the poor and relief for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the House should repudiate the monstrous misrepresentation generated by our State Department. It should repudiate the arrogant hypocrisy under which this proposal has been offered to the American people. We should make this bill a genuine relief measure. We should strike from this bill every element regarding the military. I urge that the House in all good conscience and good faith adopt the amendment which I am offering to eliminate all the military features from this bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we are making some progress now. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is early in the day and I think we ought to have a little more time to speak on this bill.

I plead with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs not to press his request.

Mr. EATON. The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], suggests that I ask that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so merely to ask the chairman this question.

I trust this is not evidence of an inclination to cut off debate because that is the thing we have been pleading for. What if it is going to take another day?

Mr. EATON. The gentleman's trust is well placed.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am apparently one of the insane Machiavellians that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has referred to in smearing all those who feel that this bill should pass.

You remember Bert Williams' song, "You don't need to know how much you know in order to know how little you know."

I have been to Greece and Turkey. I have recently talked to the elected representatives of 23 countries in Cairo. I realize that I do not know all about this. I have talked off the record with our ambassadors to Greece and Turkey and our military men here and in those countries. I realize I do not know all about this problem. But I know a great deal more about this and the threat to our own security which is involved than does my colleague who criticizes with wild and reckless generalities those who support this measure.

The pending amendment would take out the military advice and the military equipment which is proposed in this bill to give these two countries a chance to defend themselves against Soviet attacks. This amendment would make this a nice economic bill so that these countries could build themselves into richer prizes for Soviet aggression. This amendment makes this into a Henry Wallace bill. Wallace is the individual who is so anxious to furnish economic help over there but no military help of any kind so that these two countries may become richer and juicier Soviet prizes. I do not think the House wants to adopt the Henry Wallace program by adopting this amendment.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, ever since this proposal for this sort of aid to Greece and Turkey was brought to our attention by the President, I have been alarmed and worried by its implications. I have sought the advice of the people of the district I represent and the generous response has been gratifyingly thorough and thoughtful. I have, of course, studied the committee report and the debate.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in which we find ourselves in our consideration of this bill reminds me of the situation which confronted an early settler in the central part of New York State. He was a prosperous settler, the most prosperous in the entire area. Within his stockade, which lay in the center of his cultivated fields, he maintained a fine supply of arms and ammunition. It was a limited supply because all supplies were limited, but it was, nevertheless, sufficiently adequate to deter the savage Iroquois Indians from making a direct attack upon his settlement. This did not prevent the Iroquois, however, from commencing to threaten and harass the friendly and less warlike Mohicans who lived in the settlement's near vicinity. The settler knew that if these friendly Indians were destroyed, his danger at the hands of the Iroquois would be greater. He did not have enough guns and ammunition to arm all the friendly Mohicans but he reached the conclusion that it would be worth while to make a show of arming a few of them to demonstrate to the Iroquois that he meant business. His aim was to protect both his friends and himself. He also reached the conclusion that if this show of force failed, he would not leave himself defenseless by making panic distribution of the great bulk of his arms and ammunition. Instead, if and when an all-out attack by the Iroquois compelled him to retire into his stockade, he would still be strong and ready with food and guns and bullets and gunpowder.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill to aid Greece and Turkey. Beyond that, however, and for my part, I will oppose spreading our resources and our arms and our ammunition with such a free hand and in so many directions that we will be unable to withstand the Iroquois if and when they attack.

Mr. COTTON. 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 Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio which, if adopted, deprives the bill of all military significance and makes it purely a relief measure.

This amendment lays bare the real issue involved in this bill which has been largely evaded during the 3-day debate. Why should we camouflage and sugarcoat the decision which is before us? Let us face it squarely. This bill is a measure for military defense of the United States, and all for which the United States stands in the world today. That is why I am for it.

One by one the outposts of freedom have been engulfed by the onrushing tide of a world power which recognizes nothing but force and which intends to dominate the entire world. If Greece and Turkey, keys to the Near East, are so engulfed, the loss of Europe, Asia, and Africa is inevitable. The President of the United States in joint convention, has solemnly informed us that we, and we alone, can stem this tide. He has informed the Congress that a crumbling and bankrupt British Empire is no longer able to act, and that the United Nations organization, torn with dissension and restricted in its powers by its own charter, cannot meet this situation. His statement in this respect in corroborated by Warren Austin, delegate to the United Nations, and by Senator VANDENBERG who has inserted safeguards in the measure now before us to make sure that we shall not violate our obligation to that organization. The President has formally declared our policy to us and to the

world and calls upon Congress to support him. How can we do otherwise?

We have the bitter lessons of two wars to guide us. We failed to act when Hitler invaded the Rhineland, when the Nazis overpowered Czechoslovakia, and when Japan entered China. As a result, we expended thousands of lives and billions of dollars to gain beachheads in north Africa, Normandy, and on the islands of the Pacific. Shall we weakly surrender all that we have gained at such tremendous cost?

The vote which we cast today is more important than any that will be cast in this or perhaps any other session of Congress. The eyes of the world are upon this Chamber. The enemies of freedom, both foreign and domestic, are watching us. To be sure, if we embark upon the course that this bill provides we may ultimately face war, but if we reject that course we shall certainly face war or lose our liberties. Every school child knows the words of the great Virginian who made the first speech in our history against appeasement:

> What is it that the gentlemen wish? * * * Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God!

We, as a nation, cannot escape our manifest destiny which is to defend freedom at home and abroad. A vote against this bill is a vote for that policy of isolationism and appeasement which has twice led us down the road to war.

I repeat that this bill, while it properly carries relief to the sufferers of Greece, is fundamentally a measure for the military defense of this country. I shall vote for it.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, our Uncle Sam has gone delinquent. He is in his second childhood. He has deserted beautiful Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters. He has become an international philanderer. He is chasing red, pink, green, and off-colored skirts all over the world. He is squandering the wealth that Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters have created.

The time has come that we appoint a guardian to protect him from his folly, and prevent him from squandering the substance of our Nation—from giving away to gold diggers that which belongs to Miss Columbia and her sons and daughters—that which belongs to unborn generations.

I know of no better guardian than a Republican candidate for President in 1948, who believes in America first, last and all the time, with justice to all nations, whether they be the so-called 52 peace-loving nations—should be aggressors—or our vanquished foes. One who believes in the Stars and Stripes rather than in a mongrel flag. A candidate who knows enough to know that the One Worlders have been deflated. A candidate that has not, and will not, hob-nob with the former pal of Hitler, Joe Stalin.

I am sorry that such a candidate—such a guardian—is not yet in sight. I also know that 80 percent of the American people are getting sick and tired of our Uncle's behavior, and demand such a candidate. They know that our Uncle is the easy prey of the global gold diggers—that he is denuding our Nation. They know that he is leading us into another undeclared war.

I, too, realize that this is a momentous decision. But it need not be, if we remember that our first duty is to our own Nation. It is an easy decision, unless we knock-kneedly follow a few misguided, silver-topped octogenarians in both chambers of this Capitol.

The Republican Party was kept out of the White House for 16 years because it had no positive program—because its candidates were "me-too" followers of the One Worlders—globetrotters. The Democrats met a disastrous rebuke last November 5 because they too blindly followed blind leaders.

The time has come for both parties to again adopt the policy of our forefathers, and avoid globetrotting and foreign entanglements. The time has come for my Democratic friends to adopt the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson. The time has come for my Republican friends to adopt the doctrines of Abraham Lincoln. When that day comes, it will be a glorious day for the United States of America.

As I listened the other day to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], I was impressed with his dreadful earnestness, and astonished at his fallacious argument. It was the same old story—arm other nations, and they will protect us—will save us from war. How does the gentleman know on which side the Greeks or Turks will be in the next conflict? Does he not know that an armament race always has, and always will end in war?

Since when have we become so cowardly that we have to arm other nations to do our fighting—Hessians. I deny that that is essential, or for the best interest of our Nation or for the peace of the world. It means war.

Whenever the day comes that love for our country and patriotism falls so low, that this kind of chicanery is necessary, then the Republic that you and I have cherished and loved—the Republic that the world has looked to as a model of justice and decency to all nations—will be dead. Then, we will have surrendered all that is sacred and good to the human race.

Let us no longer be blind followers of deceptive slogans. We were deceived and led into World War I by false slogans. Then it was, "He kept us out of war," "Too proud to fight," "America first," and then "Benevolent belligerency," "A little group of willful men," "War to end all wars," and, "Make the world safe for democracy." Time has proven the dishonesty of all those slogans.

In World War II it was "Raise the arms embargo and save our boys," "Give us the tools and we will do the fighting—lend-lease," "The four freedoms," and then "I say again and again and again your sons will not be sent to foreign battlefields." Time has proven these slogans false. There are no four freedoms and our boys did the fighting.

Whatever difficulties we face today are of our own making. We went to bed with the former pal of Hitler and we are reaping the reward. Our Presidents and leaders were outgeneraled at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. In place of looking for more entanglements the time has come for Congress to repudiate Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, and all the other commitments that are not in keeping with decency and honesty among the nations.

History repeats itself. So does war. So do slogans. We are now being deceived into World War III. Now we are told that we—less than 7 percent of the world's population and owing twice as much as the rest of the world together—must become a permanent, international Santa Claus. We are told that we must not only feed the world but that we must arm and set nation against nation. That we must arm Greece and Turkey and set them against Hitler's former pal, more recently our pal.

In his special message to Congress the President short-circuited the UN—the angel of peace that concealed the truth and sanctioned the liquidation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, part of Poland, and part of Finland by the former pal of Hitler. The President insists that we accept reneging British commitments and assume guardianship of Greece, Turkey, and other nations. He says we must do this in order to head off communism—to save Britain from Russia.

In his armament race, in his power politics, the President is following the unfortunate footsteps of the former President. He is entering an undeclared war. All this could have been avoided if at Potsdam he had repudiated Yalta and taken a firm stand by telling Stalin to get back into his own country where he belongs and stay there.

Again, at about the time that the President asked for the $400,000,000 to arm Greece and Turkey against communism, our Government was turning over 650 artillery shell pressers and other implements of war to Russia as reparations. These were from the part of Germany that we occupy. The German war plants were dismantled and shipped to Russia. With one hand we arm Russia and with the other we are asked to equip the Greeks and Turks to combat her. The time has come to wake up. There is danger ahead.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers during the last few days have told us of the celebration throughout

Soviet Russia of "Soviet Radio Day." The Soviet radio throughout Russia and in broadcasts to other countries has been telling the world that the Soviet radio is "objective because it has nothing to hide" and has been assailing the American radio as a part of the "reactionary press." The Soviet radio has even attacked the Voice of America and I would like to read a part of a broadcast which the Russians sent over the air in four languages in Europe.

This broadcast is the second recognition the Russians have officially given to the Voice of the United States of America which has been broadcasting the news of the United States to the Soviet Union. Ilya Ehrenberg, the noted Soviet propagandist, previously has told us that the Voice of America is being heard in Soviet Russia. This new broadcast confirms the fact that many Russians are hearing the Voice of America and that apparently Russia is worried that they will hear more truth than they receive from Soviet newspapers and over the Soviet radio.

Here is what this Russian radio broadcast said:

When the famous Russian savant Alexander Popov discovered the method to transmit sound over a distance, he had visions of enriching humanity by the most perfect means of communication, expanding the viewpoints of the people who were afforded the possibility to transmit their thoughts and feelings from one end of the earth to the other with the speed of light. However, every one of humanity's great accomplishments can be twisted, and the world mass now repeatedly witnessed this. The German radio was in the hands of Goebbels for a few years, and there began the demoralization of the German people, a source of misinformation, a propagandist for war, murder, and robbery, and of race theories hostile to humanity.

To hear the same motives in a more democratized version, one has but to tune in on the New York wave lengths. There we hear propaganda for the need to create American * * *. Throughout the world we hear imperialistic plans for the conquest of strategic positions in the Near East and the Levant; hysterical appeals for a crusade against communism, against socialism, and labor unions; in general, against any progressive democratic movement, slanderous fabrications about countries of the new democracy, etc., etc.

Some people accuse the Soviet people that they are too sensitive about such reports. But the fact is that in * * * our Socialist country there is no room for the dissemination of slander and falsification. This arouses aversion on our part simply because we are decent. The Soviet information is objective because it has nothing to hide. With us there are no monopolist groups which pay good salaries for falsifications.

Facts in themselves are objective, but there is not one radio station nor newspaper in the world which in reporting these facts does not express a certain standpoint. The point is, Whose standpoint? Soviet radios throughout the world express the true and sincere opinion of the entire Soviet * * * of the powerful and peace-loving people that is prepared to collaborate with all to create a democratic peace. But in countries where everything is figured in dollars, where the radio is a source of income to the instigators of a new * * * there the radio is not the expression of the people, but that of those 60 or 100 or 200 families who control the radio stations.

This broadcast is only one of many recent Soviet broadcasts in a campaign of false and malicious information about the United States over the air waves of the world.

Since March 12, when President Truman proposed the $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, the Soviet radio has been systematically attacking what they call the "atom" and "dollar" diplomacy of "imperialist capitalists" to take over Turkey and Greece.

This campaign reached its climax during the past week when the Soviet radio began broadcasting the attack of their newspaper Izvestia on Secretary Marshall's speech on the Moscow Conference. On Soviet Radio Day this attack was broadcast in 19 transmissions in 12 languages throughout Europe and the Near East—the greatest concentrated attack the Soviet radio has ever made on a statement of the President or the Secretary of State of the United States. The Soviet broadcasts went to Greece, Turkey, and the Arabic countries which the Voice of America does not now reach. It is highly important that we make every effort to tell the American story in this highly important region.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill, commonly known as the loan to Greece and Turkey, has been in the most part earnest and sincere and of a very high order. The debate has reflected the fact that the membership is much concerned about what is the proper course to take. This is in all sincerity a very important bill because it calls for a complete departure in governmental policy. I want to emphasize this statement that this is a complete departure in governmental policy and further that it is tremendously important. It is appallingly important. I hope that whatever action the House takes on this proposed legislation will ultimately prove to be for the best interest of our country and future generations.

Much has been said on the floor of this House and through the press suggesting that this question is much the same as the question which confronted our country when we enunciated the Monroe Doctrine. I fail to see any similarity between this problem and the problems which confronted us in President Monroe's time. In fact the situation seems to be diametrically different. At that time we were laying the foundations of America. We said then, in effect, that any attempt by an European nation to gain dominion in America would be considered by us as an unfriendly act and would be opposed to the limit of our resources. In other words, we were then protecting ourselves. We were, in effect, removing ourselves away from all European aggression. We purposely assumed a defensive attitude. I think that any attempt at this time to establish a so-called Truman doctrine and claim for it the merits of the Monroe Doctrine is simply an effort to enhance the political stature of Mr. Truman. The course sought to be established by this bill is in every respect a course toward imperialism. It is a course that promises to lead us into foreign entanglements and not away from them.

Many of the Members who have spoken on this floor in advocacy of this legislation have frankly admitted that we are starting on a new course. We are not following a course of defending America for the protection of Americans but we are following a course which its advocates say is one that takes liberty to the peoples of other countries and other continents. This may be true but as yet I am not convinced that it is the right course. Personally, I think that this proposed course is of such tremendous importance that we should give it more consideration than has been given to it. When we enter upon this course we will find ourselves moving inevitably toward a one world. I think that the leaders of our country are not justified in moving so aggressively on this course. The people of the country have not been thoroughly advised with reference to the tremendous changes which this course is bound to bring us from a national and an international standpoint.

Personally, I do not think that the time has come when this great country of ours should throw itself into any movement that has for its ultimate purpose a one-world government. The fact that there is so much honest uncertainty in the minds of so many Members of Congress is proof to me that we are today embarking upon a course, the end of which we cannot safely foresee. The situation to my mind is not so imminent as to demand this action at this time.

The President in the speech he made at Waco, Tex., on March 6, took unto himself much more authority and power than rightfully belong to the Presidency. The President has no right to commit our people to a course which carries with it such momentous consequences. I should like to ask where, under our theory of government, does the President have a right to commit the American people to this course of action. In his speech at Waco, he said:

At this particular time, the whole world is concentrating much of its thought and energy on attaining the objectives of peace and freedom. These objectives are bound up completely with a third objective—reestablishment of world trade. In fact the three—peace, freedom, and world trade—are inseparable.

I agree with the President when he says that the whole world is anxious for peace and freedom. But I do not agree that peace and freedom and world trade are inseparable. In fact I claim that in all the history of our country freedom has been the cardinal purpose of our country and that we cherished this purpose as fervently and even more fervently in war than in peace. Freedom is one thing and peace is another and world trade is quite another. They are all desirable but not inseparable. We would be justified to go to war for freedom's sake but not for the sake of world trade.

When the President says, "Our foreign relations, political and economic, are indivisible, we cannot say that we are willing to cooperate in the one field and are unwilling to cooperate in the other," he

takes unto himself more authority than belongs to the office of the Presidency. In fact he attempts to commit our great Nation to a policy upon which our people have never publicly spoken. We have fought wars in defense of our political relationships but not in defense of our trade relationships. Furthermore, if our people have ever spoken on this subject, their voice has been recorded exactly opposite to the position which the President takes. We have always maintained that as far as our relationships with foreign countries are concerned, our political relationship is one thing and our economic relationship is something else. He attempts to sound forth a new policy which is not a recognized American policy.

The American emissaries at the Economic Conference in Geneva which is now in session are encountering stubborn obstacles in their efforts to foist this program upon the world. The opposition which they are encountering is a natural opposition. They are in Geneva representing a Nation in which a free economy has always been maintained and in which private industry and freedom of action have been the dominating and controlling forces. They are now attempting to deal and bargain with representatives of some nations whose economy is now largely state-controlled and with some nations that are controlled by communistic dictatorships. In other words, the representatives of the countries with whom we are dealing can speak with the authority of a dictator and can make trades without regard to the people of their respective countries while our representatives must consult with the people whom they represent. Our representatives represent a free people while many of the other representatives speak for the state or the dictator who is above the people.

The attempt of the President to speak for America is nothing more or less than an attempt on the part of the New Deal leadership to continue the practices of President Roosevelt as he went about the world committing our country to courses of action without having consulted the people or their elected representatives. When it was so plain that the most unsophisticated of our people knew that we would have trouble with Russia after the war why did not President Roosevelt in some of his many secret conferences anticipate what is happening today and guard against it? I have always maintained that the countries whose peoples were of the same racial extractions and of the same religious philosophies and the same political philosophies as ours should have joined together in the fluxing processes of the last war. They should have been encouraged to stand together against the communistic and pagan and anti-Christian and anti-human freedom countries of eastern Europe.

Likewise, the President in his message to Congress on March 12 assumed to commit our country to courses of action which the American people have not approved. As I have already stated, the President has no inherent right to commit our country to courses of action unless the same have been well recognized courses and unless the people have accepted them or unless the country is in imminent danger.

I quote from the President's message:

> I therefore ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. In requesting these funds, I have taken into consideration the maximum amount of relief assistance which would be furnished to Greece out of the $350,000,000 which I recently requested that the Congress authorize for the prevention of starvation and suffering in countries devastated by the war.
>
> In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction, and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished. I recommend that authority also be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel.
>
> Finally, I ask that the Congress provide authority which will permit the speediest and most effective use, in terms of needed commodities, supplies, and equipment, of such funds as may be authorized.
>
> If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

In this message the President says:

> In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilians and military personnel to Greece and Turkey.

I maintain that the President went entirely too far in attempting to commit our country to a new course which is entirely contrary to the foreign philosophy that we have heretofore followed. Never before in the history of our country has a President attempted to embark our country on a course of military aggrandizement or military imperialism. When we pass this legislation, we are doing it at the behest of the President and in an attempt to follow the course which I maintain that he has improperly charted for us. If this bill is passed as it is, as many Members who have already spoken on this matter have said, it is just the beginning. The President in the remarks that I have already quoted makes the solemn announcement as follows:

> If further funds or further authority should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress.

My colleagues, this action that we are about to take is the first step in the third world war. The President's language can mean nothing else. This appropriation of $400,000,000 is a military appropriation, and nothing else.

I maintain that the country is not ready for a declaration of war, and I shall not vote for a measure which is virtually a declaration of war. I maintain that the situation is not so imminent as to require this action.

I am sorry that our State Department does not have the confidence of the American people. I only wish it did have. That it does not have is due to its failure to be forthright in its dealing with the people. If we had a strong Department of State in which the American people had confidence and if we had an Executive who was recognized as a leader of thought in his own right, and if these two great departments of the Government, after the approval of the military and naval authorities of the Government, would bring us the information that any foreign country was surely and certainly planning military opposition that would threaten the rights and safety of our great country, I would then, as I have done in the last several years, vote to support them in such a program. But since the situation is entirely different, I feel it my duty not to cast a vote that from all indications will lead us into war.

In this connection, and in all seriousness, let me ask, Why is it that the United Nations organization has not been called upon to lend its good offices in an effort to compose and resolve these differences? Of all the nations in the world that should recognize the United Nations, it is the United States of America. We were more responsible for its establishment than any other country and we pay more for its maintenance than any other country. No one of those who have spoken that I have heard has claimed that the United Nations could not have jurisdiction in this case. It may be that it is not a case to come within the jurisdiction of the United Nations, but surely when the United Nations was set up it was contemplated that that organization would have such jurisdiction as would permit it to consider whatever issues this problem raises. But so long as there are Communists holding high places in our Government, and so long as persons in high places in the Government such as was the case in the Roosevelt administration, who knowingly associate and collaborate with well-known communistic persons and groups, I do not feel like taking steps that will surely involve us in war. Let us put our house in order first. Then let us encourage those peoples who subscribe to our political and social philosophies and then let us make ourselves strong in a military and naval way and while we are doing this let us call upon the United Nations organization to protect Greece and Turkey from the insidious encroachments of Soviet Russia through her infiltrations of communism and other sinister philosophies and practices which upset the internal peace and prosperity of Greece and Turkey. When and if all these efforts fail we can then appeal to the arbitrament of war.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks concerning the Greek-Turkish loan, as recommended to Congress by the President, it seems to me there can be one open door to the course of action to be taken. The program is being discussed throughout the length and breadth of our land and in foreign countries as well. It becomes now the immediate problem of the Members of Congress, after thorough investigation, discussion, and debate, to decide which policy this country will follow. No Member or group of men can foresee the far-reaching effects and ultimate outcome the action will have.

There are in this country a great number of intelligent Americans representing every walk of economic and political life, who have a firm belief in democracy and in its survival. We, in the United States, live under the oldest written Constitution in the world. We have a tradition of freedom. Despite occasional irrationalities, the dislike of servility and regimentation is deeply ingrained in the American character. To exercise free speech, free choice, free government, is one of America's chief contributions to the world. This tradition of freedom constitutes a backbone that refuses to crumble before authority. The strength of this democracy of freedom is that the United States must remain firm and true to its purpose. The true American feels that what is best in his own democracy will be best for men in all other countries seeking like ideals. There is nothing we want for ourselves that we do not want, ultimately, for the rest of the world.

We know the philosophy of Russia and the policy that follows the infiltration of ideologies into smaller countries, with the ultimate objective to incorporate through revolt and revolution or by conquest. This policy was followed by Hitler during his leadership in Germany.

Now, as we are faced with these nations which have suffered the ravages of war and are now in a state of unrest and fear of being pressed into submission by an aggressor nation, it seems to me, that America must take a firm stand in its foreign policy and discontinue the policy of appeasement. Appeasement leads only to more appeasement until we should soon find our backs to the wall and our leadership as a Nation completely wrested from us. The consequences are not hard to imagine.

To accept a do-nothing policy puts democracy under a handicap. We cannot continue a great democracy by giving ourselves up as individuals to selfishness and physical comfort and be blind to the desperate need of others. The very foundation of the American ideal of a better and richer life for all is that others, in varying degrees, may share it.

There are two alternatives for our action toward Greece and Turkey. One is lending aid, thereby furnishing the help needed to retain their freedom. The other, to serve notice to them that we are not concerned with their problem, thus leaving them in their vain struggle against aggression.

Let us stop and ask ourselves this question: "Is peace the supreme end of foreign policy or is the survival of nations in independence and security a greater end than peace?" Through the creation of the United Nations organization we have hope that these problems will eventually be settled, but we are all aware that at this period in its development and progress, it is still unable to cope with this responsibility. Therefore, I do not concede that we are bypassing the United Nations. The Greek-Turkish loan is a direct appeal to the United States.

Although included in this are funds for military aid, I do not feel that this action will lead to war, but will lend more to bringing about a lasting peace, in that these smaller nations will be put in a better position financially and morally to oppose the pressure being brought upon them.

No great power can be indifferent to any of the other great powers. It must take a position in regard to all of them. There are two great powers left in the world. America is at the crossroads as to whether we accept or reject the world leadership in the ideals of our democracy of freedom. If we accept it, we must take a firm and positive stand on foreign policy, the object being not only to provide security against war but also to organize a peace which will prevent war. We want a foreign policy so strong and so dependable that there is no way of challenging it.

To preserve civilization, we must be ready to give the world more than we get. The nation or the individual who looks for the tangible returns and quick profits will be the very one who will come back empty handed. We must have faith in God and confidence in those nations who accept our aid, that freedom, security, and peace may be achieved.

Consequently, it is my personal conviction that I must support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

On the issue before us, I take my position beside Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the outstanding patriot from Virginia. Possibly the forces back of the pending bill know that it would take us into war, and intend that it should. In that case, we may be sure the necessary incident to start the conflagration will appear in due time.

On the other hand, it may be that those responsible for bringing this measure before Congress are not deliberately maneuvering the United States into war but believe the action they are asking Congress to take will somehow spare the United States from another holocaust. If this be the case, the United States would be placing itself in the precarious position of possibly losing what power it possesses to prevent war. The Greeks and Turks might provide incidents of their own, in which event they—not we—would make the great decision. Is the United States placing its destiny in the hands of the Greeks and Turks?

What will the Turks get out of the war, if this eventuates, and what will be the spoils of Greece? Is anyone so naive as to believe they would deign to farm out their homelands to be used as a war base without some promise of territorial expansion? Was there not once a far-flung and powerful Ottoman Empire? Are we to presume that this fact does not still linger in the minds of the Turks?

First, the United States used of its resources to enthrone Hitler in power. Then at a fearful financial, material, and moral cost we knocked him off his high pedestal, but put something just as bad and possibly worse in his place. Now the Congress is being importuned and inveigled to inaugurate a scheme to shear Hitler's successor of his power.

Having accomplished that—more likely than not at an additional terrific cost of blood and physical and moral resources—and possibly the enthronement of the Turk in power, will the United States then be obliged to continue the cycle of destroying and reestablishing empires by abolishing our latest creation? Where will it all end? God alone knows.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me I should like to say something about an incident that very much affected me this morning. Over in my office about an hour ago a group of Communists called upon me, and I imagine other gentlemen have had the same experience in the last day or so. They wanted very much to know how I was going to vote on this Greece-Turkey bill. They were very much against it, of course. I told them to their teeth that I was going to vote for it. I further asked these gentlemen, and I had to put the question six or seven times before I got a straight answer, in the event of a conflict of interests between the Government of the United States and the Government of Russia, which Government would they, as the Communist Party of the United States, support. Their final answer was that they would support the Government of Russia against the United States.

That is the American Communist Party for you. Mr. Lenin, on numerous occasions, and Mr. Stalin, following him, frequently have stated the world-wide ambitions of communism. Let us make no mistake about their purposes. They have exemplified those purposes by the countries surrounding Russia today.

Gentlemen who oppose this measure state that they do so because of the economy of America and that they do not wish to deplete the resources of the United States. Let me ask those gentlemen: Are they willing to let Russia expand over the rest of the world? Are they willing to adopt a head-in-the-sand policy and permit Russia to take over the trade routes of the world? If Russia does that, what will be the result? There will result a competition between the United States and the Russian-dominated world wherein Russia, having a slave economy with ten to fifteen or perhaps more million people in slave camps working for the Russian economy, will compete with the United States. Where, then, will our economy end up? It will end up competing with the totalitarian world. Those gentlemen who talk of economy and protecting the economy of the United States—are they willing to let Russia take over the economy of the world? If that is the situation, then we

will have to become somewhat totalitarian ourselves to compete with slave labor and the average of $1.08 an hour that American labor now earns will be reduced by at least half as a result of competing with 15,000,000 slaves.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would strike all military aid from this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no greater mistake than the attempt to strike all military aid from this bill which calls for assistance to Greece and Turkey. Actually, as we all know, this legislation cannot be justified merely as relief for these two countries. The American people are entitled to know that we entertain no illusions that the assistance we are to render is other than basically military and strategic in character. However strong may be the need for civilian and economic help to indomitable Greece, it has been clearly demonstrated that Turkey neither needs nor expects anything but a bolstering of her out-of-date military machine. In the case of Greece, we will surely lose the chief fruit of our investment if we do not couple such economic help as we are prepared to give with advice in reorganizing and strengthening her army and by furnishing arms and munitions. Military aid is thus the heart of the entire program for both countries.

I think our experience in practicing sweet gentleness and forbearance that led up to two wars ought to demonstrate the futility of temporizing with dictators. An estimable gentleman by the name of Chamberlain found that being polite is not always the most effective way to deal with bullies.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we also found that being polite to the Japanese in Hawaii did not pay.

Mr. GOFF. I thank the gentleman.

We will be adopting a halfway measure if we strike the military-aid provision out of this bill. When you are dealing with bears you have to speak in growls, the only language that a bear can understand.

It seems to me the fundamental issue before us is whether we are prepared to stop this program of infiltration and aggression. We ought to make this action strong enough for Stalin to understand that we are prepared to go the limit in preventing Greece and Turkey from being taken over as have been the whole list of smaller countries on the borders of Russia. I was not impressed the other day with the argument that because we had stood by and permitted the gobbling up of Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other countries that we should not now protect Greece and Turkey. Whatever mistakes may have been made in yielding to Stalin at Yalta and Teheran, I thought Secretary Byrnes, fortified by bipartisan support at home, had stopped backing away and announced there would be no further compromise on the principles for which we had poured out American lives and treasure. We have done a lot of talking about freedom for small nations and their right to self-determination. Now is the time to show the world we meant what we said. What the Russians respect most is a firm stand and a strong hand. These will come nearer to prevention of war with them than any policy of appeasement. We did not free Europe from the Nazis just to let the Communists move in. That would be throwing away the sacrifices we have already made.

We should have had our understanding with Russia, without any compromise of principles, when her back was against the wall, and when she called on us for help. Any concession or show of weakness on our part now will permit her to grow in strength and make the inevitable show-down all the more difficult for us when finally it comes.

After serving in two wars, I have had my fill, but surely we must realize that temporizing is not the way to stop aggressors. The people of Russia are entitled to have any type of government they want, but they must not force it on us or on the rest of the world. I, too, have looked over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Stalin should understand that we are not agreeing to withhold anything if he persists in his present course, and that is the reason I voted against the amendment on atomic weapons submitted by the gentlewoman from California. I do not propose that we repeat the mistake of Britain which sent Chamberlain over to stop Hitler with an umbrella.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that everybody's mind has been made up and the debate means nothing; that each one has made up his mind. I do not concur. I will state frankly that I am grateful for the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We who do not concur in their conclusions nevertheless respect their sincerity and industry. I want to commend especially the work of Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. VORYS, of our own State of Ohio.

During the 4-day debate my opinion is that the outstanding address has been made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. He is a member of the opposite party and I have never met the honorable gentleman. However, he gave a message which we must heed when in substance he said: "Let us avoid hysteria. By all means let there be no speeches for applause and, at the time of voting, let us know that emotionalism shall not have the right-of-way." Let me state frankly that self-will shall not guide my vote.

If Dr. JUDD's amendment had been agreed to, I would have supported the bill. If the present amendment or any amendment is offered and carried which will remove us from being an aggressive power-politics nation which could change this greatest of all peaceful nations into a nation asking for war, I could support this measure. I could support it if it meant that our tractors in Greece which are now rusting would be put to work, that there would be a chance for a better world and not an opportunity for hysteria to lead us into war mindedness and war madness.

War is not imminent, neither is peace imminent. Through hysteria, we are now building up a straw man at which to shoot, thus allowing "patriotism to become the refuge of a scoundrel." I do not mean that the person so shouting is purposely a scoundrel but when hysteria instead of sound reasoning guides power propaganda talk, he involuntarily becomes one unintentionally. I shall have an open mind but there have been no facts presented to show the need which has been expressed through emotionalism.

There was a time when people called others vulgar or profane names. Now, we politely call everyone with whom we do not agree, a Communist, a Fascist, a Nazi, an isolationist, an internationalist, a New Dealer, a conservative Republican, or a reactionary Democrat. These words are also the product of hysteria. There is not a gentleman in either of the great parties on the floor of this House whom I do not respect and whom I would brand with any of these names. I do not always respect the judgment of some, but I would not charge these names to any one on the floor of the House.

The history of communism we know and we know of its start in Russia. We know of the start of fascism in Italy and of nazism in Germany. All were created when the people surrendered their freedom to their government for things and by so surrendering they not only lost their freedom but failed to obtain things. We breed communism, fascism, and nazism when we surrender the sovereignty of the individual to the control of government authority. A great many think those who vote for this measure are isolationists, isolating a group of countries against another asking for war. I do not impugn their motives. There are others who maintain everyone who loves the United States of America is an isolationist. Neither do I concur in this view. We only become isolationists in mind when we refuse to recognize the viewpoint of another. Isolationism is mental. Even though counterfeit ghost-writers are able to attach these slanderous names to persons, let us not personalize any of these names to the colleague with whose views we do not agree.

My appeal is, let us be sane. Let us not be self-willed in this hour of decision. Let us listen to the "still, small voice" instead of that self-will and be guided by the "still, small voice" in this critical hour.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

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

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER:

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 "those 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."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "or of Turkey."

On page 3, line 13, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, does that means that the committee will have the last 5 minutes or is that in addition to 5 minutes for the committee?

Mr. EATON. The committee does not want any time on this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, President Truman has asked us to form a military alliance with a nation whose record in the art of international double-cross is without parallel in the annals of history. This nation, for a thousand years, has persecuted Christians and Jews. It is without free elections, it denies freedom of the press, it is ruled by a ruthless military dictatorship. There is no argument, Mr. Chairman, of any kind—political, economic, or ethical—which does not argue against the inclusion of Turkey within this proposed bill.

Mr. Chairman, would any Member of the House invite a thief into his home to protect his property? Is there anybody who would hire a bandit to protect his wealth? Is there anybody who would pay a military dictator in order to guarantee his civil rights and his civil liberties? Is there anybody in the House who can conscientiously point to any ground whatsoever for putting our national security into the hands of the present Turkish Government? How in God's name can American national security be entrusted to a government which on the record has broken every single international commitment it ever made?

Mr. Chairman, in 1926 Turkey and several other powers signed the Montreux Convention, under which armed control of the Dardanelles was returned to Turkey. Mr. Chairman, do the Members of the House know that Winston Churchill denounced in the bitterest possible terms in the House of Commons the open, flagrant violation of the Montreux Convention by the Turkish Government during the last war? Do the Members know that Anthony Eden, Foreign Minister of Britain, likewise denounced the violation of this convention? Do all of us know that the United States Government, Russia, and Britain are committed to review and revise the Montreux Convention governing the Dardanelles? Mr. Chairman, if all of us know these simple facts which are a matter of record, why does our State Department propose to guarantee continued Turkish military control of the Dardanelles? They go further, Mr. Chairman. In this bill, what in effect they propose is an enduring and continuing military alliance with Turkey. And where, Mr. Chairman, does this military alliance end? In this bill, we are asked to pay a first installment on a mercenary army. Will we be asked next year for another one hundred and fifty or two-hundred and fifty millions of dollars for Turkish armaments in the years 1949, 1950, 1951? This policy, Mr. Chairman, of hiring mercenary armies was employed against the American people in 1776 by the British, and now we propose to repeat on a world scale the age-old errors of British imperialism—measures whose immorality and whose utter viciousness I cannot adequately describe.

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of the world has a policy of hiring foreign mercenaries in any way contributed to the national security of a country. Let us put that on the record, Mr. Chairman. Can any Member of the House cite an instance in the history of the world in which the national security of a country was properly and adequately maintained by the hiring of mercenary troops of another foreign nation? Washington and Jefferson and Madison knew and understood the immorality and colossal stupidity of such insane policies.

Never in American history, Mr. Chairman, have we proposed to establish our national security on the basis of foreign mercenary armies and an international system of mercenary alliances. This policy has been conceived in corruption and disguised in the robes of hypocrisy. It is a fatal policy—it is a policy of war and world power politics. It is a policy which no American voter has ever cast his vote for. The American people oppose it. The House of Representatives, in all good conscience and good faith, should agree to the amendment which I herewith introduce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, to adopt the pending amendment would, of course, be equivalent to adopting the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio offered yesterday when he moved to strike out the enacting clause. To strike out aid to Turkey would be but to invite immediate action on the part of the Soviet Union and to place Greece in an utterly untenable position, and it would simply place us in a position where we would be certainly involved in war. If you want to guarantee involvement of this country in foreign wars you can do it no more effectively than to adopt this amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio says: "Turn over the Dardanelles, turn over the most strategic point in all the eastern part of the world to the Soviet Union." I say turn over because they have demanded it. They have already sent their demands to Turkey and said: "We must put our armies in your territory and take control of the Dardanelles."

If America says to the world that we are not interested, then the Turks must give in. What else can they do? What would you do if you were in their position? Turkey is a country of about 18,000,000 people with more than 800,000 now under arms and they have been under arms for years. That constitutes a burden that no civilized people can long endure. Of course, Russia knows that. She therefore proposes to keep Turkey under arms until such time as Turkey's economy has collapsed by the weight of the burden of this great armament, then Russia will move in and take what it wants unless we show clearly that we will resist with all our resources.

This amendment is a direct invitation to Russia to invade Turkey. How long could Greece last if the Dardanelles fall? Those of you who have not thought this thing out, look at the map. With a Russian army on the Bosphorus and on the Dardanelles, and a Russian navy coming through these passages into the Aegean Sea, how long do you think that Greece could stand?

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has flown over the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles only 3 weeks ago and has talked with our own military attaché. I suggest that the gentleman knows what he is talking about.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim that I am an expert. Maybe I stayed 1 day too long to be an expert and 1 day too short to write a book, but we did see the physical aspects of some of these problems and we did have the opportunity to talk with the American military attaché in Turkey as well as with many of the officials of Turkey. We talked also to newspapermen, we talked to American educators, we talked to all we could find. I am convinced if there is one place on this earth that is anticommunistic it is Turkey today. If there is any nation in the world that will resist Russian aggression it is Turkey. If there is one place where the Communists have made no inroads it is Turkey and not the United States. Turkey presents a more solid opposition to Russian aggressor than we do right here. We have our apologists for Russia, some of them sitting around here today. We have them in every part of this country. But not so in Turkey. The Turks have lived next door to Russia for generations and have been the victims of Russian aggression in the past. I am thoroughly convinced that those people in Turkey, if given any assurance that the United States will back them up with the needed supplies and with an air force, will fight to the death and resist Russian or any other aggression.

With the kind of army that Turkey has and with the spirit that Turkey has, I am convinced, as are our military men, that Turkey can withstand any pressure that is put on her; that Turkey can and will keep an invasion from coming in through these mountains in the northeast and that they can keep an invasion from coming in across those fortifications north and west of Istanbul, some of which we actually saw. They simply must have the assurance that we are with them. To tell Turkey that we would not

help her would be but to make any effective Turkish resistance impossible, and to make Russian invasion a certainty. Surely no American on this floor fails to realize that, whether this bill is passed or not, a Russian invasion of Turkey means war for the United States. The only way to avoid war is to prevent such an invasion. That is what this bill tries to prevent. It tries to prevent it first by showing the Turkish people that if they resist aggression, they will not fight alone or in vain, and second, by convincing the Russian rulers that an attack on Turkey means war with the United States. Those of us who support this bill believe that by making the fact of serious consequences perfectly plain in advance, we will probably prevent any overt act.

This amendment does none of the things we want. It leaves us committed in Greece, but invites Russia to outflank Greece. It says in effect that we will fight but not until we have been placed in a much less favorable position than the one we now occupy. It says that rather than defend Greece while we have the aid of a powerful Turkish Army fighting for their own homes, that we must wait until Turkey is overrun and then we must try to defend Greece after all reasonable defense is past.

My friends, if we are going to kill this bill and turn the world over to the Soviet Union, let us do it frankly in the open. Do not try to do by indirection what we refused to do directly only yesterday.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this act, and any necessary expenses related thereto, to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established by it for the purpose.

(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this act, such payments when made shall be credited to accounts for such countries established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) (1) Payment in advance by the government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 3, after the comma, strike out the balance of the line down to and including the comma on line 4.

Page 3, line 10, strike out "by it."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "accounts for such countries established for the purpose" and insert, "such countries in accounts established for the purpose."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 4, line 22, after the period, add a new section:

"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, and 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."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, the legislation the gentleman proposes is very important and very fundamental legislation, but it ought to come before the committee in a special bill. I make the point of order that it is not germane to the present bill.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not. This is in the interest of the taxpayers and the bond buyers of the United States. It is to protect their funds. If the committee does not care to consider the amendment, I have nothing else to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to create a Foreign Funds Control Commission, to be an independent agency of the Government and to have control not merely over the funds proposed to be authorized by the pending legislation but over funds that might be made available under other legislation. Consequently the Chair sustains the point of order and rules that the amendment is not germane.

Are there further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act not to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; and (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 12, strike out "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 15, after the semicolon insert "and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this act."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 20, after the semicolon insert the following: "and (f) nor shall any of the loans, credits, or grants be used for the payment, allowance, and maintenance of any army foreign to that country."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, it has been a real education during the last 3 days to see how this bill is being handled in the House. I thought yesterday when the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered his very valuable amendment that it would be adopted, but the reception it received was very much the opposite. I thought today when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] offered their amendments that because of their validity and worth-whileness they would be accepted by the House, but they likewise received very little support.

I do not know how much support this amendment will get. I am not going to take the full time allotted to me under the rules of debate because I think the amendment explains itself quite clearly.

You will note in the preceding part of the section before this amendment goes in that it states as follows:

As a further condition precedent to the receipt of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid under paragraph (1) of section 1 the government requesting such aid shall agree not to use any part of the proceeds thereof for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government.

That is the committee amendment, and I think it is very worth while. But I would like to see added to it the amendment which is now before the House and which reads as follows:

nor shall any of the loans, credits, or grants be used for the payment, allowance, or maintenance of any army foreign to that country.

In explanation, we have been told that the British brigade would have to leave Greece because Britain could not maintain the cost of continuing that force there. I do not want to see American funds used for further maintenance of the British brigade in Greece, and, furthermore, I do not want to see the funds which will be allocated under this act used for bringing in a mercenary army. Furthermore, I do not want to see the funds which will very likely be appropriated under this authorization used to transfer or maintain any mercenary armies which are on the loose at the present time. I refer specifically in that regard to the Polish legions under General Anders, which at the present time have no country of their own to which to turn and which have been used in various capacities in various instances prior to this date. I think that explains the amendment sufficiently.

I hope the House will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 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?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment is one of those attempts to build a wall piecemeal all around a big area. If we try to put a universal negative in here by little specific instances, we will never get through handling this bill.

Of course, we are not going to have our administrators over there throwing the money down sewers. We are not going to have them putting the money in other countries than Greece and Turkey or their agencies, so you do not need such amendments, if you credit our representatives with sane common sense. Our administrators are there to help Greece and Turkey. They are not there to help any other power or maintain or pay for the army of that power.

It has been mentioned in the debate about the number of British troops in Greece. As one from the Foreign Affairs Committee who has some knowledge of the matter, I would like to explain shortly the situation with reference to the troops in Greece, and also the situation with respect to outside troops in Turkey.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], on page 4819 of the RECORD, said this:

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.

Actually what has happened in the case of Britain in Greece is this, they do have on security duty about 10,000 troops, which is one brigade. We ourselves have one division of troops for the city of Trieste. We are going to have an American contingent of 5,000 troops composed of the Blue Devil Brigade of the Eighty-eighth Division under Maj. Gen. Bryant S. Moore, who are to be there on a long-time basis when the treaties are ratified with the former belligerent countries of Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. The ratifications of these various treaties of the Four Powers, the United States, Britain, Russia, and France, are now under consideration by the United States Senate.

The treaty provisions propose and bind the signatories, that within 90 days after the ratification of those treaties by the Four Powers the United States, Britain, and Russia will all simultaneously withdraw those troops which they have in these four countries. The treaties do not apply to Greece, because Greece is not one of these treaty countries.

The situation in Greece has been handled by Britain in this fashion: Britain by statement of internal policy has said to the world that they would remove those troops from Greece at the time that Russia moves her troops out of Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. She has done that as a unilateral action ahead of time, as a voluntary action to show Russia that she will come out of the nontreaty country, Greece, at the same time that Russia moves her troops out of the treaty countries. I think that is a fair and a sane action to take; and, as you know, it was done voluntarily.

The British brigade went to Greece in 1944 at the time of the ELAS insurrection, when everyone admits it was necessary to restore public order, on the liberation of Greece. Then it was necessary because the German troops had departed and that left a vacuum so that somebody from the Allied side had to assist the people of Greece to fill it. Under the arrangement made by Roosevelt at Yalta the British were the ones to maintain order in the lower end of the Balkan Peninsula, Greece. So it was entirely in accord with the foreign policy of both Britain and the United States to have those troops there.

Britain has already put those troops at this present minute on a retirement basis and is waiting to remove them. They have no active duties in the present leftist trouble at the present time.

On the other hand, Britain has an economic civilian mission there and a police civilian mission. The economic mission has been doing just about the same thing that we intend to do in aiding Greece toward stabilizing its finances. The police mission is recruited from metropolitan police from the city of London. London bobbies are now assisting in keeping order. In Greece in addition to these, the British have a military advisory mission; and that is the sort of thing that we intend to do on the military side here. The British at present cannot afford to go further and alone keep the military mission there in an advisory capacity when they cannot furnish aid on the many projects necessary to help Greece rise to the level of the society of our democracies. We must not forget the British are our friends and have assumed to this date a heavy obligation in Greece to help her back on her feet, so she can stand as a friendly partner in the democratic world.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana to the committee amendment: On

page 5, line 24, after section 3 insert "And (h) shall agree to undertake within 6 months and after the enactment thereof a bona fide effort through taxation to support its own national reconstruction, rehabilitation, and economy; and such Government shall further undertake within such period to graduate the rates of any taxes imposed by such Government upon the income of its nationals in such a manner as to insure that the appropriate burden of taxation is borne by those taxpayers with the greatest ability to pay. The quarterly report required by section 7 shall also include a statement of the progress of such Government in effectuating the provisions of this paragraph."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized. The unanimous-consent agreement entered into heretofore was that all time on the amendment pending and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The time has already expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair sure that request was to amendments to the amendment or just a particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It was to the amendment pending and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 minutes to explain his amendment and that there be allotted 5 minutes in reply.

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

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I indulge the hope that this may not be considered a precedent and in order to materialize that hope I may say that I must object to any similar unanimous consent request hereafter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to the committee for allowing me this time. I am somewhat shocked at the speed at which we are trying to get through with section 3 after we had spent so much time on section 1 of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is not my amendment. It was the amendment offered by Senator LODGE in the other body in committee but not reported out. It was also considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was voted down. However, I feel it is an excellent amendment, because it will give the Greeks and the Turks a chance to revamp their tax structure and to assume some share of responsibility in their own rehabilitation and reconstruction.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does the gentleman recall this amendment was thoroughly discussed in the committee and voted down?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman is absolutely correct and I have already made that statement to the Committee here. However, I feel that we should not go into Greece and Turkey with this $400,000,000 and expect these governments to do nothing in return. We know from what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] told us yesterday about the tax and income situation as far as the Greek shipping interests are concerned and how little they pay to maintain their own government, and we all know from recent reports and correspondence as well as stories which appeared in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, and even in some Washiington papers, that the people having the money in these countries are not the ones who are paying the taxes toward their country's development.

I feel that we should make it mandatory in some way through some sort of agreement so that the Greeks and Turks will be able to do their part in rehabilitating and reconstructing their own country. I do not feel that we should assume the entire burden. I feel they should help themselves as much as they can.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman recall that Senator LODGE when he was advised this might embarrass the United States Government and also make it look as if we were taking too much of a part in the internal affairs of a foreign country voluntarily withdrew the amendment and did not submit it?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right. I believe I mentioned that in the course of my remarks. However, I think that this is a good amendment; that we should help these people to help themselves, and that we should not, if at all possible, bear the entire burden.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that there is no income tax in Greece at the present time?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. There is no income tax, at least as far as the people who can well afford to pay it are concerned.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Members have complained that this legislation constitutes an intervention into the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. While I do not agree that the legislation as now written is an intervention into the internal affairs of the nations involved, I do insist that this amendment will have just that effect. This is an attempt actually to write the tax laws of Greece here on the floor of this House of the United States Congress. Certainly nothing could be more clearly an act of intervention. The amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman who is now speaking was recently in Turkey and Greece, and the gentleman and I were members of the same delegation which visited those countries. Did we not find that the greatest effort which was being made to thwart our efforts was over the Russian radio, which was beaming its propaganda into Turkey every day, in an effort to build up sentiment against the United States by telling those people that America was undertaking to run their government and to conduct their domestic affairs. That is exactly the Russian line of propaganda, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. POAGE. And if we write this provision into this bill we will be writing into legislation just what Russia has been telling them over the radio everyday.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I would like to point out for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas that Great Britain and Greece have entered into such an agreement, and if Great Britain and Greece can do it, I do not see why we cannot.

Mr. COOLEY. If the matter can be settled by agreement and without legislation, there would appear to be no necessity for the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. JARMAN. One of the main criticisms of this legislation which I have heard is that it would be an intervention in the affairs of Greece and Turkey. Certainly, should this amendment be passed, as I understand it, the Congress will cause itself to be guilty of passing legislation which would be intervening into the internal affairs of those countries.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman's statement. The opponents of this bill seem to oppose it merely because they regard it as an intervention. As I have said, the bill as written is not an intervention into the internal affairs of either Greece or Turkey, but this amendment would very definitely constitute an intervention. Certainly, we will not attempt to direct the affairs of either Greece or Turkey by the enactment of law here in the United States Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman deny that in a certain sense we are intervening in the affairs of Greece and Turkey at this time, if this bill goes through?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do deny it. During the conference which we held in both Greece and Turkey, Senator BARKLEY and other members of our delegation sought to ascertain whether or not there was any apprehension on the part of the people of Greece or Turkey concerning the motives and purposes of the American Government, in connec-

tion with the contemplated loans. The answer to each question propounded by members of our delegation was invariably to the effect that the people of Greece and Turkey were familiar with American history; that they knew that there was nothing in the history of our country which would justify the belief that we were about to embark upon a program of imperialism, or that we would attempt in any way to dominate or to direct the internal affairs of either Greece or Turkey, and each of the persons with whom we conferred agreed that they were perfectly willing to accept such regulation, supervision, and advice in the administration of these loans as our Government desired to make or deemed necessary.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that much of the opposition to this bill yesterday was based on the theory that the Greek Government was a totalitarian government? The gentleman who is speaking was in Greece. Did he not see with his own eyes positive evidence that that very Government was more tolerant with those who hold other opinion than some of the opponents of this bill who want to enforce their own ideas of government on other people regardless of the wishes those people freely expressed at the ballot box? Here is a newspaper we bought on the streets of Athens, a Communist newspaper, with a picture on the front page. The picture is the only thing I can read, but I recognize it is a picture of Marshal Stalin. Those who could read the article told me it was pure Russian propaganda from start to finish. We bought it on the streets of Athens. It was circulating perfectly freely. And, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the Greek Government allows freedom of action, freedom of speech, right now? At the same time the very people who most loudly protest against us trying to help put the Greek people on their feet offer as an excuse the alleged fact that the Greek Government is a dictatorship. I think democracy involves allowing other people the same right to decide for themselves how they will run their own affairs. I think that from that angle the Greek Government is doing a better job of democracy than some of our own self-styled liberals. In what part of the U. S. S. R. or in what Russian-controlled country could you find the kind of freedom and liberty for minority views that you and I saw in Greece?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. I do not believe this paper could be published in that country if it had a totalitarian government.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the eloquent gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Does the gentleman not know that the committee report itself on page 2 states that we are going to tell them what kind of taxes to levy and what kind of imports and exports they shall have?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree with that statement at all.

May I say in conclusion that the Greek Government has been in power for only a few short months. The report referred to yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was only filed in the month of March 1947, and that contemplates a long-range program for the country of Greece.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 17, strike out "financial."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: To close section 3 on page 5, line 24, insert the following additional clause:

"(g) that the Greek Government declare a general amnesty for political prisoners, and within 1 year after assistance by the United States has been made available, the Greek Government will cause to be held a free election, the conduct and results of which shall be supervised by a commission appointed for the purpose, by the General Assembly of the United Nations; or, if the President advises the Congress that the United Nations is unwilling or unable to appoint such commission, then under the supervision of an American commission, composed of five members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, we propose to extend aid to Greece, and I heartily approve of that.

We must be very sure that this aid will produce democratic and sound economic results.

Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into Greece since the end of the war by Great Britain and the United States, Greece is still in a state of political chaos and economic desperation.

Official British, American, and United Nations reports clearly point to the reasons for this failure; namely, the incompetence, corruption, and oppression which exists in the present Greek Government.

Terror exists in Greece today—economic and political terror. Terrorism from the extreme right is as oppressive as terrorism from the extreme left.

Arthur Krock, in his column of April 1, 1947, in the New York Times, endorses completely the following statement made to him by an observer in Greece:

In one 3-day period, after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professionals—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the Government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation.

This observer concluded with the statement that as much as he detests communism, he would "go to the mountains" if he were a citizen of Greece.

Current reports made by observers now in Greece bolster this testimony. Members of the House will find them in the RECORD.

Great Britain failed in her efforts to aid Greece.

We must not fail.

In our opposition to communism, we must not make the mistake of backing the remnants of corrupt and decaying systems. This is the sure formula for failure. This is the sure formula that will breed communism. Failure to succeed in Greece will seriously undermine the challenging foreign policy which we are undertaking.

There is only one way to succeed. We must make it clear to the oppressed people of Greece that we are in profound sympathy with their legitimate aspiration for economic reform and social rehabilitation and that we propose to see that United States aid is used to create channels for the free political expression of those aspirations.

Stephen K. Bailey, who was the Chief of Balkan Intelligence for the OSS, has this to say:

Anyone who views communism in the Balkans as the result of simple Russian machinations is overlooking the centuries of poverty and aristocratic corruption which have characterized those countries. * * *

A peaceful resolution of the impasse in Greece depends upon two things: Convincing Russia that any military expansion will be met by force; using every means at our disposal to hasten long-overdue economic and social reforms. * * *

* * * We must search out those political leaders who until now have been crushed between the millstones of reaction and communism and give them power.

It was said yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that when we defend liberty for others we defend our own liberty. I agree fully, with all my heart and mind, if the liberty we defend for others is the same liberty we cherish for ourselves; and I am ready to defend that liberty abroad as well as at home, not just with $400,000,000, which guarantees nothing but a beginning, but with billions of dollars.

That is evidently not the sentiment of this Congress, or it would have passed the International Children's Fund before this and it would not have gutted the relief bill, the crippling of which will invite communism in Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Poland.

If we are going to be instrumental in the development of a democratic world it is going to cost us something in terms of hard cash and generous treatment to the impoverished and miserable people of this earth.

My amendment is in line with statements made by the Secretary of State

and evidence presented before our committee.

I offer an amendment which requires as a condition precedent to giving aid to Greece that the Greek Government declare a general amnesty for political prisoners and agree to hold a free election within 1 year after assistance has first been made available. Such a procedure must appeal to the people of the United States as well as to the people of Greece since it embodies fully the democratic process which it is the stated purpose of this bill to defend. Whatever may have been urged against the former King of Greece, it is indubitably clear that the present King, without a trace of Greek blood in his veins, married to a German princess, notorious for her Nazi activities and sympathies during the war, may well be thoroughly unpopular and unacceptable to the Greek people.

The record of the present King is such that even the British Foreign Office, we are reliably informed, has grave misgivings about his fitness to serve as the ruler of Greece in such critical times.

A free election by the Greek people would, of course, not directly resolve the issue as to the continuation of the monarchy or the future of King Paul. On the other hand, it would enable the Greek people to elect representatives who would presumably fully express prevailing political convictions. If these representatives should in turn, decide that the welfare of their country demands constitutional reforms, they would be empowered to take the necessary steps. You will agree, I am sure, that this is the way we want to see things done and that if it is our sincere desire to bring about and support a democratic government in Greece, we must shape our own assistance so as to contribute most effectively to that end.

To assure a thoroughly free election, my amendment directs the President to request the United Nations to appoint a commission to supervise the election. Since I recognize that for various reasons the United Nations may be unable, or possibly unwilling, to undertake the commitment, the President is directed, if such be the case, to inform the Congress of the fact and to appoint a five-man American commission to supervise the election.

In order further to assure Congressional participation in this course of action, my amendment proposes that if an American commission is appointed, it be subject to confirmation by the Senate. I have allowed for a leeway period preceding the election of 1 year after assistance is first made available to Greece on the ground that in that period relief operations will have reduced tension among the Greek people, restored a measure of calm and thereby contributed to an atmosphere in which a truly free election may be held. Furthermore, during that same period of time the United Nations will have the opportunity to decide whether it chooses to assume the responsibility of appointing a supervisory commission.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to bob up so frequently, but it seems to me that this is a tremendously important amendment, and I feel that it should be opposed and defeated. The author of the amendment, unfortunately, did not discuss the first part of it, which in itself is quite important. The effect of the first part of the amendment is to declare an amnesty for political prisoners. Does that mean that the author of the amendment would like to open up the jails of Greece and turn out the criminals and guerrillas, so that they can overthrow the government? Apparently this is clearly the purpose of the amendment.

Shall we by this amendment attempt to direct Greece to hold another election? I wonder if the author of the amendment and those who will support it would be willing for Congress to pass laws directing Yugoslavia and all of the other countries which are puppets of Soviet Russia, and in which elections been held to hold other elections, to be supervised as contemplated by the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, I feel that elections in Yugoslavia and in other countries which have been overrun by communism should hold new, free and unfettered elections, but I certainly question the wisdom of an act of Congress directing that such elections be held. This is an unreasonable proposition and I certainly hope that it will not be seriously considered by this Committee.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I recently talked in Cairo to Greek Republicans who opposed the monarchy, and they said they hoped that an election would not be held too soon, because if an election were held too soon the danger would be that the only choice would be between a monarchy and communism, whereas if sufficient time elapsed, there could be then a real choice between a republic, which they supported, and a monarchy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] does he feel that 1 year is a reasonable length of time?

Mr. VORYS. I think Greece knows more about that than we do.

Mr. COOLEY. We have general elections in this country every 4 years and we seem to get along all right. When another election will be held in Greece, perhaps, is not so important, but the importance of this proposition is shall the American Congress direct or require, either directly or indirectly, the holding of an election in the far-away country of Greece, in which country we are told that more than 85 percent of the people even now approve the Government in existence there. Maybe the great powers should have supervised elections in other countries, and had they done so I venture to say that the situation in many of the countries of Europe would be quite different from what it is today.

I insist that this amendment should be defeated, and by an overwhelming vote, to the end that Greece and Turkey and all other countries of the world will clearly and definitely know that America does not intend to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations, or attempt to dominate or direct the domestic affairs of other nations by remote control. We either believe in this bill or we do not believe in it. We are either for it or against it. We either want to follow Truman and Marshall and Vandenberg, and all of the other leaders of America, including our distinguished representative to the United Nations Organization, Senator Austin, or we want to follow the primrose path of weakness, which leads to conflict and bloodshed.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUBER. 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 Ohio [Mr. HUBER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, several days ago I stated on this floor—and I repeat now—that if we allowed political expediency to determine our vote on this measure we would all vote against it.

This morning five Communist veterans from my district called upon me and they asked my why I, as one who in the past had to some extent believed in the principles of Henry Wallace, could possibly support the Truman doctrine. I told them I could support the Truman doctrine because I had been given the great privilege of traveling through many of these countries that have been mentioned. I had the opportunity of being in Moscow, and, following that, in eastern and central countries—Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Turkey, and Greece. I was not wined and dined at the cocktail bars of the diplomats, but I talked to the average people—to the little people. Everywhere I went I found that in every country they were fearful of Russia and fearful of the future. I told those veterans that was one of the reasons I would vote for the Truman doctrine. I told them I would vote for it because I believed we were going to insure freedom to our part of the world—to this country—where I can walk out of the door and stand on the steps of the Capitol of the United States and say whatever I choose to say about the President of the United States, about the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of State, or anyone else.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That aggregation of so-called Communist veterans was simply a mission from Moscow.

Mr. HUBER. Well, I do not know what the mission was, but I know that they asked me as vets of this war if I knew what they had been fighting for. I said it was not only those who fought in World War II; it was those who fought in World War I, the Spanish-American War, the Civil War, and the Revolutionary War, to preserve the heritage that has been won for us at so great a cost. I did not have the privilege of serving in this war but I have stood by the graves of those who died, and have a true appreciation for the sacrifice they made. There is a great obligation on us.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. It occurred to me to suggest also that that misison from Moscow, to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred, came here and had their communistic convention, or whatever it was that met yesterday, with the ridiculous idea that they could influence the House of Representatives of the United States in its vote on this measure.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Last night the principal speech was made by the leading Communist, William Z. Foster, who just got back from Moscow.

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

Mr. HUBER. I may as well. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman find any significance in the fact that the young Members of this House who bear the scars of World War II upon their bodies are generally for this bill?

Mr. HUBER. I believe the overwhelming number of veterans who have served in all the wars in which this country has engaged are and should be overwhelmingly in support of this bill.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Along the same line brought out by the gentleman from Georgia—and he has focused attention to a point I was going to make, one which I think the membership of this House can well consider—the vast majority of men who know war more recently than a great number of the Members of this House are for this bill because they feel that we do have to take a stand and they know that when you are speaking to a power which knows only the language of force you have got to answer with force yourself.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I merely wish to suggest that perhaps the gentleman from Alabama was not quite right after all when he said that the Communists had the ridiculous idea that they could influence votes in this House by holding their convention here. I believe that by their opposition to this bill they have induced a lot of Members to support it who now realize where the strength of the opposition comes from.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for an additional 5 minutes if he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has not yet expired.

Mr. JARMAN. I still ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBER. I appreciate the interest shown in my remarks.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would suggest that the gentleman spend his additional 5 minutes in explaining why these questions cannot be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. HUBER. I may say to the gentleman from California that if he will explain why Russia cannot handle similar matters through the United Nations then I will be satisfied. This thing is not one-sided.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure everybody in the House fully realizes and deeply regrets that so many of the countries of the world, especially those devastated by the war, are disrupted and distraught, and their governments are in bad condition; no one pretends that the Greek Government is as good or as democratic as we wish; but is this not our situation, that the choice in Greece is not between the present Greek Government and something better, it is between the present Greek Government and something infinitely worse?

Which will be better for the Greeks, for us to help the government chosen by themselves maintain the nation's independence, while helping it to work toward more democracy and more efficiency and less corruption or, on the other hand, to abandon Greece to the control of a foreign power which has never yet given any people under its heel any chance whatsoever to develop democracy? Is not that our real choice, between the present Greek Government and something worse, not between the present government and something better?

Mr. HUBER. There is much truth in what the gentleman says. But we must not condemn all the young ex-soldiers who came down with this group. They are looking for a better way of life. Do not condemn them too hastily. If they could be assured of security in the future it would go a long way in changing their outlook toward our great form of government which guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or the right of the people peacefully to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, the question I asked the gentleman from Ohio was evaded and to some extent turned back to me; and, of course, I am not going to try to use my 5 minutes to show how this could be taken up through procedures which are set forth in the United Nations Charter. I know the Members of this House are familiar with them, and I believe many of them seriously considering this matter realize that such a problem could be handled through the procedures and methods set up in the United Nations Charter.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman agree with me that everything could be done by the President under the United Nations Charter if he but would? In other words, we would not need any congressional action if he would but do it that way.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. He has the power to ask Mr. Austin to initiate the matter either through the Security Council or the General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to recommit this bill, in case I am recognized by the Chairman of the Committee, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment, and I want to take this time to read the amendment briefly and to explain briefly what it means:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"SECTION 1. It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States through the appropriate representative of the United States shall initiate in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations proposals designed to ensure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey, and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum not exceeding $100,000,000 for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation of the Greek economy. The President may expend funds appropriated pursuant to this provision through existing agencies of the Federal Government and through transfer of such amounts as he deems appropriate to the Government of Greece and the Secretary General of the United Nations for expenditure by them. Such funds shall be expended for the purchase and other provision of supplies for the civilian economy of Greece, including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services, but no part of such money shall be used for the provision of military supplies or services."

Very briefly, I first ask to recommit the present bill. Second, it instructs the President to initiate through the appropriate representative of the United States, in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations, proposals designed to insure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and middle eastern areas which are endangering the peace.

As the Members of this body know, the Palestine question is now in the hands of the United Nations. To a certain extent a portion of the Greek situation is in the hands of the Balkan Commission. There is nothing involving Turkey at the present time, as far as the United Nations is concerned. But the

Dardanelles is a problem which will remain regardless of whether this bill passes or not. When the $100,000,000 which goes to Turkey is expended, the problem of the Dardanelles, and the problem of the distribution of oil in Iran and Syria and other places will still remain and, Mr. Chairman, we will have to appropriate other hundreds of millions of dollars because the problems will still be there. That is why I say you cannot solve the problem of Greece and Turkey without solving the related problems which are contiguous and related thereto.

Third. An appropriation of $100,000,000 is made to Greece immediately for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation in Greece. I supported the $350,000,000 relief bill, and I opposed the Jonkman amendment that cut that amount because I felt at that time it cut down too much the need for relief in Greece.

The expenditure of this fund is for the civilian economy, and the reason I set the figure at $100,000,000 is because the Food and Agricultural Organization which was embodied and created by the United Nations recommended $100,000,000. That is why I set it at that amount. This cuts down the amount of this bill from $400,000,000 to $100,000,000 to comply with the FAO recommendation.

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

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

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it prohibits an expenditure for military purposes and it provides that at the President's discretion such part of this fund as necessary may be transferred to the Greek Government or the Secretary-General of the United Nations for supervision in the expenditure of money in Greece.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that when this motion to recommit is offered we will have enough support on the motion to show that we still have some faith in the United Nations and that we are not completely ignoring the existence of such body

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Gladly.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close with this address.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are pending on this section for which unanimous consent has been asked to close debate upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that there are no amendments pending on the desk on this section.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when the President of the United States on March 12 delivered his now historic message on aid to Greece and Turkey the occasion marked a significant turning point in America's foreign policy. In the words of the President:

> One of the principal objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the wars with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will and their way of life upon other nations. * * *
>
> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Stated another way, the President of the United States, in the name of the people of the United States, on that day before the Congress abandoned, once and for all, the ineffectual and costly isolationist policy of the past—a policy which directly contributed to the devastating wars that the world has witnessed within this generation.

The issue in Greece and Turkey is identical with the one which prevailed when Japan marched into Manchuria, when Italy took Ethiopia, and when Hitler violated all of the treaties of his government, and by force, by threats of force, and by his Nazi fifth columns, conquered much of Europe without firing a shot.

The issue may be put by way of a simple question. Shall we face up to our responsibilities throughout this one world or shall we adopt a 1947 variety of appeasement and isolationism which must sooner or later bring about a Third World War that so many are already calling inevitable?

If we follow a course of appeasement, if we decide that what happens in the rest of the world is of no concern to us, then the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, just as the madman in Berlin of 1939, will decide that the western democracies are weak, and can be conquered by the same techniques of propaganda and boring from within as employed by Hitler. If, on the other hand, we meet our responsibilities and let the world understand that we will not shrink from them, the freemen everywhere will be encouraged and the voice of our great and powerful Nation, spoken in behalf of democracy and freedom will be heard in every corner of the world and the march toward communistic totalitarianism will be halted.

The need is urgent. The time is short. Greece and Turkey are vital. They command the Near East, Africa, and Asia. If they fall to the Russian fifth column from within, then before long, all of the world outside our hemisphere may be within the orbit of the iron curtain. If their position is held, most of western Europe will be saved, and constructive measures, such as the establishment of a United States of Europe, will make possible the economic rehabilitation of that continent. Such action should assure the continuation of world peace by convincing Moscow that our policy is one of justice, backed by all the strength and might of this great Nation.

Those who argue that we are bypassing the United Nations are either begging the question or opposing our policy by indirection because they know that we are confronted with acute internal situations in Greece and Turkey which cannot be handled at this time by the United Nations. They are also deliberately ignoring the fact that Russia has a veto power in that assembly which she would not hesitate to use.

America now faces the same challenge that it faced in 1914 and in the 1930's. If it follows the course of coming to the aid of stricken peoples and abandons isolationism and appeasement, the tragic and bloody history of 1917 and 1941 will not be repeated. If it follows the opposite course, a third blood bath may soon be upon us.

Let us be frank about this matter.

Are we willing for the iron curtain to be extended to the shores of the Atlantic, through all of the continent of Europe, through the Near East, and possibly throughout Asia and Africa?

Have we forgotten the bloody, dismal struggle which so recently engulfed mankind? Do hundreds of thousands of young Americans lie in hallowed ground and other thousands suffer in hospitals and institutions so that we might substitute Red dictatorship for black dictatorship? Shall we repeat in Greece and in Turkey and in western Europe the solemn tragedy of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Albania, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, and Yugoslavia; or shall we use the moral power of this Nation for the cause of freedom? Freedom is an ancient word. It first gained its magnificence in the land of the Hellenes. To many of us who have lived under the blessed sun of the United States, it may seem like an academic word; but in those bleak nations behind the iron curtain, it is still the most glorious word in the minds of men. And yet, the issue involved here is just that simple. It is whether freedom survives on this earth, or whether some strange ideology, which proclaims freedom but practices tyranny, which talks about the rights of man but foists a brutal, soulless system of collectivism upon the minds and hearts of men, and which employs cruelties heretofore unknown to mankind shall prevail. For my own part, it is my firm belief that there can be no compromise with communism. That is the issue. If we compromise now, if we throw Greece and the nations of Europe into the waiting, willing arms of Red fascism, then we will face a third world war more horrible and more devastating than the one that this world has so recently experienced. If we fail in this duty, then we may as well withdraw our armies of occupation from Europe. We may as well remain away from the conference tables and prepare for the holocaust.

I read with interest Mr. Stalin's interview with Mr. Stassen. He talked about cooperation and said that our countries could live together in peace. I fervently

hope that they can. But certainly Mr. Stalin would be more impressive if his deeds spoke out rather than his words.

The philosophy to which he subscribes, denies the validity of covenants, the validity of morals, the validity of religion. How then can western civilization trust his assertions? He talks about freedom, when in his nation and in the nations that are dominated by communism there are more slaves than have ever existed in the entire recorded history of this world.

To compromise with communism is to compromise with an essential evil. It is no more possible than to compromise with cancer or tuberculosis.

The debate, however, has pointed up the need for something more than a negative policy in Europe. While we must oppose Russian expansion and while we must fight communism on every front, we also must put forward a positive program of democracy. The objections voiced to the extension of aid to Greece and Turkey have come from many thoughtful Americans who are justly worried about our precarious fiscal structure and who realize that dollars alone will not solve the problems of Europe.

These thoughtful Americans are properly concerned over our tremendous national debt. They show where we have already spent billions in England and France and throughout the world, and communism marches on. There must be some other way. Otherwise we will bankrupt America.

There is an alternative that has stirred the minds of men for many centuries. It is to be found in a federated western Europe. A resolution "that the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations" is now pending in this body and in the Senate. That resolution has received support from the overwhelming majority of Americans, representing all political groups, from the press, and in public forums. Recently a group of 81 of the Nation's outstanding leaders in business, finance, religion and education, and journalism endorsed the plan as the answer to the recurrent problem of Europe. It is not a new plan. It has been supported for many years by great statesmen of Europe. Today its principal champions are Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Smuts, John Foster Dulles, Walter Lippmann, Prime Minister Attlee, and many others. George Washington once wrote to General Lafayette:

> We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere on earth, and one day, taking its pattern from the United States of America, there will be founded the United States of Europe.

The great French writer, Victor Hugo, prophesied:

> The day will come when these two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic—when they will exchange their goods, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, to civilize the globe, to fertilize deserts, to improve creation under the eyes of the Creator, and to assure the greatest benefit for all by combining these forces: the brotherhood of man and the might of God.

That day is at hand.

The Greek loan must be made, because as I have pointed out, we cannot compromise further. But at best it is serving only as an oxygen tent for the patient. Similar loans have been made to France, England, and to the Netherlands, and the condition of our ex-enemies does not need recounting at this time.

Greece is vital, but western Europe is even more vital, and now is the time, with Europe prostrate, for the ancient ideal of federation to bear fruit. As one writer has said, "What was once an ideal is now a necessity."

In the words of Winston Churchill:

> And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the small states have, indeed, made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, careworn, and bewildered human beings gaze on the ruins of their cities and scan the dark horizon for the approach of some new peril, tyranny, or terror.
>
> They may still return. There is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted by the great majority of people in the many lands, would as if by a miracle, transform the whole scene and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is today.
>
> What is this sovereign remedy?
>
> We must build a kind of United States of Europe.

America cannot bring about the United States of Europe, but by the adoption of the resolution now before the Congress the forces at work everywhere in western Europe will be immeasurably strengthened and those who hesitate now because of the opposition to Soviet Russia will be given the courage and the support to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate on this measure for 3 days. I have opposed every amendment which has been offered to the committee bill. I shall continue to oppose amendments. I shall oppose the amendment which the gentleman from California contemplates offering.

The committee has done a masterful job in framing this legislation and the issues have been clearly presented to this body. Everyone here fully understands that. As the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and our great minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] pointed out on day before yesterday, the comparison existing between 1914 and 1939-41 is too serious to overlook, and all thoughtful Americans realize that we must no longer adopt a policy of appeasement.

I listened with interest this morning while one gentleman said, "Of what concern is it to us what happens in eastern Europe or what happens in Russia?" My mind went back to my first term here in this Congress in 1941 when we were debating lend-lease, and I heard those same words, and those same gentlemen making the identical assertions. After Hitler had conquered most of Europe, and when the British Isles were holding out all alone, those same gentlemen stood in the well of the House and said, "What concern is it to us what Hitler does in Europe?" Then, all of a sudden bombs fell on Pearl Harbor and it was of direct concern to every American. That is the same challenge that we face today, and we had better not make any mistake about it.

But, I want to take this time to point out what I believe is possibly an alternative to the direction we are headed. Many years ago the statesmen of Europe recognized the fact that as long as Europe was disunited, as long as we had countless little nationalities and countless little nations in Europe, we were bound to have these interminable wars and interminable struggles. Recognizing this recurrent situation, some months ago, in conjunction with some of my colleagues in the Senate, I introduced a resolution in this House favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations. I am certain that many Members of the House have noted the overwhelming approval with which that resolution has been met by the press, in public forums, in educational, and in civic circles of this country. I am happy to say that that movement now has a tremendous momentum, and today the Moscow Conference having failed and our effort of cooperation with Russia having completely failed, we must have an alternative.

I say to the Members of the House, if they will give serious consideration and serious thought to the age-old ideal of a united western Europe, together in trade, together in commerce, and together in government, the 200,000,000 people of western Europe will be the answer to this problem, and I believe we will have some hope for peace on this earth; but as long as we maintain all of these separate entities, as long as we try to create artificial barriers in Europe, they are bound to overflow into our own Nation and we are bound to go into another and a more bloody world war.

I ask you to read when you have time the words of Winston Churchill, of John Foster Dulles, of Prime Minister Attlee, and the expressions of 81 prominent Americans which recently appeared in the press, representing every shade of political opinion in the United States, recommending and endorsing the Federation of Europe. If you will read those expressions, and if you will study them, we as Americans may find an alternative to the grave and chaotic problem of Europe.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.
>
> (b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

On page 6, line 1, strike out all of subsection (a) of section 4.

And on line 8 strike out the letter "(b)" indicating a subsection and on line 9 substitute the figure "200,000,000" for "400,000,000," and after the period on line 10 strike out all of the following sentence, and substitute a new sentence as follows: "Out of the funds provided herein the President is authorized to supply such financial assistance as may be requested by the United Nations to further the objectives of this legislation, but in no event shall it exceed $5,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the nature of the amendment I have offered, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, this not to include the 10 minutes already allotted to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I make this suggestion at the request of the majority leader.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would it not be better to hear what the gentleman says concerning his amendment, so that we can see if any Member wants to discuss it?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object at this time?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, you will note if you have a copy of the bill before you that I am striking out all of subsection (a) because it is a request to advance $100,000,000 without going before the Committee on Appropriations.

I see no reason why there is need for such quick action. I believe that the Department of State should justify the need for that sum of money before the Committee on Appropriations. There is nothing in the record, as I recall it, wherein there was a showing of such need. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are going to pass this legislation, let us be businesslike about it. Certainly, there is no justification for this provision to be in the bill.

I go on to the next part of my amendment, cutting down the amount from $400,000,000 to $200,000,000. I am wondering if Members of the House realize that so far as the record is concerned, Turkey, which is covered by this bill, has never made a request to this Government for any money. If I am wrong, I want the members of the Committee to tell me so. $125,000,000 is provided in this bill for Turkey. I trust that the members of the Committee who want to ask questions will wait until I complete my statement.

So far as I can find, all we have concerning aid to Turkey is the statement in the report on page 3, as follows:

The situation in Turkey differs substantially, but she has found it necessary during recent months to apply to the United States for financial aid.

That is the statement made by the committee. What does Mr. Acheson say? The only testimony is this:

Today the Turkish economy is no longer able to carry the full load required for its national defense.

But in the statement on the same page Mr. Acheson does not say that there was a request for aid, and if he did I submit that that would be a self-serving declaration and a statement in support of his own position.

The report is very clear, however, so far as the Greek Government is concerned. On March 3 the Greek Government actually asked for this assistance. I could not find in these heavy secret documents that we have, 6 or 8 inches thick, anything to show that the Turkish Government has asked for this aid. As a matter of fact, they did not ask it or need it. Turkey wants arms and not money.

I say there should be before this House something in writing to show that the Turkish Government wants this money. I submit the record does not indicate that, and if it does then I have missed it and I will stand corrected if the evidence can be produced.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have it right here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman will wait until I complete my statement.

Mr. JARMAN. You ask for it and then you do not want it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In the latter part of this amendment I provide that the President would be authorized to advance out of this authorization $5,000,000 to assist in carrying out the objectives of this legislation. If there is Russian aggression, let us find it out. Let us find out through the United Nations organization. We have heard a great deal about isolationism. I wonder, in all this by-passing of the United Nations, who are the isolationists.

I want to call attention to a matter which I think is highly important because I believe it indicates that even as far as Greece is concerned, they can go to the International Bank and get this money. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, page 4719, to an address delivered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON]:

A reading of section C of part 4 of the charter of the International Bank proves conclusively that this United Nations agency can be used to help the people of Greece. It says, and I quote, "If a member suffers from an acute exchange stringency, so that the service of any loan contracted by that member or guaranteed by it or by one of its agencies cannot be provided in the stipulated manner, the member concerned may apply to the bank for a relaxation of the conditions of payment." This certainly applies to Greece today as it seems to me.

The very first chapter of the bank's charter is even more specific in its application to Greece today. It says under section B the resource shall be used "for the purpose of facilitating the restoration and reconstruction of the economy of members whose metropolitan territories have suffered great devastation from enemy occupation or hostilities. The bank, in determining the conditions and terms of loans made to such members, shall pay special regard to lightening the financial burden and expediting the completion of such restoration and reconstruction."

There you have it. It is all laid out. The International Bank can take charge of this matter, so why should we in all our largesse volunteer to hand out this money which our taxpayers are striving so hard to pay each year? We as Republicans, under the program outlined, have promised tax reduction and debt reduction and all that goes with it. Under no circumstances can we be justified in making not a loan but a gift of more than $200,000,000.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Dean Acheson delivered an address last evening in place of the President, and he advocates rehabilitating the whole world. After we have bled ourselves white, who will there be to give us a blood transfusion?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The question answers itself, it seems to me. Of course, we will face economic ruin and we are on the verge of it today.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I simply ask the gentleman to yield to produce the evidence he asked for a moment ago. I believe the gentleman made the statement that if there was any evidence that Turkey had requested this assistance, he would like some member of the committee to produce it. It is found on page 13, where I inquired of Under Secretary Acheson, as follows:

In other words, as I understand it, everything proposed to be done in this bill has been definitely requested by the countries concerned?

Secretary ACHESON. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is that the best evidence the gentleman offers? It is a self-serving declaration. I say it is not the best evidence.

Mr. JARMAN. That may not be the best evidence but it is most excellent evidence.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not for me.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman asked for it and when he gets it he does not want it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You know as a lawyer that is not the best evidence. Produce a copy of a letter from the Turkish Government. That is what I am asking for. There is a copy of the Greek request in the confidential report prepared for the committee by the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman wishes further evidence——

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am asking you to produce it and you cannot.

Mr. JARMAN. The difference is I have confidence in the President and other officials of my country whereas the gentleman does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the unanimous-consent request suggested by the majority leader, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ascertain how many seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees five Members indicating they desire time.

Mr. EATON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the following Members who indicated a desire to be heard: Messrs. MACKINNON, VORYS, CHENOWETH, MILLER of Connecticut, and JARMAN.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may the committee members be heard last?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will be recognized last.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday one of the illustrious Members of this House said that when you hear one person you have heard one-half of the story. That is not true on this issue, for when you have heard one person on this issue you have heard only one-third of the story. You have three views on this issue.

One group believes that the national interest of the United States is involved and they support the bill. There are two groups in opposition. First, the isolationists oppose it. Secondly, in opposition you have that group whose foreign policy has been such that they have not actively opposed the foreign policy of the Soviet Government and they have opposed the foreign policy of the United States. It is very easy to pick that group out. You know what their position was on lend-lease. They were demanding that Russia get more lend-lease. You know what their position was on the second front. For several years they demanded an immediate second front in Europe regardless of the inability of our country to prosecute effective military operations.

THE PARTY LINE

The party line that they have now developed on this particular bill is they say that they oppose military aid, favor relief to starving children, and then they say, "Besides, the United States cannot afford to give this relief in any amount." That argument is completely dishonest, because in one breath they say, "I favor partial relief," and in the next breath they say "I favor no relief." That is the party line argument on this bill today. To merely state it is sufficient. Its inconsistency is its own answer.

IDEAS VERSUS FORCE

One of the arguments that has been made, that seems to have some force with a number of people, is that you cannot stop ideas by force. Their inference is that communism is an idea and hence it cannot be stopped by force.

But I say communism has no force as an idea. Communism has never been accepted by any country of the world except by force. Does any person—and I will yield the floor to anyone who has an answer on this one—can any person in this House tell us today of any nation in recorded history that ever voluntarily accepted communism? No person rises to suggest that there ever was such a nation—and I agree that there never was. Communism has never been voluntarily accepted by any country. It needs force to impose it and it needs force to continue it.

There is no question that when you run into force you have to make your position clear, and that is what this bill does. We are opposing communism.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

In closing I want to say that I regard this program as unfinished business arising out of our involvement in the war. It is nothing more than we did after the last war. We stayed until conditions were stabilized. For the same purpose today we are in Germany, we are in Austria, and we are in Italy. In those countries we are presently seeking to bring stability to their economy. They were our enemies a short time back. Should we not also seek to maintain a stable government for our friends who ask our aid? They were our allies in the war and are our friends now. I submit that they are entitled to our help now as much as our former enemies.

THE GREEK ELECTION

Some criticize the Greek Government. You can criticize almost any foreign government—in comparison with ours. But the Greek Government was elected by the Greek people in what our observers state was a free election. The statistics show that of 1,900,000 eligible voters, 87 percent voted and 68.3 percent favored the present Government. This leaves 31.7 percent opposed. In other words the vote was 2 to 1 for the present Government.

That is a more substantial popular majority than any President of the United States ever received in recorded history. No person can truthfully say that the Government in Greece does not have the popular support of the Greek people.

USE THE UNITED NATIONS

Some say we should use the United Nations. I agree with that proposal and the bill contains ample provisions for the use of the United Nations if that body wishes to assume jurisdiction, but we have already seen the power of the veto in Russia's hand to delay effective action on this very issue.

RUSSIAN VETO

Russia vetoed the initial attempt to investigate the Greek border dispute. Subsequently the investigation was only authorized when Russia refrained from voting. Do we want to permit the Soviet to use such dilatory tactics? That is their game. Everyone knows it. The veto power gives them the authority to delay action—and they use it. This issue in Greece and Turkey involves internal stability. Thus it is not a proper case for the United Nations. It does not involve international issues with respect to those countries. By the very charter of the United Nations they have no jurisdiction. Our delegate from the United States has pointed out that this bill does not bypass the UN. I agree with that analysis of the problem.

THE ISSUE

The issue in this bill is clear. Are we going to appease Russia; are we going to jump through the hoop at the Soviet wish? We only intervened in Europe in World War II after the most constant demands from Russia. They demanded arms, munitions, and a second front. We finally opened the second front and the war was soon over. Now the Soviet line is to say, "Get out now, leave Europe to us." To this demand I say we did not intervene in Europe to permit Communists, Fascists, or other groups alien to their own country, to have free reign to aggressively overrun the remnants of European civilization. By our position as victors we owe a duty to the world to restore stable governments before we pull out. Let us all support this bill to do that for Greece and Turkey—our allies.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate in the closing hours of this debate that has been going on for four days that some Members' patriotism so runs away with them that they have to charge those who honestly and conscientiously oppose this bill as following what is referred to as the "party line." I am not at all disturbed about anybody questioning my Americanism or my patriotism. I do want to ask one question and I hope before the debate closes someone on the committee or in the House will answer it for me.

I listened this morning to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] speak of the wave of communism sweeping over Turkey and over Greece, then across the Mediterranean over Italy and over France, and so on, possibly over the Atlantic to the United States. I concede that it is certainly a threat and that all this world is threatened with the spread of communism. Assuming all that to be true, will some member of this committee explain to me why, to deal with such an important problem, in view of our participation in the United Nations and our promise to the American people, we were going to deal in association with the other nations of the world, that we

should embark on this lone-wolf program on our own.

Some may say that other nations cannot contribute their share in money toward this effort to stop the spread of communism into Turkey and Greece. If they cannot appropriate $100,000,000 or $400,000,000, if they would appropriate a quarter of a million dollars to this program and associate themselves with this Government, I would feel much happier about it and I could then support this whole program. But I do not want to see the United States Government embark on this program with no assurance, certainly no assurance has been given us throughout this debate, that the program has the support, at least the moral support, of other nations associated with us in the United Nations. If they cannot furnish financial support they certainly can make known their support in other ways. I wish that somebody could show me how we can do this job so much better alone than with the help and cooperation of other nations.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it not true, sir, that when we approve this action we are taking, it means that any other nation may take any action it sees fit so long as it says it is carrying out the purposes of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We are formulating our own program and carrying it on alone, so far as I am able to find out.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I want to remind the gentleman what the United Nations representative of the United States, Senator Austin said:

> In my opinion, the United States program of aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I heard that statement read and I may say it does not answer my question. I have not said anything about bypassing the United Nations. I am asking why other nations that are in the United Nations cannot cooperate in this program. I heard the statement read by the chairman of the committee yesterday and I have great respect for Senator Austin.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In all fairness, the House should be reminded also of what the Secretary-General of the United Nations said on this subject.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes. I go back to my question which was: "Why do the proponents of this bill think that the United States acting alone can do the job better than it could be done in cooperation with other nations?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment, as I understood him a moment ago, stated that Turkey had not applied for this assistance and challenged anyone to prove otherwise. I thought I did so by quoting the Under Secretary of State of the United States, who at the time was Acting Secretary of State. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, just as I do not know what General Marshall's politics is; but he is the Under Secretary of State of the United States and, for my part, I am willing to take his word on a matter with the responsibility for which he is charged and on a matter about which he naturally knows more than could any Member of this body. Furthermore, he is an exceptionally able official to whom I heard one of our best Members refer during this debate as the man who had the most alert and most brilliant mind with which he has come in contact.

However, I find, after my colloquy with the gentleman—for whom I have a very high regard, but who I think should be more careful with his challenges and his statements—that the President of the United States in his message made the same statement, and I say to you, my colleagues, I care not who the President of the United States be, whether he be Democrat or Republican, I am willing to take his word on a matter such as this, and I quote from the President's message:

> Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity.

Now, for my part, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I am perfectly willing to believe those two officials of this Government and not be pin prickey and issue challenges about whether they are telling the truth or not.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, an able member of our committee.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin said he searched the committee report and looked through it carefully and could not find it. He must have missed page 1, because there Mr. Acheson says that at various times during recent months the Turkish Government has applied to the United States for financial aid. And, there is no quibbling about that.

Mr. JARMAN. Indeed, there is not. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I read to the gentleman the Under Secretary's reply to my question, in which he reiterated that fact.

Now I gladly yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to again ask both of you gentlemen, who are lawyers, if you would accept that as proof in a court of law?

Mr. JARMAN. Absolutely. I would accept the statement of my President and my Under Secretary of State as proof.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That sounds fine, but that still is not proof. That is a self-serving declaration.

Mr. JARMAN. Are we in a court of law here?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You might be.

Mr. JARMAN. Is this a court of law?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is anything that you make it.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes, and we have established it without reference to the precedents of the courts, too. We do not have to go to courts to get precedents. We have them of our own.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The challenge is still open to produce the proof. Turkey has never asked for this loan, in my opinion.

Mr. JARMAN. I repeat, I have confidence in my President, whether he be a Democrat or not, and should the gentleman on the other side ever be so fortunate as to have a President I would have confidence in him, whoever he be.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is the gentleman's privilege.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, having challenged both of us as lawyers, has gotten himself a little outside in saying that opinion evidence is admissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

(Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think on this issue of whether or not Turkey made a request we should read the President's message delivered at the joint session of Congress. With respect to Greece he specifically states that Greece has asked for this assistance. You do not find any language as strong as that with respect to Turkey in the President's message.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. I wish to commend him for the splendid and brilliant leadership he has exercised in handling the opposition to this legislation.

It appears that Turkey has asked for no assistance. I understand that Turkey has no financial crisis like Greece. Unless the purpose of this bill is entirely military, I cannot conceive how any Member of this House can vote to send money to Turkey.

We are told, however, we should support this bill because it has the approval of the President and the Secretary of State. Our leaders have made some tragic mistakes. They have formulated policies which even the proponents of this bill admit have been unwise and unsound. Surely we must make an important decision like this for ourselves.

Largely because of pursuing wrong policies this country became involved in World War II, which cost the lives of 300,000 American boys. The debate today reminds me very much of the discussion of the lend-lease bill in 1941, which was represented as a peace meas-

ure. We soon discovered it was a step toward war. We won the war, but now we are again disillusioned; after defeating our enemies we are now told there is a new threat to our security. This measure is a subterfuge and a bald-faced deception. The title implies this is a bill which authorizes aid to Greece and Turkey. You know, and I know, it is purely a military move. Yet we are being told we must continue to follow leaders whose blundering policies have precipitated the situation in which we find ourselves today. Our first responsibility is to the people we represent. It is my opinion the overwhelming sentiment of this country is opposed to this legislation in its present form.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. This is the same leadership that in the last 2 years has spent $18,000,000,000 to promote communism, and is financing communism.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely right. We are still shipping supplies and materials to Russia. It is impossible to reconcile these conflicting positions. I have never understood the influence which has enabled communistic Russia to obtain unlimited amounts of equipment and machinery from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, let us look for a moment at this bill. It states that it provides for assistance to Greece and Turkey. However, I think the mask has now been drawn aside. The intent of the bill is clear. You have seen the amendments, limiting the military personnel to 100, or 200, voted down. Those sponsoring this bill vigorously opposed any military limitations.

It is proposed to send members of our military forces, but we are assured they will act in an advisory capacity only. I submit there is no precedent for such a step and that it now appears obvious from admissions made on the floor by those in charge of the bill that our military operations will not be restricted to advice only. A motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Forces would be very proper.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me an article written by Mr. Palmer Hoyt, Jr., Denver Post correspondent, who made a recent tour of Greece. He urges us to help Greece rebuild, and not to fight a war. I wish to read a few lines of this report on Greece, as the observations made by Mr. Hoyt are very pertinent to the bill we have before us. He says:

> The United States can compete successfully with communism in Europe. It can compete successfully with communism elsewhere, too, but in order to do this the Government must adopt a positive policy of aid to countries whose economy has been threatened by the war or its aftermaths.
>
> The Greek-Turkish aid bill is a case in point. Right now it is important that these countries receive financial aid. Greece, especially, has need of food and clothing for its people. It needs money to rebuild a shattered economy.
>
> But the Greek-Turkish aid bill is being talked about, in Athens and America, in terms of military supplies and money to support the army in its fight against what the rightist Greek Government at least, calls a Communist threat.
>
> It is true that communism threatens Greece. Nevertheless, the point of attack should not be through the Greek Army, fighting Communist and non-Communist guerrillas in the hills. If the American grant is to be successful the attack must come through the country's economy.
>
> When the army uses funds to wage war, a lot more houses and roads and people are destroyed. The survivors find conditions difficult. Then they are easy prey to totalitarianism—Communist or otherwise.

I agree with Mr. Hoyt, and I submit we are making the wrong approach to this whole matter. We want to rebuild Greece, and not destroy her. As Mr. Smith has pointed out, the International Bank has been set up to aid countries like Greece. I feel certain satisfactory arrangements could be made to obtain the credit she needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, further commenting on whether Turkey requested aid, in the questionnaire found on page 366 of the hearings appears this statement from the State Department:

> In order to prevent a deterioration of the Turkish economic situation, which might weaken the country and compromise its position, Turkey has requested American financial assistance which the President proposes that we grant.

Under Secretary Acheson, at the very start of the hearings, said—see page 1:

> At various times during recent months the Turkish Government has applied to the United States for financial aid.

Apparently the opposition feels that if a country asks a whole lot of times that does not count as a request, but if a country asks once that counts as a request.

I am one of those who opposed the way the evidence was brought before us on the relief bill a few weeks ago. We were not told what the money was to be spent for and where. Possibly as a result of the protest that many of us made the secret document furnished the first day of the hearings on this bill was thrown open, and detailed information has been given in the hearings as to how they propose to use this money, not only for military purposes, but to rehabilitate the economy of Greece.

The military part is $100,000,000 for Turkey, only part of which is to be for arms and ammunition, and $150,000,000 for Greece, only a third of which is to be for arms and ammunition. The other $150,000,000, and you can see the details on page 3 of the report, is composed of $20,000,000 for agriculture, $50,000,000 for reconstruction—and the items are noted—and $80,000,000 for consumer goods.

I have here a 1,000-drachma note that I got in Greece. I may say that I got it legally. At that time there were 5,000 drachmas to the dollar at the legal rate of exchange. Here is a 10,000-drachma bill. The 10,000 drachma bill is worth 2 bucks legally, $1.25 on the black market. The 1,000 drachma one is worth 20 cents legally, 12½ cents on the black market. The exchange varies so rapidly over there in the skyrocketing inflation that is going on that it is hard to keep track of your money.

It cost me 8,000 drachmas to buy 6 post cards and the Embassy driver got 375,000 drachmas a month. One of the things that must be done to stabilize Greece is with reference to their exchange. That is a part of this bill.

Another part is provisions for physical rehabilitation of their economy.

Another part of it is to furnish Greece military assistance, advice, and supplies, so that Greece can drive the Communist-supported guerrillas out and maintain her integrity.

This is a very ambitious program. It is going to be difficult to accomplish. It has its risks, not only possible military risks, but the risk that the economic program may fail. We increase the risks by cutting the program heavily at the start.

This is only an authorization bill, and the appropriations will be checked carefully by our appropriations committee. I suggest it would not be wise to cut this authorization now and I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 49, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin: On page 6, after line 13, add a new subsection (4) (c):
>
> "That forthwith and immediately upon the taking effect of this act the Government of the United States and all agencies thereof shall cease and desist from sending any materials, granting any credits, paying any moneys or anything of value whatsoever, either under lease-lend commitments or otherwise, to the government or governments of any country or countries that in the opinion of the President of the United States are threatening, or during the life of this act do threaten, directly or indirectly, the integrity or sovereignty of Greece and Turkey."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment sets forth a policy which many of us are strongly in favor of, I am sorry to say I must raise a point of order that it is not germane to this bill.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman. I believe this amendment is germane. I think it is highly necessary that we indicate in this very act wherein we propose to assist Greece and Turkey in resisting aggression, that we also indicate very clearly by the same token that we do not wish to send anything over there to any countries that are threatening or endangering the very countries we are attempting to assist. I think it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair invites the gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment proposes that the Government shall cease and desist from sending any materials, granting any credits, paying any moneys or anything of value whatsoever either under lease-lend commitments or otherwise, to the government or governments of any country or countries, and so forth. In that respect it would in effect place limitations upon existing law and go far beyond the scope of this bill and is neither germane to the bill nor to the section to which it is offered.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is limited to those countries that threaten Greece or Turkey. It does not pertain to the entire lend-lease program. It is only to those countries that threaten the integrity of Greece or Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has taken note of that but believes that that in no wise counteracts the point which the Chair has made.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this bill has constantly revolved around the subject of communism. The specter of aggression by the U. S. S. R. is the one great fear-impelling shadow that has overwhelmed this Congress in a wave of hysteria. The implication of isolationism or pro-Russia has been cast upon the opponents of the Truman doctrine. I refuse to accept the implication of being isolationist or pro-Russian.

I am fighting today for what I believe to be the best interest of the American people. I am fighting today for the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. What is the basic principle? It is found in article I:

> To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Notice the phrase "to take effective collective measures for the removal of threats to the peace and for suppression of acts of aggression." Collective, not individual. Multilateral, not unilateral. Upon this great principle the League of Nations was formed. Because this principle was not followed the League disintegrated when Japan started aggressive action on Manchuria.

We have another chance to make an international organization work for international peace. An improved organization whose procedures and methods were improved over those of the League. Again it is based on "collective" investigation, consideration, and action against aggression.

The United States took a leading part in the formation of the United Nations. It is our own making. We are its strength. Our faith and confidence in it is its lifeblood.

We have been told that the United Nations is too weak to handle the Greek-Turkey case. We have been told that it is impotent.

It was not too weak when the sovereignty of Iran was violated by the actual presence of Russian soldiers. The Security Council acted and the Russian Army withdrew from Iran.

It was not too weak when the Lebanon-Syria crisis occurred. The Security Council acted and the British and French soldiers obeyed its edict.

In the complaint against Indonesia by the Ukarainian Republic, the Council considered the charges but they voted against investigation. In the case of the Poland complaint that Spain was a threat to the peace, Russia exercised her veto. The Security Council thereupon formally returned the complaint to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, after due consideration, unanimously decided to drop the matter.

Let me point out here that the veto by the parties directly concerned is permitted upon certain serious charges which involve the use or threat to use military personnel. However, in the case of appeals for investigation, the parties involved do not have the right to use the veto.

Why then do we not follow the four precedents of multilateral consideration within the framework of the United Nations?

Is it because we are afraid of the decision United Nations might reach?

Is it because we are embarked on a course of unilateral, military, imperialism which is in contradiction to the principles of the Charter?

Has the virus of world empire entered the veins of our democracy?

Are we ready to junk the United Nations by denying it the chance to grow with its responsibilities? These questions must be answered in the light of moral and spiritual values, or we stand convicted of violating our pledges to the United Nations principles.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. Are there any amendments pending to section 4?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. EATON. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 6, line 21, insert at the end of the section the following:
>
> "The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:
>
> "(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;
>
> "(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;
>
> "(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and
>
> "(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 7, line 14, after paragraph 4 insert:
>
> "5. If the President finds that the government of any country receiving assistance hereunder is not representative of a majority of the people of such country or is not taking the governmental and economic measures essential to the reconstruction of such country."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to qualify this amendment on the technical phases first. It consists of two parts. It states first that the President shall withdraw assistance to any country if he finds that the government in that country does not represent a majority of the people in it. And I draw the attention of the members of the committee to the first proviso of the Vandenberg amendment, which says that if requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey respectively representing a majority of the people of either such nation, the President is directed to withdraw assistance from any such country. So that we have written right into the bill the necessity that the President shall make that kind of a finding before he responds to any request to withdraw assistance to any such nation. All I say is that the President withdraw even if he is not asked to withdraw, if he finds that the government of the country assisted does not represent a majority of the people of that country.

The second part of my amendment requires that the government of any nation assisted is itself taking every governmental and economic measure necessary for its own reconstruction. In other words, it is doing everything possible to help itself. I call the attention of members of the committee to the fact that this particular provision was written into the relief bill by us in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The situation,

therefore, is as follows: When the money devoted to Greece's relief, which will be fifty or sixty million dollars, is used up, our own administrators over there will be no longer bound by the provisions which we have in the relief bill unless we write that into this bill, too.

Why have I proposed this amendment? I am a member of the committee and I do not want to delay the debate, but I feel in good conscience, and bespeaking the minds of Members of this House who are in the middle of the road—not those on the extreme right or those on the extreme left—just the sober people who are worried about the implications of this legislation, that this amendment is essential. Why?

We have to remember two things about it: One thing that worries us who are of the middle-of-the-road point of view is that this legislation should not be a signal to any extremist to the effect we are going to have a political witch hunt in this country, or a wave of reaction imperiling civil liberties in the United States. I think too much of our own devotion to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution to place the greatest stress on that, and I for one will be eternally vigilant on this floor to fight as I have fought for the civil rights of all, regardless of whether I may disagree with them. Therefore I feel it is enough to make that point at this time. But the second point does hinge a lot on this amendment. We must notify these people overseas, these people in Greece, that it is not our intention to shore up governments which leave a great deal to be desired as the Government of Greece itself does, and our own President said so and the witnessess have said so. We have got to let those people in Greece know that it is not our intention to support a reactionary government and shore it up, that we are not telling them they have to take this government or else they will not get this money. We have to let them know that they have freedom of action and that the only government we intend to deal with is one that represents a majority of the Greek people. That is not telling them how to run their internal affairs or anything else. That is just plain, decent being an American.

Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize this further fact: Let us get away from the idea that this program is antianybody, that it tends to stop anybody. All we are trying to do is fill a vacuum. There is a vacuum in the world. It is the vacuum of despair, it is the vacuum of an unreconstructed, devastated world. Into that vacuum may pour an extremist philosophy, the philosophy of communism. All we say is that we will fill that vacuum and that we want to let the decent judgment of the majority of the people of every country determine how they are to live and be governed. That is all my amendment seeks.

After I was in Greece in December 1946 I came back here and reported to this House that the guerrilla fighters were not a lot of long-haired people running around fighting for communism; but that they were a decent people, desperate over the political and economic situation of Greece; that there had not been less extremism and punishment of the common people in Greece from the "Chite" bands of the right than there had been from extremists on the left.

This is an amendment of common decency. It seeks only to give these peoplement the right of self-determination and that we in the United States shall back the demands of a majority of the people with our own faith in the love of freedom and justice of the Greek people.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire whether this amendment was offered in committee or not?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the gentleman makes that inquiry. In the committee I offered an amendment which was generally along the lines of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] about elections and democratic government, but I could not work out the language which would give a certain leeway that hers did not have. The particular thought in this amendment was not offered to the committee.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York permits the President to discontinue the proposed aid in the event he finds that the Government of Greece is not representative of the people.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to confirm the gentleman's impression.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case it is an unnecessary amendment because the President already has been given that discretionary power in the bill as it is. In the enacting clause of the bill you will find these words:

> The President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their Governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I make the point which I made previously, and reiterate it, that this is assurance to the Greek people that we are not giving this relief or assistance only if they keep this government. This is serving notice on them that in case it represents a majority of them, whether it is this one or another one, we will help them and that the important feature is in getting that message across from the people of the United States as represented by this Congress to the people of Greece.

Mr. RICHARDS. In reply to the gentleman I will say that a great deal of assurance has been given the Greek people in the other provisions of this bill, and I think it would be unwise to clutter up the bill further with his amendment.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. The main object of this bill is to protect the people of the United States, at any rate.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire as to the exact parliamentary situation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The parliamentary situation is that a committee amendment is pending to which the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment on his own behalf.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I support it for two reasons. In the first place, as the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, there is now language in the bill which at least hints at the fact that this legislation is supposed to do the thing that the Javits amendment spells out specifically, and that is to give the President the authority to discontinue this relief if he finds that the Government in Greece or Turkey is not representative of the majority of the people. The Javits amendment simply expands that hint to a mandate.

It is our desire in this legislation not alone to stop communism and military aggression at the borders of Russia, but to help create conditions which will be resistant to the growth of communism from the standpoint of the infiltrating methods of the agents sent out from Moscow. If conditions are unjust and if conditions are unfair we find a fertile field then for the growth of communism. This kind of an amendment in the first place, therefore, gives assurance to the people of Greece, many of whom believe in a republican system of government such as we have over here, rather than in either a monarchy or a communistic dictatorship; it gives them assurance that the intention of the Congress and America is to see that our advice and our counsel and our aid is directed to the end that gradually and steadily there will be better recognition of human rights in Greece and Turkey.

In the second place. I like his amendment because it does in a rational and reasonable way the thing which the Smith amendment proposed to do in a very abrupt manner. I voted against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to reduce this from $400,000,000 to $200,000,000, because we have no evidence whatsoever to indicate that $200,000,000 will do the job. On the other hand, this proposes that the President can withdraw this aid should he find that the governments of either country are failing to take the necessary economic and commercial steps to underwrite their own economy. It is along the same line in that connection as the Mansfield amendment. It is encouragement for them to develop a just and equitable tax system. It is encouragement for them to assume more and more the burden of their own economy and their own government. It is an indication that we do not expect to continue indefinitely and forever a program of financing and supporting these foreign governments which now find themselves up against a dire emergency. And it encourages both Greece and Turkey to broaden the base

of popular support for and participation in their governments.

So, it seems to me that this amendment is constructive. Certainly it is not a crippling amendment. This amendment will indicate, in the first place, that we are urging those countries to work toward the American concept of government and freedom and, in the second place, we are serving notice that they must take steps on their own volition to improve their internal conditions and to maintain their own security, because while we are stepping into this breach as an emergency, we are not underwriting these countries as a program to go on ad infinitum.

If this legislation is to help promote peace and stability in the world it must be followed rapidly with the development of some such sort of comprehensive, consistent, clear-cut, constructive program of relationships between the United States and Russia as the one I outlined as objectives in my talk the opening day of this debate. This legislation can hold the line for a time but it cannot solve the prodigious problems which now perplex and bedevil the world. By the same token, if this legislation is to achieve the maximum dividends for Greece and Turkey it should be so administered as to make both countries self-supporting as soon as possible and so as to enable them to move steadily and smoothly in the direction of governmental set-ups which are more and more to be found in the hands of an increasingly large number of people in both countries. The Javits amendment in my opinion will help achieve this result and I have worked with him at some length on his proposal.

Just as it is the hope of Congress that the whole problem confronting Greece and Turkey may gradually be turned over to the United Nations for administration and assistance so, too, it is our hope that in both countries their respective governments may become more and more representative of all the people and that they will increasingly protect and defend the human rights and the individual liberties of all their people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to ask the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment a question. I may misunderstand his amendment, but, as I understand it, if, after the United States of America put in, say, 90 percent of this money, the President came to the conclusion that the existing government did not represent at that time a majority of the Greek people, would we just walk out and leave everything we put in there in the hands of a government which did not represent the majority of the people?

Mr. JAVITS. We are giving the President that amount of discretion, and we assume that he is keeping check on it and will keep check on it constantly as we go along, while the 90 percent is going in and before the additional 10 percent goes in, as the gentleman states.

Mr. MATHEWS. That is exactly the situation I have put up to the gentleman. If after the 90 percent is in the President determines that the government does not represent the majority of the people, and we should do what the gentleman sets forth in his amendment, then we leave the 90 percent that we put in in the hands of a government which does not then represent the majority of the people.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the gentleman that that is just the problem this amendment is designed to meet.

Mr. MATHEWS. It seems to me that is just the problem it creates.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 6 the President is directed to withdraw if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable. You may have put in 99.74 percent of the $400,000,000, but the Council or somebody else can then say, "It is undesirable; step out." If you ever had a screwball proposition submitted to you in your life, this is the perfection of one.

Mr. MATHEWS. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. It has been said on this floor that this policy is absolutely necessary to the security of this country. We have gone around the United Nations for that purpose. Are we now going to say that regardless of the essential necessity for that policy for our security we will abandon it the minute the United Nations tells us to?

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

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. How are you going to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear? No matter how you amend this bill it still is the United States reinforcing the Truman doctrine, which is the permanent global policy of interfering everywhere in the world.

Mr. MATHEWS. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that he left out one very important sentence in the paragraph he read, that is, that we cannot save our faces by using the Russian policy of "I veto."

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to make it very plain that the statement of the gentleman from Michigan has no application whatever to my amendment. It refers to the committee amendment, which will come up later. My amendment does not deal with the text which the gentleman from Michigan read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 6, noes 104.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the committee amendment:

On page 7, strike out all of the language after the figure "(2)" down to and including the semicolon and substitute the following:

"(a) As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question of Communist aggression to the United Nations organization;

"(b) If the President finds that the United Nations has failed to act within 60 days after the enactment hereof, he is directed to carry out the provisions of this bill."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order because there is no reference in this bill to Communist aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it seems ridiculous to me, although I may be caught in a parliamentary situation, that we have legislation based upon the request of the President of the United States, who says this aid to Greece and Turkey is necessary because of Communist aggression, and that my amendment which goes to that situation should be ruled out of order. My amendment goes to the point of asking that this matter, if there is such a thing as Communist aggression afoot, be referred to the United Nations, the organization set up to accomplish the very thing that the President complains of. I will have to confess, so far as the wording of the bill is concerned, there is perhaps no reference to it. I would like, however, to ask unanimous consent to strike out from my amendment under subsection (a) the words "Communist aggression" so that it would read

As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question to the United Nations organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to modify his amendment by striking out the words "Communist aggression."

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama care to withdraw the point of order?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the amendment:

On page 7, strike out all of the language after the figure "2" down to and including the semicolon and substitute the following:

"(a) As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question to the United Nations organization.

"(b) If the President finds that the United Nations has failed to act within 60 days from the enactment hereof, he is directed to carry out the provisions of this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE UNDRESSED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to hours of debate on this bill.

We do not need more words. What we need is light.

And I have it. Here is a fresh piece of evidence, the first new light on the question in many hours.

It is a book called The Struggle for the World, by one of the intellectual stepfathers of the Truman doctrine.

You must read it. It will curl your hair. This volume is a dead give-away. It tells us what the real Truman doctrine is, and where it will lead us.

It is a veritable Mein Kampf.

When you have read it carefully, you will be horrified about the picture it gives us of the Truman doctrine in its final and expected form, even though the President may not realize it.

It says that the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world, and should therefore plan to conquer the world. It says we have the atom bomb, and should therefore send it crashing on the cities of the world to assert our claim for world empire and world domination.

It says, and many of the Members of this House are familiar with the sound of these words, that we cannot escape war with Russia.

Here are no pious phrases pandering to the humanitarian sentiments of the American public. No tears about aid for poor little Greece and Turkey. Here is the outline, in all its naked horrors.

Now you may interrupt at this point that the book was not written by Harry Truman. But it was written by a New York professor, one of those intellectuals whom we have seen so much of since 1933.

The author of this book, James Burnham, it is true, is not a member of the President's official family. But he is hailed as one of the prophets of Trumanism.

On a recent evening he spoke over a network of 262 stations of the American Broadcasting Company in defense of this doctrine. His publishers, in paid advertisements in the New York Times, claim that this book has been most influential in establishing our foreign policy.

Step by step the moves on the road to empire which he recommends in this book are being taken by the administration. And even if he does not have a room in the White House, his public and radio sponsorship of the Greek-Turkish bill has never been disavowed by the administration for which, to all intents and purposes, he speaks.

Now, let us get on with the analysis. Here is your new Truman doctrine. Here is the poison at its source.

The essence of Burnham's book is: The line is drawn. And you have your choice. You can help the Russians build their empire. Or you can build an American Empire. Either way. There is no other out. And either way, it is war. Which side are you fighting on?

What a fallacious pair of alternatives. What a trumped-up choice.

Secretary Marshall recently said that even though the situation is not encouraging he still believes we can reach an agreement with Stalin. I do not know, but that is what Marshall said.

But to get back to the evidence, Mr. Burnham says we must force England and the dominions into our grasp. India will be kept in chains. Spain will be freed from the forces now dominating its Government. China will be propped up, bailed out, and bottle-fed.

And get this: "The strategic plan must be, it would seem, to strike an immediate, paralyzing blow with atomic weapons at the Caucasian oil fields, Moscow, and a dozen or more of the chief Soviet and Soviet-controlled cities and industrial concentrations." That is on page 243 of this book.

Think of that. The very blueprints for an aggressive war of the type we just paid 250,000 lives to curb. But this time it is us. And this time, instead of the Wehrmacht, we have the atom bomb.

May God have mercy on us!

And here is more on page 177—four direct quotes:

"1. It would have to be recognized that peace is not and cannot be the objective of foreign policy.

"2. What tag ends still remain of the doctrine of 'the equality of nations' would have to be discarded. The United States would have to be prepared to make an open bid for world political leadership.

"3. Similarly, the doctrine of 'nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations'—already little more than a verbal shell—would have to be discarded altogether.

"4. The United States would have to accept the need for world-wide propaganda as an arm of policy that cannot be dispensed with in the modern world."

Gentlemen, it is not just rhetoric, when I speak in shocked awe of the possibilities outlined in this book.

It is rather an expression of fear at what is happening to us. Are we too being corrupted by our power? Has God been too good to us?

Will we abuse the trust and bountiful blessings He has given us, and turn ourselves into a warrior Nation?

Does America want to become the dreaded scourge of the peoples of the world?

Who is it that does not scan the sky now for our bombers? Or who is it that does not quail at the thoughts of our rockets?

Gentlemen, the Truman doctrine evidenced in the Greek-Turkish aid bill is an immoral proposition, advanced chiefly on the assumption that we can get away with it.

It is unworthy of us, and the high position which destiny has handed us.

If we will, we can be friends and leaders of the world. If we would, then we must disown this Truman policy lock, stock, and barrel.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment in substance turn this matter over to the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It does, and it remains in the hands of the United Nations for a period of 60 days. If there is no action by that organization the President is authorized to proceed under this legislation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it gives the United Nations an opportunity to act before we spend the money?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And before we become so deeply involved?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Before we open the door. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Instead of going ahead with all of these plans and then giving the United Nations a chance to throw us out if it desires to do so?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. You say the United Nations should act. By that term, if the United Nations should start to do something within the 60 days and they do not finally conclude their deliberations, they can continue and continue and continue, because it is not final action you are looking at. It is merely that they can start action.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My answer to that is that we will assume those who have charge of such matters will not allow such a situation to arise. They are prudent men.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this attitude of hurry and rush is evident. I know the Preakness race is on tomorrow but I am sure there is time tomorrow to get to that.

There has been in my mind for a long time a question as to just what kind of an organization we have set up in the United Nations. I am sure that as you read your mail and you read the daily press you know that the mothers and fathers of this country are concerned about whether or not we are going to bypass the United Nations, because when you vote down this amendment, or any amendment whereby you refuse to recognize the United Nations, you might just as well build on John D. Rockefeller's

estate in New York a mausoleum to the memory of the United Nations. Nothing more nor less. I am amazed at those in this body today who have had something to do with bringing this baby into existence and see them repudiate their previous action. We see today only a lip service to the United Nations.

I think it is begging the question when you say it is foolish to take this matter to the United Nations because it cannot act. Sixty days is not a long time. It is true that the President on March 12 said that there was a terrific crisis existing, but nothing much has happened, has there? So, I say it seems to me that we can well afford to stop, look, and listen at this point and give the United Nations a vote of confidence, because if you do not, tonight over the radio and the telegraph will go to all parts of the world the statement that the United States has backed out of the United Nations.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, may we have some decision on the time to be consumed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall have to object unless the chairman of the committee revises his request.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request until we can get a little clearer picture of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back the balance of his time.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield back the balance of my time; I gave the privilege of using my time to the gentleman from Mississippi, because if I yield back the balance of my time I would not have any left for myself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as one who has long advocated an abandonment of the policy of appeasing Russia, and who has given much serious deliberation and study to this question of stopping that aggressor by providing assistance to Greece and Turkey in their effort to combat communism, I must cast my vote for this bill.

The issue confronting the Congress and the country is, in my judgment, most momentous and far reaching in its implications. There have been few, if any, of more transcending importance before the people of the United States since the unfortunate fratricidal strife known as the Civil War. And yet it is a very simple issue, for there are few intelligent people in the world today who would still attempt to deny that the Soviet Russian Government, under the domination of Generalissimo Stalin and his little band of advisers, constituting the Politburo, is a totalitarian and despotic government, bent upon territorial and idealistic world expansion. Moreover, it must be apparent to students of current world affairs that the little, but strategic countries of Greece and Turkey are the immediate objective of that policy. The immediate question, therefore, is whether these small countries shall be added to the list of such countries as Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, who have been taken within the communistic orbit over their impotent protest.

In the fall of 1945, as chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, it was my privilege, together with a half dozen of my 17 colleagues comprising that committee, to make a 2-month, on-the-spot study of the economic and political conditions in 13 European countries. We then interviewed the rulers and the outstanding national figures in all of those countries, including Generalissimo Stalin himself. It was the firm and unanimous conviction of our committee, after a completion of that study, that there is no substantial difference in either the Russian system, as it exists today under Stalin, and the German system, as it existed immediately prior to World War II under Hitler. The individual had about as much freedom under one as he has under the other.

The Allies, under the then leadership of Great Britain, had a glorious opportunity to stop Hitler, when in wanton disregard of existing treaties by a process of infiltration and intrigue, he violated the sacred rights of other countries, but instead, the democracies under that leadership tried the policy of appeasement. And under the Chamberlain umbrella policy, Hitler then began his mad march, subjugating and enveloping country after country.

History has a way of repeating itself. Today in a world situation not dissimilar to that, President Truman, with the able counsel and backing of that great soldier and statesman, Gen. George C. Marshall, our Secretary of State, together with the advice and assistance of such able statesmen and real Americans as VANDENBERG, of Michigan; CONNALLY, of Texas; and EATON, of New Jersey, has embarked upon a firm policy of cessation of appeasement; stopping the aggressor; and preventing the further spread of communism. The first step in this program is this $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey.

Since I am sure that we are all agreed that something must be done to stop the aggressor lest we have a repetition of that gory strife known as World War II, what alternative is advanced? What do the opponents of the President's plan have to offer? Do they propose to continue the policy of Russian appeasement so strenuously advocated by Mr. Henry Wallace? Or, in the alternative, do they propose that we should sit idly by and permit the Russian policy of waging a war of nerves, of obstruction and infiltration, until it is too late?

The only alternative so far advanced has been that this whole matter should be referred to the United Nations. Can anyone seriously contend that such a policy could be effective? Is it not perfectly apparent to all that Russia would exercise her right of veto and the Greek-Turkish assistance would be hopelessly shelved even as every other serious proposal made by the United States, Great Britain, or France has been obstructed and barred from realization? To advocate the referring of this matter to the United Nations is simply equivalent to saying that one is against the necessary assistance to these two small countries to prevent their being taken into the Russian sphere.

The civilized world today, as a result of the recent global strife, is in a state of moral, economic, and political unrest. The Soviet Government of Russia is capitalizing on that situation. Russia wants war no more than we want war. She is not prepared for war. Her rulers are taking advantage of the weakened condition of England and France and of our known and fervent desire for peace to expand and grab everything she can short of war.

Mr. Chairman, no one dislikes the idea of adding to our already staggering national debt by foreign loans more than I do. As a matter of fact, for the past year and a half I have insisted that our own economy be given first consideration. Only last week in this House I voted against the $350,000,000 foreign-relief bill. But, like you and other representatives of the people here today, I am confronted with a duty to perform. We are all agreed that we cannot afford to retreat. We cannot have another Munich. The Commander in Chief, who speaks for our foreign policy, has told the world that this was the way to stop the dictator, Stalin, and the further spread of communism. If we turn him down here today, it will mean that Russia will take that as her license to continue her onward move, even as Hitler took the retreat at Munich as his license to proceed. So, as much as I dislike the idea of this foreign loan, I feel in duty bound to vote for it. In other words, I feel that any other policy would be unfair to the millions of our young veterans who risked their all to win the war. What is the risk of the loss of a few million dollars more invested in the objective of winning the peace when we spent countless billions to win the war? What will we have gained by the expenditure of these billions of dollars of American resources and the loss of so many precious lives in that war if we now permit the setting up of another dictator in the place of the one we destroyed?

Mr. Chairman, just a few months after the Battle of the Bulge, and while I was on the mission to which I earlier referred, I visited an American cemetery in a clearing of a forest on the outskirts of Luxemburg. There I witnessed a

scene that has been intensely imprinted upon my mind. Hundreds of German prisoners of war were being utilized to set in order a large cemetery in which were buried several thousand of our gallant American soldiers who sacrificed their lives in that battle to stop the last German drive. They were busily setting up thousands of tiny white crosses to mark the last resting place of these heroic boys. As we approach the final argument on this legislation I feel that I must keep the faith with them. I have no other alternative.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I doubt if anyone in this House has worked harder through the years for an effective world organization to establish and maintain peace than I have. Although from a stanchly Republican family, I cast the first vote of my life for the Democratic Party in 1920—for Cox, and the only vote I ever cast for Franklin D. Roosevelt—because I thought the most important issue then was the League of Nations.

After 19 years as a surgeon I gave up the security and deep satisfactions of my profession to enter public life because it did not make sense to spend one's life bringing children into the world, nursing them through all sorts of difficult illnesses, bringing them to clean eager manhood, and then sending them out to be killed. Nothing we accomplish domestically can endure if we have a war every 25 years.

I became convinced that the only way to keep the United States out of war is to make sure there is no war for her to get into; that the only major war we can keep out of in this shrunken world is the war that isn't.

I could see no way to prevent world wars except by getting some sort of world organization which would be able to work out just and reasonably satisfactory settlements of disputes between nations before situations deteriorate to the place where men see no other way out than by going to war. It must be able to deal with wars as with fires, put them out before they get going in such a way that our own house is endangered and we cannot in self-defense stay out.

All my adult life I have worked harder for such a world organization than for any other single cause. I think I can claim to be interested in the United Nations.

When the United Nations Charter was adopted I was unhappy about some of its provisions, especially the veto, and said so. In a speech on a Nation-wide broadcast, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 29, 1945, almost 2 years ago, when the San Francisco conference had just ended, I urged that we enter the organization because it seemed to me "Our choice is not between this and something better, but between this and nothing, which is worse." I further said:

> While I do not believe the Charter is as bad as some people would have you think, I also do not believe it is as good as some others portray it to be in their concern to make sure our country will participate this time. I deplore that over-enthusiasm, because it will almost certainly lead to over-disillusionment, producing three isolationists where only one grew before.

I warned repeatedly against overselling the United Nations in its present form.

I think the confusion and dismay we are in today is largely the result of that over-selling. The American people believed all they were told by the propagandists and naturally came to think that the United Nations in its present form was set up to handle situations like the internal disorders in Greece and so they come and say, "Turn it over to the United Nations. Let it do its stuff."

They do not realize the tragic fact that the UN is not set up to deal with this kind of an internal situation. It was authorized to deal with troubles between nations, but not to deal with troubles within a nation. In fact it is specifically forbidden in its own Charter to deal with a situation such as exists in Greece. Article II, paragraph 7, says:

> Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter * * *.

It was set up to deal with old-fashioned military aggression from outside a nation. Many indulged in the wishful thinking that after we disposed of Hitler and Japan, there would be no more aggressors. And then its first big test comes on aggression by one of its own Big Five, working by infiltration from within another member nation. The organization was not set up to deal with such aggression from within. To ask the United Nations to take over the problem of restoring internal order and peace in Greece so reconstruction can begin there is to ask it to violate its own Charter.

Secondly, everyone knows it does not have as yet the tools with which to do the job, the money, or the men.

Thirdly, action by it against the Communist insurrectionists in Greece would be blocked by the Russian veto even if the organization had the authority in its Charter, and the tools.

What happens to a bird which is pulled out of the nest and called upon to fly before it has feathers? And especially if one wing is tied down, as the UN is by the Russian veto.

I regretted the veto arrangement because it was a monkey wrench carefully placed in the UN machinery in such a way that it could block the turning of a single wheel, beyond discussion, if one of the Big Five so desired.

I said in June 1945:

> This Charter with all its inadequacies does provide machinery by which I think the nations can settle peaceably the conflicts that exist now and those that will inevitably arise. It is workable if there is the will and good will to make it work.

Mr. Chairman, the record proves that all the major nations, save one, do have the will and good will to make it work, but that the one nation does not.

President Truman at San Francisco rightly said the Charter was only a first step. But Russia has insisted on blocking the necessary next steps. Let us not have our people fooled any longer. Let us frankly recognize that as long as one Big Five nation does not have the will or even the willingness to let the machinery work, then the machinery, no matter how good it looks, is useless for such a crisis as we face today—until the monkey wrench is removed.

We all remember vividly the last time that the former President of the United States, President Roosevelt, spoke from this floor. He was just back from Yalta. He told us frankly he did not like some of the compromises he had agreed to. But he said they seemed necessary in order to achieve two most important objectives. One was the assurance that Poland would have the chance to become "strong, independent, and prosperous"; the other was that Russia would come along into the United Nations. He apparently assumed that if she came in she would come in for the same reasons we did—to help solve world problems. History proves how tragically he was betrayed or out-traded on both counts.

Perhaps you remember the magazine articles written about the Teheran Conference by Ernest Lindley and Forest Davis, with President Roosevelt's blessing. They described his so-called grand design—getting Russia into the United Nations. Yielding to her on matters of principle, pledges, and territory—for example, Poland's—was considered justifiable as a temporary expedient, if it succeeded in getting Russia to join up. Well, she joined up, but not to help develop a workable organization—rather to make sure that it did not work. That, in my judgment, is the climactic tragedy of President Roosevelt's life—the tragedy of Europe's life, the tragedy of the world's hope that it would get a United Nations that could deal with situations like that within Greece. It ought to have been able to, but the plain fact is that it is not.

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

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I serve notice on the House now I will object from here on unless time is extended so that we will have a chance to debate. That means all requests.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, futher reserving the right to object, I am wondering whether, as soon as the gentleman concludes, a motion will be made to limit debate. If so, then I think some of the rest of us ought to be given a little time, too.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctantly forced to object to yielding additional time even to a member of my committee.

Mr. JUDD. If you want the United Nations to succeed, as I do, then do not pass the pending amendment and torpedo it by asking it, in violation of its own Charter, to take full responsibility

for something it simply cannot accomplish in its present form. Rather, let us do soberly and well the job before us while helping develop and strengthen the United Nations until, please God, it can be improved so as to make it capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law for relations between nations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Evidently it is his desire that we rush in, as a Nation, where angels fear to tread.

I would be impressed with the argument the gentleman has made about the United Nations being weak, and unable to do anything in support of the very purposes for which that organization was created, to wit, to preserve the peace of the world and to protect the territorial and political integrity of the smaller nations of the world, were it not for the fact that just a little over a year ago in a very similar situation, when Russia actually had troops within Iran, one of the countries you will be sending money to within the next 6 months—remember my prediction. The Iranian Government appealed to the United Nations and that organization so marshalled the forces of world opinion that Russia was compelled to withdraw her troops.

I say again, how much better it would be if we keep the pledges, if we would live up to the solemn covenants we made at San Francisco and move to meet this Greek-Turkish problem as a member of the United Nations. I know and you know that we would pay most of the cost and furnish most of the men, we would give the great part of the support to the United Nations for its efforts to preserve peace, but we would at least be operating under the cloak and authority of the United Nations, and would show, by our action, that we actually believe in the things we have preached—sincere cooperation with the other nations of the world.

Yes; I have heard a great deal of talk on this floor in the last few days about isolationists and internationalists. I will tell you who are the isolationists in this House today. They are those men and women who are, by their support of this legislation, about to destroy the United Nations. Oh, you talk about covering up. Remember that you are going to destroy the United Nations and its usefulness when you bypass it, and that is exactly what you are doing by this bill.

I was a nationalist, if you want to call me that. I believe that we should have made an honest try to stay out of the last war. I did everything within my power to keep America at honorable peace with the rest of the world. Then, after the war was over I was sold the idea, by some of these men who talked about peace measures prior to the last war, that we had to cooperate on an international basis, and that we had to support the United Nations. To my astonishment, when this legislation is presented to the House these very same gentlemen are running right out on the very same promise and pledge they were able to get me to make, and in support of which I cast my vote for the Fulbright resolution, and for every bit of enabling legislation to make the United Nations work.

I think history will tell us who are the internationalists, who are the ones who want to cooperate with the rest of the world against aggression and to preserve the peace, and who are actually now the isolationists. These isolationists are now saying to all civilization, "We will not cooperate with the United Nations. We will not cooperate with the other nations of the world. Instead, we are demanding that America go it alone. We do not want the help of any other nation."

Undoubtedly those who are now the isolationists have the votes to pass this bill, but remember, by the passage of this enactment you are driving a dagger into the very heart of the United Nations. You are destroying the very organization which has been, and is, the one great hope of the world for peace.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Committee may not be misled, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that there are no Russian troops either in Greece or in Turkey, as was the case in Iran. I cannot refrain either from expressing greater confidence in the membership of this body that that evidently entertained by the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke. If I understood him correctly, he said that the isolationists are those who wish to destroy the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from challenging the statement that there is any Member of this body who wishes to destroy the United Nations. I simply do not believe that. My confidence in them is such that I cannot bring myself to agree with that.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that if we give the United Nations something that it cannot do we will probably destroy the United Nations?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is not only eminently correct but that is probably the best, the surest, and most positive way to destroy it.

Mr. COX. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In spite of the statement made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, it is impossible for me to believe that he favors our imposing a limitation upon our right to exercise the law of self-defense when the safety of the Nation is imperiled to make it contingent upon the consent of some international power.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it that we are here now trying to take the initiative as a nation individually, single-handed, and alone, without going out to these countries that you have tried to band together, such as the Par American Union, for example, or some other foreign nation, and ask their aid and assistance to join with us now to do the job you are trying to do. No; we want to do it alone; we want America to go over there and take charge of Europe. I say when you do that you will wreck our country.

Mr. JARMAN. May I answer the gentleman's question by inquiring whether he was in favor of the extension of UNRRA the last time it was voted on?

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Was not the essence of the Iranian situation this: The issue there was between two countries—Russia and Iran. The United Nations had jurisdiction. It could operate, and it did.

Now, we are dealing with a situation not between two countries, but within one country, Greece, which is a totally different situation. The United Nations does not have similar jurisdiction.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is correct, and he will also recall that the Russian troops were already in Iran.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. May I say a further word? President Roosevelt put all our chips on the gamble that if he could get Russia to come along into the United Nations, she would join for the same reason we joined, namely to help solve world problems. Now, it is tragically clear that she came in not to get solutions to problems but to block solutions. We face the hard realization that her purpose in joining was not to make the United Nations work but to do everything possible to keep it from working. To ask it now, stymied as it is from within, to take over this problem would be to sound its death knell.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman, who is one of the ablest Members of the House, is eminently correct.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished friend that I fear the apologies for this action today will be heard for a long, long time.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman mean his action?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; I mean the action of those who will bypass the United Nations by voting down this amendment.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who has not had enough time to speak.

Mr. MORRIS. I know it is a little distasteful for a new Member to speak, but I think we should speak what is in our hearts.

Mr. JARMAN. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. MORRIS. I am going to ask a question. You referred to the fact that I had spoken. I spoke from my heart and for my country, sir; the best I knew how.

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

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, the House, in my opinion, is considering the most important matter that will face the Eightieth Congress. This, I believe, is the most important decision that ever confronted me.

The sudden and alarming deterioration of the affairs of the world at large and in Europe particularly requires us in the interest of national safety, and in the cause of world peace, to review the entire international situation in order to clarify our position and determine the best use we can make of our great, but not unlimited, resources.

We must assume our responsibilities which this deterioration has forced upon us. We must carefully define those responsibilities and decide for what purpose they are being undertaken. We must determine where we can do the most good and how we can protect and enhance those principles for which we recently fought. God grant us sustained determination and guidance to use our talents well. May our actions help solve the greatest objective of mankind—peace—not by force but with freedom, remembering always that the more virtue we have the fewer treaties we shall need.

The President has definitely committed our Nation to all-out diplomatic action. In other words, the honor and prestige of our Nation is at stake. It will take all our wisdom and skill to fill this new role, into which we are virtually being forced, in the great American tradition.

The formation of a sound and efficient military policy which will provide effective support of our foreign policy and at the same time promote efficient and reasonable economy is indeed a difficult task.

In the debate this week we heard cries of imperialism. I am proud of the record of our great country. We have never been the aggressor but have always been the protector. A year and a half ago we had incomparably the greatest military machine that the world had ever seen—in the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea. If we had a single ounce of imperialism in our souls, a single design on Russia, we could have imposed our will on her, or on anyone else, for that matter. What we did with our great military forces is a matter of history.

Then we hear again that we could afford to disarm because we have the atomic bomb. Let us look again at our record. We told Russia that we would give her all the atomic secrets, conditioned only that any use she made of atomic energy must be under the control and full inspection of a real International Commission. This, to my mind, was the most outstanding, the most far-reaching proposal any strong, sovereign, victorious nation ever made in all history.

Russia can have the atomic bomb under exactly the same conditions as we ourselves have it. We have done everything we could, and perhaps more than we should, to try to show our friendship and good will toward Russia. To our great disappointment, our relations have grown steadily worse.

This is not a contest for supremacy, but a contest between two different ideologies. The eyes of the entire world are upon us. We are not only determining whether the people of the world shall have a chance to go the way of freedom but are determining whether we ourselves are to be a safe, solvent, and free people.

Millions and millions of men and women who love freedom will fight and die for it, if they have hope. We can give them that hope and can inspire them to hold fast to their religious beliefs.

In supporting this measure I have relied upon the protection of a divine providence that our sacred honor and our beliefs shall not perish from the earth, and that we shall be instrumental in establishing unity and human freedom throughout the world.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, for 4 days I have listened very carefully to the debate upon the President's proposal to expend $400,000,000 and give military and naval advice to Greece and Turkey in an effort to preserve their independence of Russia. We are embarking upon a new and dangerous foreign policy of intervention in behalf of weak nations and the preservation of their liberties.

When the President first came before the joint session of Congress on March 12, and asked that Congress make this most important decision since the declaration of war, there came to me the thought, "Just how far shall we go? Shall we commit ourselves to the stupendous task of stopping the expansion of communistic Russia throughout Europe?"

Every day since then I have studied this problem from every possible angle. Many of us here, I know, have prayed for knowledge to do what is right in this hour of decision.

I personally have been much disturbed since VE-day 2 years ago over the domination by Russia of a dozen small nations formerly independent and now satellite states of Stalin. There seems to be very little hope that Finland and Poland will again be free or that these dozen nations will ever emerge from behind that iron curtain of darkness, despair, and communism where freedom of speech and of worship is not permitted.

The debate here for 4 days has convinced me that the United Nations organization is not able to assure Greece and Turkey their continued freedom from the ever grasping claws of the Russian Bear, intent upon aggression. I am also convinced that this debate has proven that the United States is the only power capable of stopping Communist Russia in its creeping expansion throughout Europe. The conclusion has been forced upon me reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, that it is our duty, whether we like to face it or not, to stop further encroachment by Russia upon weaker nations.

As has been stated here often, if Greece and Turkey go communistic, it will be but a matter of time before that blight will fall upon Italy, Switzerland, and France. What then can we expect to happen to honest little Finland's neighbors, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, not to speak of Great Britain. It seems to me there is but one answer and that leads us to the question, Can we afford to let this happen? My answer is "No," not even if it costs us billions of dollars to prevent it.

Yes; frankly, it may be that intervention in Greece and Turkey will lead to war. Just as frankly, we do know that, if we do not intervene and do not help the small nations of Europe keep out of the clutches of Russia, war is sure to come, 5 years from now perhaps, 10 years, who knows when.

I hope and pray that the passage of this legislation, coupled with a hard-fisted nonappeasement foreign policy, will prevent World War III. It is with that hope and prayer that I am today voting, as are most of you, for this bill. God alone knows whether we are doing right or wrong.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate for 3 days, and to say the least, it is a bit confusing and full of contradictions. Many issues have been brought into the discussion that do not properly belong and certainly have no bearing on appropriating $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations. The position is taken in the bill that we have a responsibility to maintain peace and we believe that our own country will suffer whenever totalitarian regimes are imposed on free people. With this position I am in complete agreement. I intend to vote for the bill and against any crippling amendments. First, because the President of the United States in his message to Congress made clear to me that this aid is necessary to implement the position we have taken to establish freedom throughout the world. Second, because the President has been supported in his request by the Secretary of State, by a former President of the United States, by our top men in the United Nations, and by many commissions and individuals who have made an objective study of the question. They are the people who are in position to know much more than we are, and I am satisfied that in following their considered judgment and reports I am on safe ground. And last, but by no means least, if I needed to be persuaded, I would find much comfort in the fact that most of the opposition to this bill is furnished by Members who before 1941 opposed every effort we attempted to prepare for a war that everybody should have known was inevitable if we were to remain a free people. Not until we were attacked by Japan did they realize that the United States was next on Mr. Hitler's list of countries to be conquered. It was a small group in the Congress during those frightening days that really had the courage to do the right thing. We succeeded then and we shall succeed today because real Americans usually see straight, even though we may have many differences of opinion. Let us by our big vote here today prove that America can be depended upon when the choice is, as

between great strength and courage, to do the right thing or appeasement which could easily lead to destruction.

It took billions of dollars to win the war, much time and a tremendous amount of sorrow and suffering. We cannot change these facts. Let us be realistic.

It will take many more billions and probably much more suffering before a just and lasting peace is secured; but we cannot falter now, we must go on. With the help of God and an informed courageous people we shall reach the greater goal, and that goal is a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my replies to the few letters I have received both for and against this Greek-Turkey aid, loan or gift bill, I have answered by saying, "This is the sort of a decision which tries one's very soul," without committing myself one way or another, for the very good reason that up to until yesterday I had not fully made up my mind as to how I should vote on this bill with all its far-reaching implications.

I have now come to the very definite conclusion that if this bill, as now written, finally becomes law it will not give relief to the suffering people for which it is intended, nor will it tend to frighten the Communists out of Greece and Turkey, or any other country, but to the contrary by sending military personnel to Greece and Turkey, it will, in my studied opinion, cause internal revolution there, which will really put us to the acid test of full military intervention, and possibly start World War III, or else be obliged to back out with our faces red, and be the laughing stock to the rest of the world, especially in the eyes of Stalin and the Communists both over there and right here within our own shores.

The administration in power has given aid and comfort to the Communists both here and abroad for many years just to garner their support and votes, and are still doing it, as is evidenced by the fact that our Attorney General still gives only lip service to the law which requires him to rid from Government employ any person belonging to any organization which advocates the destruction of the American form of government by force and violence, as is the purpose of the Communists. And if we are obliged to back out of Greece and Turkey, the Communists here will gloat and be even bolder and become more powerful.

I say, we in America had best clean our own house of the destructive forces within our own shores before we attempt to force them out of other countries far across the sea. And in my humble opinion we will fail miserably if we make this weak attempt to drive the Communists out of Greece and Turkey.

In addition to the danger I have so far pointed out, I again want to remind you, my colleagues of this House of Representatives, that there is a limit to our ability to pay and pay and pay. And if we pass this bill in addition to all the other gifts, loans, and so forth, we will be called upon to make to the other countries now forming in line with their hands out to Uncle Sam, if this bill is made law, to say nothing about the thirty to forty billions of dollars required to pay the running expenses of our own Government, how in heaven's name can we avoid national bankruptcy when we look squarely at the whole picture? Surely such a condition will soon confront us unless we stop this spending spree now.

In one of Lenin's last speeches, he said:

> We will force America to spend herself into bankruptcy, then we will take her over.

Mr. Chairman, if we permit this spending spree to go on much longer, then just as surely as we live, Lenin's prediction will come true. God forbid that we should be so stupid. What will the good people of the world profit, even if we do succeed in driving Communists out of Greece and Turkey, if at the same time we extinguish the only lamp of liberty in the world, America?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is pending, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], imposing, if adopted, a condition precedent to this bill going into operation, I hope, will be defeated, as has been other amendments. The adoption of this amendment would for all practical purposes defeat the bill that we have under consideration. It has been pointed out by myself, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and other Members, that this bill does not bypass the United Nations. I was amazed at the argument made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the effect that he now is an internationalist. The gentleman pleads guilty now to being an internationalist. But based upon the evidence that I know in relation to him, and insofar as I can arrive at a judgment on this evidence and his confession, I think the confession of guilt is under legislative duress, and because of that, if I were sitting as a judge, I would rule it out as inadmissible and find the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] not guilty of being an internationalist.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, there is only one question that concerns me on all legislation of this kind, as well as the legislation which preceded Pearl Harbor and during the war—that is, what course of action at a particular time is for the national interest of my own country? I recognize that Members may have honest disagreement on this question. So far as I am concerned, Greece will be taken over by the Communists of that country unless we take affirmative action, and, after being taken over, the Government of Greece, like other countries that we are aware of, will become a satellite of the Soviet Union. I am satisfied that if we sit idly by and do nothing in our own national interest Italy will be the next country. We know that France is already fighting with its back to the wall. I am satisfied that if Italy goes, or if France goes, the Mediterranean goes with it. That will mean all of Europe. That also means that international communism or Red fascism will envelop all of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I take the position that such will not be for the national interest of the United States. What are we going to do—sit idly by, adopt the negative attitude, and see country after country taken over by default? Russia does not have to act. Russia has it groups working in every country. They are backed by the spirit and indirectly by the forces of Soviet Russia. They operate upon discontent, through fear, through any means—lawful or unlawful—or a combination of both—to attain their ends. They have their representatives and agents in each country to get control of the government of a country and then, once having control, use repressive and vicious measures upon the decent elements of such countries, and, if necessary, to liquidate them.

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

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

Mr. BLOOM. What Russia is doing, as the gentleman said, cannot, according to the United Nations Charter, be brought to the attention of the United Nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Russia says, "We are not doing it as a nation," and, theoretically, from a legalistic point of view, they are correct, but from the practical angle everyone on the floor of this House knows what is going on.

Let me ask this question: Suppose we do nothing, what do you think will happen to Greece? Is it likely within the near future that they will be taken over by the Communists within Greece, assisted by Yugoslavia, Albania, and back of it the Balkans that are now under the control of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union itself?

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that happens, will that be in the national interest of the United States, is the next question? All right. Suppose Greece goes. Does any Member in this body think that Italy, already under pressure, and the only nation outside the iron curtain that is compelled to have a coalition government today, with Communist members in its cabinet, can survive? If Italy goes, will that be for the national interest of the United States?

Now, I respect the views of those who disagree with my reasoning, but that is the way my mind operates. If we do nothing, it is only a matter of time when Greece will go, and I say as an American that will not be for the national interest of my country. Then a month or 2 or 3 months from now, pressure on Italy will become intensified, and if Italy goes, I say as an American that this will not be for the national interest of my country,

and it is on that ground that I take my position.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is in order to again quote Shakespeare who in one of his plays, one of his characters, the King, in speaking of the conditions of the Government in Denmark, observed that, "The people muddied, thick and unwholesome in their thoughts and whispers."

I think you can take the debate on this bill, and analyze it studiously and carefully and come to the conclusion that the American people are muddied in their thinking, and especially the Congress of the United States is muddied in its thinking. We have the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations, the United Nations organization, Bretton Woods, all of the side agreements which have been mentioned numerous times in this debate, the British loan agreement, and the International Trade Organization in which we set forth the aims and objectives of the people of the United States in cooperation with other nations and with respect to international relations. We certainly put faith in the United Nations organization, and yet this very day we have from the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, the five-point program to implement the so-called Truman doctrine, which, as set forth in this debate, shows that it cuts directly across the face of these other international agreements to which I have referred. And in Dean Acheson's statement he points out that, "We must take whatever action is possible immediately," irrespective of what the United Nations organization may desire to do or what it has the power to do.

I am familiar with the debate which occurred in the other body with respect to subparagraph 2 on page 7 of this bill, and if the argument presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is accepted for argumentative purposes or otherwise, if the United Nations organization is not in position to assume responsibility on this issue, then will some member of the committee in his own time tell us why on earth the language, lines 1 to 7 on page 7, is in this bill? Why do we propose to turn over the destiny of the United Nations as affected by the communistic doctrine and philosophy and aggression and approach when we say in the language of this bill that the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein if the Security Council or the General Assembly finds that this aid is undesirable in these two countries?

In that language you give the United Nations the power to stop your program. That is exactly what you do. If the United Nations has no power to act, as stated under the Smith amendment, what is this language doing in the bill? Our people on this floor have a right to be confused with respect to this debate and this presentation, and the people out through the country have a right to be confused.

Here during the first 3 months of this year we exported on the basis of an average annual performance nearly $15,000,000,000 worth of goods from this country. It outclasses anything we ever did in peacetime other than during the period we were shoving lend-lease goods out to the world. Yet one of the five points listed by Dean Acheson is:

1. Vast increase in American exports to narrow the financial gap between—

Between what?—

what the world needs and what it can pay for.

One of the five points is to shove the substance of this country out to the four corners of the earth. It squares absolutely with Lenin's proposal to whittle us down. Whatever the American people want they may have, but I shall not support this bill because I do not believe it is what the people want. Their secondary reaction to this proposal when its full force and effect falls upon them will be most interesting.

If the United Nations is to have the say as to what we shall do, it should be said before we spend the $400,000,000 and further involve ourselves.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very illuminating discussion here. I should like to raise the question now as to closing this debate. I wonder how many there are who want to speak. I had the very unpleasant duty of objecting when a very eminent and able member of my committee wanted to add to his 5 minutes, because I wanted everybody to have a fair show. I should like to say about three sentences myself on this subject before we get through. How many now want to further illuminate us on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counts 14 Members on their feet. Does the gentleman care to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EATON. I will take my seat with an earnest plea for mercy.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman try to get an agreement as to a time to close all debate on the bill, say a quarter past 5, and let those who are standing be recognized in that time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I object, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment supported by the gentleman from Wisconsin and would like to reason with the Committee briefly about some of the fundamental decisions we are about to make on the final roll call vote.

Like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] I feel the time has come to focus our attention not only on what we propose to do in this legislation but on the conditions which would prevail throughout the world should we fail to act favorably on this legislation at this time. We dare not overlook the fearful alternatives which we now confront.

Ever since the war America has been suffering from the lack of a consistent and comprehensive foreign policy and program. Perhaps that was an inevitable consequence growing out of the great conflict, but more probably it is the direct result of the Roosevelt era of appeasing communism. But in all events we find ourselves, on the one hand, spending billions of dollars and maintaining vast armies abroad for the purpose of averting war, for the purpose of stopping the forces of dictatorship from arising in Europe. For the past 2 years, at the same time that we have been doing that, we have been appeasing abysmally another great dictatorial force—the Communist forces of Moscow.

Since March 12, for the first time we are beginning to fashion a consistent foreign policy, comprehensive and clear-cut and understandable, whereby while we do maintain armies abroad and spend billions of dollars in Japan, Korea, Austria, and Germany to hold down the forces which we defeated—the forces of dictatorship—we also propose now to stop similar dictatorial forces from aggressing further down toward the Mediterranean into Greece and Turkey. We now at long last propose to prevent Stalin from doing that which we have prevented Hitler from achieving. So for the first time in many years we are acting consistently.

I submit that those who oppose this legislation today should present something as consistent as the program offered by those of us who favor this legislation, even though we favor it reluctantly and as the least evil of the alarming alternatives which have been forced upon us all.

We present a program from our committee now based on consistency to resist these forces of evil wherever they raise their heads and to set up barriers against them. If you do not think we should do that, if you talk in terms of economy or terms of isolationism or terms of anything else which require you now to oppose this legislation, to be consistent then you should submit legislation or proposals to the Congress and your countrymen asking us to withdraw our Army from Germany and Austria; to withdraw our army of occupation from Japan and withdraw our army of occupation from Korea because why should we keep hundreds of thousands of men there and spend billions of dollars if we are going to permit the floodwaters of the Red torrent of Russian dictatorship to sweep down through Greece and Turkey, Iran and Iraq, Italy and Europe and then eventually down through South America to our own American shores?

I think that we all have the responsibility of being consistent in this action. I submit this situation to you. Not one Member of Congress that I know of has arisen to protest against the fact that we have 5,000 American soldiers now in

Trieste for the specific and identical purpose that we are now proposing to extend $400,000,000 of aid to Turkey and Greece.

The only conceivable reason our money, men, and materials are in Trieste is to keep the Russian Communists out. There is no other reason. Nobody protests that. But what good will it do to keep the Russian forces out of Trieste if we are going to hang the welcome sign up by defeating the proposal now before us and let them come into Italy and Turkey and Greece.

You should be consistent in any position you now assume. If you believe America should withdraw entirely to its shores, that we should pull back our armies of occupation that we should to put up the white flag of surrender to the red flag of communism all over the world, well, at least a program of consistency can be built along that line. Personally, I cannot support such a complete surrender of everything for which World War II was fought. However I cannot follow the line of reasoning of those who say it is within the realm of consistency to spend money and materials and send occupying armies of men in some of the countries of the world to stop the forces of aggression, and then refuse to give any aid whatsoever at a place where every military leader in America tells us the danger is greatest at the present time. So I urge you to defeat this amendment and to support the legislation. We owe it to our armies of occupation abroad either to back them up or bring them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Following out the program of consistency that was so eminently described by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I would like to talk a little myself about consistency. Picture the position in which we find ourselves throughout the world today and before the people of America and the people the world over. Here we are, arguing over a $400,000,000 appropriation authorization to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. In other words, by this act we are virtually telling the Greeks and Turks what they shall do with their problem of Communism. While we as Members of Congress are arguing and trying to tell Greece and Turkey what they should do with communism, right in the very House that we are debating that issue we have in the galleries from 100 to 200 Communists, right in the United States of America, listening to us. Last night they had a convention of 500 Communists in the city of Washington, talking on how they are going to take over Washington, D. C., when they have their first mayorality election. Here we sanction and we approve of the activities of the Communists in our shores. Now we are going to spend $400,000,000 to tell the Greeks and Turks what to do with their Communists. We are going to ask them to outlaw the Communist Party; to imprison and disarm and to shoot every Communist that exists in Greece and in Turkey. We are going to ask them to do what, as Members of Congress, we do not have the courage to do right in the United States.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. The Communists oppose this bill and you oppose the bill. Now, you are not a Communist.

Mr. O'KONSKI. No; and I am not a Stassenite, either.

Mr. MACKINNON. You cannot both be right, can you?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I will say this to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]: He and I have voted in opposite directions for the last hundred votes that have been cast. This is the first time we are together; but those who are accusing me of voting with him at this time have nothing to say about the 100 times that they voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in the past. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is right once, for the first time out of a hundred, and I am going to follow him.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. And they do not make any point of the fact that you are voting along with HARRY BYRD? They make no point of that at all? They try to conceal that fact.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, I vote my own vote. I do not care how anybody else votes. Anyway, we are going to tell the Greeks and the Turks how to treat the Communists when we have them running free right here within our own country and doing absolutely nothing about it. What we do not have the courage to do we are going to ask the Greeks and the Turks to do. Is that consistency?

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know you are anti-Communist. The very thing you mention about this meeting in Washington last night has me bothered, as it has you.

The gentleman from Wisconsin well knows that if this group that met here last night were doing here what they are doing in Greece, if they were armed guerrilla bands trying to overthrow this Government, there could be but one result. The gentleman does not doubt for 1 minute what action this Congress would take. In other words, we are faced with just a little different situation here in trying to handle this problem in this country than is the Government in Greece. The problem in Greece is that the guerrillas are actually trying by force of arms to overthrow the Government.

I say to the gentleman that if these hundred Communists in the gallery, 150 or 300 who may have been here today, were actively engaged in trying to overthrow the Government, he knows what the answer would be. The two situations are not the same.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, having mentioned his name.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wanted to say that I am overwhelmed by this attention. The gentleman says sometimes there are a hundred with me or a hundred against me; and at last the gentleman is with me. I do not know what is going on any more.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from New York is right for the first time in a hundred votes and I am going along with him.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

At the outset let me state that I am ready to vote relief funds for the distressed people of Greece and for the unfortunate people of other lands. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the question here involved.

Without a question of a doubt, history will record that the proposal here today is the most significant event in our foreign policy since the Declaration of Independence. It may exceed—it may well transcend—in importance our declaration of war in 1917 and in 1941. In each of those wars we had allies. But here today we are out on our own. If we delve through the fog and mist of the uncertainies of today, it seems to me that we can find a yardstick that will dictate our proper course of action.

The British Empire endeavored to maintain peace for over a century. Today it stands exhausted at home. Segments of that once great Empire are breaking away. It seems to me that before we embark on a course of unilateral action, we should know just where we are going. If we go into Greece and into Turkey today then, most certainly, we shall be obliged to go into Korea, into India and into many other countries throughout the world. Russia will see to that. The decision in that regard will be Russia's and not our own.

Let us see what the world situation is. Only three countries are on a balanced budget—Canada and this country in the Western Hemisphere and South Africa. Inflation is the most important single curse affecting the vast majority of nations. Of course we must alleviate human suffering, but we also owe a duty to this country to see that when we help an impoverished world we do not endanger the financial security of the United States. The gentleman from Ohio spoke of the radical inflation in Greece, but I am fearful that the action here today will increase the possibility of radical inflation here in America. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that before we undertake this responsibility we should endeavor to obtain the cooperation of all peace-loving peoples of the world not presently within Soviet domination.

We can use the power and force of the United Nations to mobilize the people of the world against aggression and at the same time we can insist that they join us in a fight against inflation and by that action we can achieve a measure of financial stability throughout the world.

The United Nations already has a commission operating in Greece. The ques-

tion of assistance to Greece and Turkey should come before the United Nations pursuant to the direct mandate of its charter. Some people contend the United Nations is not strong enough to assume this responsibility. But if that be true, let us take the steps to make it strong. If this issue is submitted to the United Nations, then we will force a showdown with Russia in that body. As for me, I believe that Russia will back down when confronted with the combined opposition of the people of the world outside the confines of its own and its satellite states.

The people of America want us to take such steps as will make the United Nations stronger and stronger and not to impair its standing in the world. I submit, Mr. Chairman, if the United Nations assumes jurisdiction of this question and resolves it in the proper way, then and then only will we be on the road to world peace. If this amendment is not adopted, I shall be constrained to vote against this resolution.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee amendment and the Smith amendment to the committee amendment do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 135, noes 21.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 65, noes 137.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I had to object to one of the members of the committee requesting additional time, and I hated terribly to do it. I object.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, to whom I have listened now for four solid days, with the other members of his committee.

Mr. Chairman, I perhaps will not be able to say in the 5 minutes what I would like to say, but I want to make my position perfectly clear on this bill. I do wish that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who formerly was the majority leader, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and a lot of these people who are talking so glibly today, had been making the some kind of speeches 4, 5, 6, and 7 years ago that they are making today. Why, it was heresy to even use the word "communism" in the well of this House just a few years ago when the great appeaser was in the White House appeasing Communist Russia. We all know what brought about this position that faces us today. I predicted it in a speech which I was pleased to make on the floor of this House on the 30th of January 1941. Let me quote therefrom:

What are the war aims of the democracies in the present struggle? It is said by Lord Halifax that the British aims are to win the war and to crush Hitler. It is said by others that this is a war between conflicting ideologies, totalitarianism on the one hand and human liberty protected by democratic institutions of government on the other.

If that is true, I ask you in all seriousness what difference is there between Hitler and Stalin?

I asked that question in 1941. I asked you then, "Who would rule in the world in the event Hitler was crushed? Under what sovereignties will these people live?" And I got no answer. You said, "We are going to keep out of war; we are going to live at peace." I voted as my conscience dictated at that time for the thing that I thought would keep this country out of war. I have no apologies to make. I was designated as an isolationist because I took the same course that prior to the election of 1940 the President of the United States took, and which both parties wrote in their platforms. But the advice which I gave at that time and which others gave, went unheeded. When we took the course that we did take, the foreign policy of this Nation then was determined. I supported it with every vote from that time on.

Now we are faced with another situation, and we are not told what is going to eventuate. But what should be my position now? Can we turn back? No. The President has announced the foreign policy of the United States and has done so in these most critical times. What should I do as an American? With American troops scattered all over the world, in Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan, Korea, and other places, and with the forces of Stalin facing us in every place, shall we withdraw? Shall we turn tail? My colleagues, it is too late. What is the alternative? The opposition have failed utterly to present any alternative except to refer the matter to the United Nations. This is a hopeless gesture at this time, with Russia holding the veto power.

What can I do as an American? Must I only carp and criticize? We are involved all over the world, whether we like it or whether we do not.

Time will not permit the discussion of the things which I have considered prayerfully at home, alone, that impel me now to take the position that I must reluctantly take. I can see no other course. The alternative is too terrible to contemplate.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Will the chairman give me some more time now?

Mr. EATON. The chairman has no power to give time, but I will withdraw my objection, because I think this is a speech that really means something.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BREHM. Must not the gentleman from New Jersey ask unanimous consent to withdraw his former objection?

The CHAIRMAN. That matter is not before the Committee. What is before the Committee is the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I very deeply appreciate the magnanimity of the chairman of the committee, who objected to my request for five additional minutes until he found out that I was speaking in favor of his bill. I think the unfairness in the distribution and allocation of time that has prevailed in the discussion of this bill is now perfectly clear and perfectly plain. However, that shall not change my vote on this bill, because I must vote as a Member of Congress and as an American as I see it in the interest of my country. To me it would be unthinkable now, in view of what has transpired in the Senate, and in the address of the President to this Congress, to send the word out to the world, "The people of the United States are not united, they are divided, and we have at last succeeded in dividing them," the very thing that Mr. Stalin would like to see done.

Now, may I ask you to see this. They say that the Stalinites want to bankrupt this Nation. They say that the spending of this money is a step in that direction. Is it? I note that the Reds are all for killing this bill. The "pinks" are all against this bill. If they were going to bankrupt the Nation by that means, I should think they would all be for it. I may interject here that many splendid Members of Congress intend to vote against it. They are honest and courageous and I do not challenge their attitudes.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has arrived at his decision on this very serious problem by almost exactly the same rather tortured mental processes that I went through as a member of the committee in hearing the testimony and in arriving at the same conclusion. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me on this, that we face the alternative that, if we vote this legislation down, this country and this world face the very definite probability that the Russians, chained as they are, and moving in fast

in periods of stress and unrest, will step into Greece and Turkey and we will be confronted with fait accompli.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that in my opinion the Russians can go into Greece and Turkey any time they want to. What is there to stop them? We were told by the President that this thing was of such vital importance that we had to act by the 31st of March. I could almost see the Russians going down with their divisions from the Balkan area into Greece at that time.

Let me tell you that they are over there just as they are here and just as they are in Italy. They are there with their ideas and ideals, and you cannot stop that by building a wall of bullets or guns, regardless of what anybody says.

Let me tell you of what I am advised. I am advised that Italy is all ready to go communistic and all they are waiting for is for us to hand them $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 as a loan before they announce it. I understand that France is all ready to go communistic, and all they are waiting for is a $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 gift from us.

Let us not be foolish about this situation. But, still, with all that knowledge, I am going to vote for this bill because I, as one Member of Congress, went out throughout this Nation and condemned the administration because of its appeasement of Russia. I demanded that it announce a foreign policy. The administration has done so, and I hope to God they carry it out. Let us send word to Stalin that we do not intend to appease any longer.

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

On March 12, 1947, President Truman appeared before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives and delivered a message wherein he recommended the legislation we are now considering, to wit: House bill 2616. He concluded with these words:

> This is a serious course upon which we embark.
>
> I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious.

The President realized that by the request he was advocating not merely assistance to the people of Greece so that they might have the necessities of life and be saved from starvation, but that he was also advocating relief of a military character and that we were in reality bolstering with American arms and personnel the military strength of Greece and Turkey.

A member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which reported out this legislation for consideration by the House, recognized the military character of the same when he moved before the Rules Committee to transfer the matter to the Armed Services Committee for its attention.

The majority of our people do not object to the granting of relief, as such, to the people of Greece. Only the other day we passed House Joint Resolution 153 appropriating $200,000,000 for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war and Greece has been allocated $50,000,000 thereof. The Greek Army, described by the President as small and ill-equipped, has absorbed about $44,000,000 worth of equipment, some of it second-hand lend-lease. UNRRA's contributions, totaling approximately $360,000,000, have been poured into Greece and we paid 73 percent of that amount. Greece has also been extended a loan credit of $25,000,000. I understand that Britain has spent $150,000,000 on the Greek Army and has canceled $160,000,000 owed her for maintaining 16,000 British troops there and for other purposes. All this has been done in the past for Greece and yet, like China, she seems to be economically worse off than when we started.

Since the President's message on March 12, I have received many letters from constituents at home in which they express alarm over the bypassing of the United Nations and claim that by this action we reduce that great organization to the role of a glorified debating society. Many were persons who only a short time ago had worked so enthusiastically for the adoption of the United Nations and nad come to the conclusion that in it lay the hope for future world peace. I am frank to say that I have given the question of the legality of unilateral action by the United States very serious consideration. My research led me to the conclusion that by adoption of the United Nations Charter, all nations recognized that the maintenance of international peace and security was the responsibility of the United Nations collectively; that no nation should act unilaterally; that the Security Council had exclusive jurisdiction with respect to this matter and, as a matter of fact, is actually exercising the same at the present time.

It is stated by the President in his message, however, that the action contemplated gives effect to the principle of the Charter of the United Nations and does not bypass it or violate any of its provisions. Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, two statesmen who played a very important role in the formation of the United Nations also have gone on record to the same effect.

The Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States representative at the seat of the United Nations in the Security Council itself, in his address to the delegation on March 28, 1947, in explaining the action requested, also stated that the proposed program of assistance would in fact be a most essential act in giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that it is directly related to the act of the United States in creating a commission of investigation in Greece. On May 8, Mr. Austin addressed a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was read in the House in which he reiterated that this action does not bypass the United Nations; on the contrary, it would be a most essential act in support of it and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

The Honorable Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, also discounts the claim that the United Nations is being bypassed and indicates that it is not equipped to handle this matter, and that the action taken is in conjunction with that body. He said in part:

> The situation of Greece and Turkey confronts us with only two alternatives. We can either grant aid to those countries or we can deny that aid. There is no possibility of putting the responsibility for extending the aid for Greece and Turkey as asked from the United States on some other nation or upon the United States. This becomes clear when we consider the specific problems that confront Greece today. Greece has charged before the Security Council that armed bands operate within her territory are partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, and that these bands are moving back and forth across the borders. Greece has asked the United Nations for help in dealing with this situation and the Security Council has appointed a commission which is at the present moment investigating the Greek charges on the spot. It is expected that this commission will begin writing this report early in April and that report should be ready shortly thereafter. We hope and believe the United Nations action in this matter will result in the cessation of disturbances along Greece's northern borders. Such a result would be a most vital contribution to the situation in Greece and make possible the task of stabilization and rehabilitation. It would not be a substitute for the assistance which Greece has asked from the United States. More is needed to deal with internal disorder and economic break-down.
>
> The second problem confronting the Greek Government is the need for supplies and funds to enable it to cope with its internal difficulties, namely, the restoration of order in the country and the averting of economic collapse. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the British Government have been helping Greece with these particular problems, and the present crisis has arisen because those two supports must be withdrawn.
>
> To whom was Greece to turn? The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which recently sent a mission to Greece, recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the United States and the United Kingdom to extend aid to it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal, until expanding exports, international development loans and expanding production should enable Greece to balance its international accounts.
>
> If Greece had applied to the United Nations or any of its related organizations, the essential element of time would have been lost and the end result would have been the same. The funds would have to come primarily from the United States. The United Nations does not of itself possess funds. The Economic and Social Council is an advisory body that recommends economic, financial, and social action to member states. The International Bank, which is just now completing its organization, is set up primarily to make self-liquidating loans for long-term reconstruction purposes. It has not yet made any loans whatsoever. The Economic Commission for Europe is still in its early organization stage.
>
> It may be that at some future time the United Nations will be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey. But, as the President said, the United Nations and its related organizations are not now in position to extend help of the kind that is required. Even if some organ of the United Nations should decide to recommend assistance to Greece and Turkey, it would have eventually to turn primarily to the United States for funds and supplies and technical assistance.

It therefore seems to be the opinion of those who should know, that the present proposed action is certainly not taken in opposition to the United Nations, but in cooperation with it, and our American representative so reported to the United Nations and apparently satisfied the members in this respect.

Whatever may be the situation from a technical, legal standpoint, the legislation proposed provides for the termination of this program if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds—with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto—or that the General Assembly finds that the action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuation of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Are we justified in taking the course recommended, which, in the minds of many, may lead us to the third world war?

In determining this question, no one can overlook the opinion of Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of State, who is recognized by all as one of the greatest military generals in history and who has just returned from the Moscow Conference, and who, while debate on this vital issue was going on, sent to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee a letter which was read and made a part of the record, in which he said, in part, as follows:

> My strong conviction that the immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting at Moscow. * * * I fully endorse the committee's conclusion that the bill pending before the House will enable the United States in this crisis to support the United Nations by pursuing a positive policy in behalf of Greece and Turkey. I am convinced that it will be in our own interest and in the interest of world peace. I hope that the bill will be enacted as expeditiously as possible.

It may well be that it is anybody's guess as to what will happen in the event this legislation is enacted. While I do not wish to be facetious concerning such a serious matter, we may be in the position of the Connecticut farmer who, when asked by a city traveler how to get to the next town, told him that he could take the road to the left, then turn right, and go on a few miles, and he would get there. Or he could turn right and then go left for a few miles and eventually arrive there also, but that whichever road he took he would probably wish he had taken the other.

In my opinion, the present Secretary of State is amply qualified to make an intelligent forecast as to what will be the future. If his opinion is wrong, it will be just too bad for all of us, but I have come to the conclusion that I could take no step to prevent our present Secretary of State from carrying out the program he has so earnestly recommended. I realize that this proposal would seem to be a departure from our historic foreign policy, but after all this is a new world and unlike years gone by. In this atomic age, man's frontier is not the Rhine, but his own doorstep.

It must be conceded that the United Nations is not as strong as some people wish it were, or as some feel that it actually is. At its meetings, there seem to be continual controversy and bickering and failure to come to a meeting of the minds. This is not unexpected for it took many, many years for our own Federal Constitution to arrive to the point where it functioned efficiently and even now our Supreme Court has divided five to four more than once in its interpretation of the same. Certainly the money would have to come from the United States and not from the United Nations for according to the Secretary of State, Greece cannot qualify for a loan from the World Bank as it is not a good credit risk, nor from the Export-Import Bank, for the same reason.

I believe it should be understood, however, that by this action we are not committing ourselves to embark in endeavoring to stamp out communism in all other countries of the world. The Under Secretary of State, in his testimony before the committee, states that we are not, and that each request in the future will be considered on its merits and that it cannot be construed that this Government would undertake such action in any other country identical, or even closely similar, to Greece and Turkey. We may have some difficulty, however, in carrying out this announced policy without embarrassment to ourselves and a charge of discrimination made at a later date.

One compelling reason why I will cast my vote for the pending legislation is the fact that the program is an accomplished fact already in the minds of the people of the world. Failure to pass this bill at this time would be interpreted as an abandonment of free people everywhere to whatever fate may befall them. The President by his action and the Senate by its majority support have left us with little choice except to go forth. It is a difficult but now, apparently, a necessary course that we pursue. Favorable action on this legislation has been stated to be the lesser of two evils. It has been brought about and is the direct result of a policy heretofore pursued by our Chief Executive and his predecessor toward Russia; the situation of necessity was some years in the making and is certainly not a problem created by the Congress.

Let the world understand that we pursue no imperialistic program. We are not intermeddlers, but are granting assistance at the urgent request of the countries presently under consideration. We ask for nothing. We give and sacrifice in order that we may take steps which, in the minds of those who should know, will guarantee safety, security, and peace on American soil and, equally important, make for a condition of peace elsewhere.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

"TIME LIMIT"

The "time limit" or "urgency theme," is a fallacious one.

First. The British precipitated this so-called "urgency theme" by their abrupt announcement of withdrawal from Greece of aid and troops on March 31. Did our State Department have any advance information on the date of probable British withdrawal?

If they did have advance information, it should have been conveyed to Congress and the American people.

If they did not have information or premonition as to this important decision of Great Britain, then I say they stand convicted of stupidity beyond justification.

Second. The President on March 12 gave his message and stressed the emergency which would occur on March 31. He asked for legislation to enable the United States to replace Britain in Greece at the time of her withdrawal.

The legislation was not passed by March 31 nor by April 30, and yet no crisis has occurred. Russia has not marched across the border of Turkey, nor has Tito marched into Greece.

Starvation, guerrilla fighting—yes, Communist organization continues to exist as it has for the past 25 years in Greece. But no change of government has occurred and no attempt at outside aggression or internal military coup has occurred.

What has been more important in the intervening weeks, Turkey has not appealed to the United Nations with a specific claim against an aggressor nation. The appeal of Greece is under UN consideration and we are obligated by the Charter to await the report of the Balkan Commission before interfering further. What is the hurry? Why the rush act? Unless an aggressive action against Greece or Turkey is taken soon, the "urgency" theme is going to have a red face.

The "time limit" rush act has been overplayed. The United Nation's procedure could have been used and can still be used.

Food and rehabilitation funds can continue to be furnished on a bilateral or unilateral basis in harmony with the principles of the United Nations. Such funds and foods can be administered as recommended by the FAO Commission of the United Nations or by an international regional commission as provided for in the Charter.

Let me assure you my friends, that if the will to use the United Nations was there, a way can easily be found.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I do not know whether I am going to illuminate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or anybody else here or whether I will receive illumination. But be that as it may, illumination is what is needed here.

Now, the old red herring has certainly taken a terrible beating here for the last 3 days. I am not ready to join with all of my friends here to give so much credit to the Communists.

If I know a little bit about history, I do know that after the First World War the people of the world—not the Communists but the people of the world—got rid of the Hohenzollern gang, got rid of the Hapsburg bunch, got rid of the czars of Russia, and they got rid of the Ottoman sultans. After this World War the people of the world—not the Communists but the people of the world—said "We have had enough of Madame Lupescu and King Carol and Prince Umberto and King Emanuel and King Peter and King

George and all the rest of that gang of royalists." Those are the people of the world speaking, not the Communists.

Now, here is the Congress of the United States of America jumping into this fight against royalists and monarchs and going into this Balkan mess, to oppose the people. I do not know whether we are diving in head first or tail first, but I think we are going to get our tails burned. We are jumping into this Balkan mess to do what? When everybody is getting rid of kings and queens and princes and dukes and noblemen and landed aristocracy, we are going there to give these Royalists guns and bayonets and bullets. To do what? To kill Russians? No. To kill whom? To kill Greeks and Macedonians. That is what we are giving them these guns for, and you know it, and that is what they are going to do with them. They are going to kill their own people. Today, throughout the Balkans, there is no nation more hated and stinks worse than the British, because of their lousy policies. So we, the United States, will be hated and we will smell just as badly in a short time.

I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 4 days ago, at the beginning of this debate, this simple question: "Are Macedonians Greeks?"

He said: "You know, my friend gets me into an ethnological discussion where I am not too well at home, and I would therefore find some difficulty answering the question."

He had a big chart here, standing here like a professor, showing us all about that Balkan situation. He knew all about it. I asked a simple question, "Are Macedonians Greeks?" and he could not answer it. I think we ought to amend this bill to cease further consideration for 1 year, and hire a couple of professors to come here and give us some lessons in history and teach us something about the Balkans before we jump into this mess. Macedonians are not Greeks. They are Slavs. The Macedonians were under Turkish rule for 500 years. The Turks tried to make Mohammedans and Turks out of them. They could not do it. After the Balkan wars that part of Macedonia was awarded to Greece. It had not been Greece before that. Now, all of a sudden it has become Greece, since 1912, but are you sure that the Macedonians want to be Greeks? Can you make Greeks out of Macedonians? Then, what are you trying to do? You want to send these guns over there to these kings and queens and princes to kill these Macedonians. For what? Did they not fight with us in both World Wars? Did not those Macedonians hate the Turks because of the persecution that they underwent? Did they not hate the Germans and the Italians, and did they not fight with us in both World Wars? And now what is the pay-off? The United States is going to give guns and bayonets to the kings of Greece to kill off Macedonians. For what?

The people cry for bread and we give them bullets. The people cry for freedom and we give them bondage.

For 2 years, the British with their armies, have tried to stuff the Royalists down the throats of the people. They could not do it. Now we step into these discarded British Tory boots and we shall reap the hatred and animosity of a people who have always been our friends. I stand for relief and economic assistance to Greece. I oppose militarism anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike this bill. I dislike the necessity for it. But aid and assistance to the people of Greece in the matter of food, clothing, and shelter, and the means to provide these by way of farm machinery, manufacturing plants, and reconstruction of railroads, are so imperative that the shortcomings of the bill must necessarily be overlooked.

The provision in the bill for military equipment is to me quite contrary to our ideas of a peaceful world, but we must rely on the integrity and good judgment of the President in the handling of these funds. I am sure that the President of the United States would in no sense allot funds for military purposes unless they were of the most urgent and impelling kind. I am sure of this; and, since he is charged with the direction of the foreign policy of this country and has called the attention of the Congress to the dire need of the people of Greece and Turkey, to their poverty and lack of facilities for producing the goods which they need, the Congress cannot turn its back upon this request or refuse to uphold the hand of the President. After all, there is too much poverty and suffering in this world for us to ignore the fact that we are the richest Nation and can provide these goods without the least injury to ourselves. Late statistics prove this; and, if we are to promote in the peoples of the world an interest and desire for our form of Government, particularly on the humanitarian side, then we are obligated to aid in the rehabilitation of these impoverished people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, there are four amendments pending. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 25 minutes, leaving 5 minutes for each of those amendments and 5 minutes to close. I do that at the request of the majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that the amendments are at the conclusion of the bill.

The question now is on the committee amendment creating a new section 6.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 18, strike out "6" and insert "7."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 19, after the word "activities", insert "which shall include uses of funds by the recipient Governments."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

MY CONSCIENCE PREVENTS ME FROM VOTING FOR THIS BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it is claimed that this $400,000,000 appropriation is for the purpose of stopping communism all over the world. Naturally, all the great economic royalists and war profiteers, here and everywhere, with all the force and influence at their command, are advocating this dangerous course and are pushing us into it.

Their attitude is no different from that of the financial leaders and industrialists and munitions makers of Germany who, under the pretense of fighting communism, supported Hitler and the Nazi cause and plunged the whole world into holocaust.

BRITAIN UNLOADING BURDENS ON US

If I believed for one moment that our country—my country—were in actual danger, or even that our legitimate interests are threatened by Russia by this overpublicized and overbuilt fear of communism sweeping the Western World, I should vote for this gift, and for additional billions beside, even though I cannot feel that Turkey is entitled to any consideration on her merits, and believing as I do that this bill merely enables the British to unload on us their burdens and responsibilities of empire.

The inhumane cries of danger from Russia, danger from anywhere except the threat of a new fascism, from those who seem chiefly interested in strengthening the undemocratic governments already existing or trying to reestablish themselves, sound feeble and badly inspired to me.

Outstanding military experts have testified that the destruction wrought by the Nazis in Russia is so great that Russia could not conceivably make war for at least 10 years, assuming that she desired to.

CONCENTRATE ON FRIENDSHIP

Rather than this constant preoccupation with the danger from Russia, we should concentrate on the assurances given by Stalin both to General Marshall and to former Governor Stassen. Before we rush to arms to destroy Russia while she is helpless, we should examine these professions of friendship and cooperation with friendly eyes, and look for the good instead of the bad—not forgetting security, but for the sake of security.

So far as we can learn, Russia has punctiliously observed covenants agreed to during wartime when neither Great

Britain nor the United States has been so careful.

Remember that Russian troops began to march against Japan exactly 3 months after VE-day, in accordance with the Yalta agreement. According to newspaper reports, Russia has kept out of north China, although President Roosevelt's assurance to China that British warships would not enter Chinese ports was broken. Russian troops have left Iran; but British troops are still in Greece, and still in Palestine.

Russia made no objection to our trusteeship of the Pacific islands. She has yielded repeatedly in the Danube Basin. Russia proposed disarmament immediately after the end of the war.

DOES NOT CONDONE RUSSIAN ERRORS

Do not mistake me. I make no excuses for those things which Russia has done, and done deliberately, to outrage the western powers. I am not an admirer of a police state. I do not condone press censorship. I do not forgive aggressive action against smaller countries.

But none of the things we dislike about Russia can excuse the bullying attitude, the military aggressiveness, or the fantastic fear that have seized England and the United States. I repeat again and again and again, that the way to keep fascism and communism out of America is to make our own democracy work, and we cannot do that by suppression, by bribes, by concentration camps or bayonets or atom bombs, nor by a third world war. It is clear to me from the arguments advanced that this bill is actually to protect the British Empire's lifeline and to back up the Anglo-American oil trusts who have got their fingers on the largest oil reserves left in one geographical area.

GREECE AND TURKEY NOT DEMOCRACIES

When Under Secretary Acheson, who has been the Acting Secretary of State during General Marshall's absence in Moscow, says that Greece and Turkey are democracies he is just talking bunk.

Neither of these countries is a democracy in our sense of the word, any more than Russia is.

I am equally skeptical about the so-called Communists in northern Greece, or Aegean Macedonia, as it is called. There may be and probably are Communists among those guerrilla bands; there may be and probably are liberal democratic patriots who cannot stomach the fascistic monarchy imposed by the British, nor the virtual occupation of Greece by the British, however disguised it may be.

But the fact is that the majority of the guerrilla bands in Aegean Macedonia are freedom-loving Christian Slavs whose one burning desire is now, as it has been since the Ottoman Empire was first squeezed back from the Balkans, to be able to unite with their blood brothers in those parts of Macedonia which lie in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Time after time we have announced our adherence to the principle of self-determination of small nations; why do we refuse to recognize the rights of the Macedonians?

UN FORCE FOR PEACE

I believe that the United Nations can be a powerful force for world peace and stability. I believed in the League of Nations in the same way. The United States insured failure of the League when the Republicans made it a political issue and kept the United States out of the League. I am fearful that favorable action on this bill will have the same effect on the United Nations, because we are bypassing the world organization which should do this job.

Unfortunately, we have public men and certain newspapers and radio commentators constantly injecting poison into the minds of the people by distorting and obscuring the facts, and sometimes by sheer invention and prevarication. Many sincere, well-meaning men and women in America have had their minds so prejudiced by this unending stream of propaganda that they now believe the lies.

Yes; these distortionists are emulating the tactics of Hitler, who said that no matter how big the lie, if it is repeated often enough it will be believed.

Fourteen years ago, when Hitler came to power, Great Britain tacitly sanctioned Hitler's rearming by failing to prevent occupation of the Ruhr and by making no effective protest against the growing militarism of the Nazi government. Likewise, Great Britain failed to support the other powers in the effort to check Japan and Italy and Spain.

It was disclosed at that time that in this country we had many Nazis and Japanese whose activities were questionable.

I succeeded then in obtaining passage of a resolution setting up a committee to investigate subversive and treasonable activities, which, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] brought many hidden vermin to light.

These activities did not cease, however, and I succeeded in bringing about passage of another resolution. Investigation was undertaken under the chairmanship of Mr. Dies. When the committee became permanent first the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] and now the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] occupied the chair.

That committee, with an efficient and hard-working investigative staff and all the money at its command that it needed, and with the active help and cooperation of the gentleman from Mississippi, and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation still has not succeeded in bringing about conviction of any Communist or alleged Communists of attempting to overthrow the Government by force, or of traitorous or seditious activities, though a number of Nazi sympathizers have been convicted on various counts, or are still awaiting trial, all of them through the investigative activities of executive agencies.

STRUGGLE IS BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND ISMS

The reason is that we have but a handful of Americans parading as Communists, most of them without any understanding of what they are saying, and none of them with any reason or justification for their beliefs. We have no room and no need in this country for communism or Communists.

Once more I repeat: The struggle in America is not between communism and Nazi-fascism, but between American democratic ideals and every kind of foreign and authoritarian ism.

We have in this country the best standard of living, the highest degree of personal freedom, the finest schools, and the greatest productive capacity of any nation. Our task is to make sure that we spread the benefits of those blessings as far as possible, in the interest of the masses and of the public welfare.

I feel that the people promoting the current Red scare know this, and are deliberately pumping up this exaggerated fear of communism in order to cloak their own efforts to destroy American democracy.

Many of the gentlemen who spoke on this bill let the cat out of the bag when they said the purpose of those who advocate this policy is to keep the Dardanelles as they are, and to quarantine the Near East oil fields.

The appeal of huge profits with little personal risk is universal, and our international cartelists are working smoothly to skim the cream for themselves at the expense of the common people everywhere.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PAY BILL

It seems to me that the American people will pay the bill—certainly in sweat and dollars, perhaps in lives and suffering—and the British Empire will reap the profit, if any. Skillfully the British have maneuvered us into a position where they have made themselves appear to be the arbiters between the United States and Russia by forcing us to front for them. They are determined to save the Empire at our expense.

This $400,000,000 advance is only a small beginning. Next year, when this is gone, there will be more money to be appropriated. Even though we are rich and strong and prosperous, we cannot withstand such drains on our resources indefinitely. While we are debating this bill, there are other appeals pending from Korea, from France, from Italy, from China, and again from Great Britain. There will be more because many of the nations are bankrupt morally as well as financially.

Who is manipulating this country we all love to such an end? We know the background of John Foster Dulles, the Republican adviser to the State Department, with his close connections to the Nazi banking and industrial interests. But what of Mr. Acheson? Does his law firm—Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson, and Shorb—have no foreign clients? Has he resigned utterly and in fact from that firm or is he still guided and influenced by their international accounts and clients?

There are many matters of wonder in this entire policy. This bill is being forced on the country by the State Department on the pretext that we must keep Russia from overrunning and dominating Greece and Turkey by having our military advisers in those countries and by building up their defenses.

Yet our own military experts agree that if Russia really wanted to overrun those countries we could not pour enough men and arms in there to hold the Russians back, even if there had never been a Hiroshima.

In this morning's newspaper I read that Under Secretary of State Acheson asserts that we must start rebuilding Germany and Japan. At the same time he insists upon passage of this relief bill for the victims of those who were responsible for bringing on the greatest war of all time, costing us $400,000,000,000 and 300,000 lives and 700,000 casualties, destroying altogether nearly 20,000,000 lives. For those favors, Mr. Acheson says, we must now start making them strong again. For what? To start another world war?

DEAD LINE HAS PASSED

We were told with the voice of doom that April 1 was the dead line. Well, this is the 9th day of May, and l . anything happened in Greece or Turkey? If Russia really had any desire to march into those countries, she had plenty of time. If things were as desperate as painted, our frontier on the Aegean was pretty thinly guarded for almost 6 weeks.

On the other hand, we are about to authorize the appropriation of $400,000,000 with which to punish those who fought on our side, who suffered far more in loss of lives and property and resources than we did, at the hands of the Germans and the Japs, for whom Mr. Acheson says we must now rebuild.

Rebuild for whom? For the cartels and the international traders who supported the wars of Hitler and the Japanese war lords?

It is unthinkable.

WHY MUST WE REBUILD GERMANY AND JAPAN?

Only 2 days ago we observed the second anniversary of VE-day, when the Nazi empire crashed utterly and left Germany prostrate, without a government, after 6 years of annihilating warfare.

We have not yet brought home the bodies of our brave men who fell in Europe, in the Pacific, in north Africa, because of Germany and Japan.

The ruined cities of Europe are not yet rebuilt; the people have not enough food or clothes or shelter; General Clay announces that if necessary he will use our troops to force Germans to give up their hoarded stocks of food so that all can share equally.

Yet, Mr. Acheson can say we must—I repeat, he said "must"—"push ahead with the reconstruction" of Germany and Japan.

I feel that we should pause and take stock.

I regret personally that my conscience cannot permit me to support this bill; that I fear it will weaken the United Nations; that I fear it will hurt rather than help the cause of world peace and economic stability.

If we strengthen, not weaken; if we build up, not tear down; if we affirm, not deny, the principle and the fact of the United Nations, the 51 signatory powers will be in far better position together to stop Russia, if need be, than the United States and the disintegrating British Empire by themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

"SEC. 8. In adopting this act the Congress expresses its approval of and reliance upon the statement made by the Secretary of State on February 14, 1947, with reference to Greece, and in particular the hope therein expressed on behalf of the Government of the United States for the political cooperation of all loyal Greek parties for a dynamic program in Greece of amnesty coupled with the disarming of illegal bands, just and vigorous tax reforms, modernization of the civil service, realistic financial controls, and even-handed disposition of justice."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will this be taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman yields it will be taken out of his time.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Then, Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Montana declined to yield. The gentleman from Montana was recognized and he refused to yield. I submit the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. There were various gentlemen seeking recognition.

The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the point of order comes too late. I had been recognized for 5 minutes and I had refused to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JARMAN. No; I do not care to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana. It seems to be a statement of policy which is related entirely to the extension of aid to Greece provided under the act.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Montana will proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, on February 14, 1947, the Secretary of State made the following statement at his press conference:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MARSHALL ON REFORMS IN GREECE

I have been asked by several correspondents for the views of the Department on the recent broadening of the Greek Government, which I now understand is representative, from a party point of view, of almost 90 percent of the members of Parliament. We welcome this move as an indication that responsible Greek leaders are aware of the urgent necessity of subordinating narrow or personal interests to the greater ideal of national reconstruction.

We are all deeply concerned with the welfare of Greece and with the restoration in that country of economic and political stability, destroyed during the war by the occupation forces of the enemy whose deliberate aim was to leave Greece economically ruined, and by aggravating internal factionalism, to paralyze the Greek body politic. Greece's long history of devotion to liberty and democratic ideals entitles her to the sympathy and respect of the world. It is to the interest of the United States and of all the United Nations that Greece be assisted to maintain her independence and territorial integrity. However, no amount of assistance can prove effective or of lasting benefit unless the Greek people themselves are prepared to work together resolutely for their own salvation.

The road to recovery is a difficult one, calling for the same unity and mutual confidence required for resistance to armed attack. No country divided against itself can hope to solve problems which are national in scope and which affect all citizens and not merely those of one particular political belief. Economic health can be restored only by a comprehensive program in which the whole Greek people participate and to which all make their appropriate contributions. Law-abiding citizens whose main desire is to be allowed to live and work in peace can offer little help to their country as long as they are intimidated by armed extremists of whatever political complexion.

This Government hopes that the recent broadening of the Greek Government is a sign that the Greek people are turning away from the past and forgetting bygone differences, are beginning to face the future with confidence and in substantial unity. It also hopes that this recent development is merely a first step in the direction of the broadest political cooperation of all loyal Greek parties and that partisan differences will be submerged in a dynamic program of amnesty coupled with the disarming of illegal bands, just and rigorous tax reforms, modernization of the civil service, realistic financial controls, and the even-handed dispensation of justice.

That press release was dated February 14, 1947, and fully explains my amendment. You will note that this amendment contains the exact words of Secretary Marshall, and as it contains his sentiments and my own on this very important matter, I urge the Committee to adopt it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the majority leadership which is anxious to conclude action on this bill today, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Can the time be divided so that those who have not had an

opportunity to speak on this bill may do so? I have waited here 4 days to say something, and have not been able to, while some have spoken on the bill a dozen times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) there were—ayes, 18, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, like all thoughtful Americans, I know what the people back home are thinking about—thinking of the future of America.

Their boys—their neighbors' boys—came home from the war not many months ago. They wanted to relax—enjoy their return. They wanted peace and quiet—to visit with their neighbors—to work, to plant, to harvest, to listen to the radio for entertainment—to enjoy the quiet and peaceful way of life and to just enjoy all the wonderful advantages we have in America. Oh yes, they knew we had irritations—the OPA, railroad strikes, coal strikes—but through it all they knew and I knew that these hindrances would pass away—and we would all enjoy our bountiful America after years of strife and agony—of not knowing what the next day would bring in the way of sorrow.

We believed in a fanciful United Nations to stop all aggression in the world. No more wars. Earnestly they prayed for all of this. They knew there was no totalitarian regime in this country to cause them to fear arrest, torture, and a concentration camp. But now after months of waiting—what do we see approaching—Russia with its communistic doctrine.

The Communist doctrine ridicules as hypocrisy the Christian concepts of charity, virtue, monogamous marriage, and home life. Lenin instituted a postcard divorce and remarriage law. All a man had to do was drop a post card in the mail stating he had ceased to live with one woman and was living with another. This morally irresponsible way of life is against every one of the world's leading religions—all of which teach the sanctity of marriage. Communists regard the home and family life as evils to be abolished. The young are to be provided with institutional rearing. The Communists constantly trample underfoot the press, the radio—poking fun at our Christian American way of life and advocate the Marxian system of Godless pagan principles. They are out to destroy America—free enterprise, profit system, and rights of individuals to own anything. Their way would be rationed, centralized, all for the state policy.

The American Council of Christian Churches has adopted a strong resolution calling upon the church people of America to stand solidly against any further appeasement of Russia. They declare the Christian doctrines are now challenged by aggressive communism.

Many loudly proclaim liberalism but most of the liberalism of a lot of societies is nothing more or less than counterfeit communism.

The Greek proposal is simply to my mind an action for the defense of our country. From every cemetery in Europe and in the Pacific, where sleep our American comrades, comes a reminder of our pledge—that war must not come again. We tried appeasement after World War I. Today Russia feels secure—that we are too occupied with domestic friction—our isolationist background—an indifferent attitude to do anything about her aggressive foreign policy.

I know the full import of this stand. Russian domination means revolution by Communists to gain power. Police and firing squads to wipe out opposition—and requisition of all valuable factories and goods to be taken to Russia. Russian countries are areas of poverty.

The United States offers a stabilized peace—a build-up of the countries—that believe in the Bill of Rights.

By contrast, Russia offers these things:

First. Revolution in all countries for Communists to gain control.

Second. An international police to advise on terror and liquidation of opponents.

Third. Requisition of factories and supplies to build up Russia.

Fourth. Russian-dominated countries will be poverty areas.

Russia has sought and has gained strategic victories by maneuvering her fifth columns and political weapons against weak countries.

From the Baltic to the Adriatic, behind the iron curtain, lie all the capitals of central and eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia and their millions are under the control of communism. Athens, the birthplace of democracy, alone is not under communistic power.

In peace as in war, the only strategy that succeeds is an offensive one.

Oh! You say we cannot fight communism with bombs—I agree, but you can fight an idea with a better idea—if you back up your idea with planning and money.

You cannot use the United Nations because Russia has the veto power. She has consistently used this veto power for everything we proposed. Does anyone think she would not use it in the Greek-Turkey question?

The United States must assume the leadership and expect to rally all other peace-loving people who believe in a bill of rights, to our side.

The basic trouble is that Russia, like all dictator nations in the past, thinks appeasement is weakness. Communism is the only force in the world today that threatens peace.

To sum it all up, our action in Greece and Turkey is an action to build them up, not an action to take over the British interests. It is just an action for defense of American people and will prevent World War III.

The alternative of not aiding Greece and Turkey is far more serious than aiding them.

I believe communism to be the enemy of true democracy and all religion, the outspoken foe of all freedom, and in fact the headquarters of the greatest slave market the world has ever known.

What is pressing in on Greece is not a few mountain rebels, but Russian communism. This terrific force is trying to break through as a further step toward setting up world communism.

After two world wars in our generation, we should know by now that you cannot stop aggression by appeasement.

I again repeat—Russia will not stop. She uses the same tactics as Hitler, preaching appeasement, lulling her enemies into a sense of security—and then devouring them.

Do not forget this—some think communism is a political party. It is far more than that. it is a way of life; and remember, Joe Stalin said last spring, "Communism and capitalism cannot survive in the same world. Capitalism must be destroyed."

In case of doubt on any question, I will always be on the side of what I believe to be for the best interests of our country, and alongside of this I am convinced no nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense.

I shall vote for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, it is not without misgivings that I support this measure which is, in my opinion, a doubtful stopgap against the flood of European statism.

The best we can hope for from a governmental panacea of this sort is the retarding of out and out statism in countries where many assert that statism is inevitable unless our free enterprise system is proven workable outside our own borders in a modern economic age.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S MORAL LEADERSHIP WILL BE HELPED, NOT HURT, BY THE EXTENSION OF AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, two objections have been repeatedly urged against this bill: First, that America's moral leadership will be damaged and, second, that the program authorized by

the measure would expose us to startling new dangers.

Now, let us look at this charge that moral principles are involved. The hearings are deficient in this respect. A number of witnesses representing various organizations appeared before the committee to plead that any display of force to protect the independence of Greece and Turkey would impair our moral position in the world.

In the debate today opponents have asserted that the bill would bypass the United Nations and would hurt our influence in the world. They invoke the principles of moral leadership. The implication is that use of force is incompatible with a strong moral position. They speak of the rule of law as if it can be maintained without an enforcing power. The hope of a long reign of peace is indeed the United Nations, but that hope will never be realized until an adequate force is at the disposal of that great agency. It should be a latent force, but it must be available just as the police force is available for the execution of judgments in the domestic courts of this land. No one can seriously contend that the United Nations is so equipped today.

Some of the voices raised in protest against the use of force to put down disorder and to protect the independence of Greece and Turkey would inveigh against any force at all, even that exerted by a multilateral agency devoted to the peace. Underlying this point of view is the false assumption that force is used only by violators of the peace. Brigands use force, peaceful men must not behave like that. But police must use guns, too. I am not arguing here for military activity by the United States in the affected area except to the very limited extent outlined by the bill. I am arguing only that the strengthening of these two nations whose peace and sovereignty is threatened is not only justified in the light of our own national-security needs but is an act of international morality. It would be immoral not to exert ourselves in defense of our institutions and our ideals. If we were setting ourselves against the policies and aims of the United Nations the arguments of those who speak of moral leadership would have validity but Mr. Warren Austin's message to the Congress dispels any semblance of support for that contention.

I think I know what is in the minds of the opponents and I appreciate their earnest and sincere espousal of a cause. They should not be dismissed with the reply that they may have their moral claims, that we will be practical. To be sure ours is the practical way but it is also the stronger position morally. It is unfortunate that the banners of idealism were seized by groups whose record before Pearl Harbor and afterward reflected an unwillingness to defend our beliefs.

Do we believe in liberty? Do we believe in international decency and in respect for the rights of small nations? Do we believe in the standards of national morality that have made America stand out? Do we believe enough in these things to sacrifice for them? That is the issue and to decide that issue on the basis of using our resources for defending a strategic area in the world is to exhibit moral leadership.

The other objection is that the action contemplated by the bill would lead us into dangers—conceivably, it would. It is only because the other alternative is even more dangerous that we should accept this course. Surely the preceding speakers have been convincing on that point. The dilemma is not pleasant. The bill involves heavy expenditures at a time when we all wish to spare our burdened people. It is only because the dangers of inaction are greater and are certainly more imminent that we should approve this bill.

Our world is full of dangers and perhaps it will continue to be a dangerous world till the youngest among us are old men. We cannot escape danger. The colored preacher who lived down our way was right. He was asked if he had prepared his people for the dangers of the atomic bomb and his reply was, "No, I have not. I figure that we are always here at a very great risk."

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

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to extend their remarks may do so at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

GIVING TO BOTH SIDES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, while the House is debating the present bill of money to Greece for the supposed purpose of stopping the spread of communism throughout the world, at the same time, and while the debates are going on to give this money, our Government is actually sending millions of dollars of goods and machinery to Russia. Only this week there are locomotives going from my district direct to Russia and in addition machinery for mining. And in the New York Times of Wednesday, May 7, the State Department is now making arrangements to exchange 50 Russian scientists so that Russia might have full and complete scientific information as to what is going on in this country. By what kind of reasoning can the State Department ask for hundreds of millions of dollars to stop the spread of communism and at the same time give to Russia untold millions of dollars of heavy durable goods in the way of railway equipment, farming machinery, and mining machinery and invite 50 Russian scientists to come to this country to have the benefit of our scientific achievements.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, it is admitted that the proposed loan for Greece and Turkey is for a military adventure aimed at stopping Communist aggression.

It is needless for me to say that I now and always have opposed communism or any attempt to force any kind of a totalitarian form of government upon our people. I have never hesitated to speak against Communist aggression and call attention to the menace of that foreign ideology. I have spent many hours trying to bring to the attention of my people what communism would do to this country. However, I am voting against this loan for I believe that the immediate situation in Greece, and similar problems in the Middle East and elsewhere, are definitely in the realm of the United Nations responsibility and not that of the United States or any other one country alone.

Approval of this loan will lead to similar demands from many other countries. Korea, China, India, Iran, Iraq, and others will contend they are endangered by Communist aggression and request aid from this country. Demands will come thick and fast. I believe it is of far more importance that we first try to set our own house in order by combatting communism here at home. Instead of authorizing huge gift-loans for foreign countries I believe we should give first consideration to providing adequate hospitalization and medical care for our disabled veterans and better welfare benefits for our elder citizens.

No one knows how much the new foreign policy we are embarking upon will cost, or when that cost will end. No one knows how many other countries will demand aid of us to stop the spread of communism. No one knows whether the enactment of this policy will result in war or in peace. No one knows whether this is the best way or the worst way to accomplish our desired purpose of bringing peace, liberty, and freedom to the peoples of the world.

If this new proposed foreign policy is to cost the fifteen to thirty billion dollars many estimate it will, if we are to continue to furnish the food, the clothing, the machinery, and the equipment the world demands, there is a strong possibility we shall so weaken ourselves here at home as to fall an easy prey to those Communists within our own country who are attempting to destroy our representative form of government.

During this debate, our able colleague, Representative REED of New York, inserted in the RECORD a printed article stating that Lenin, godfather of communism, boldly declared: "We shall oblige America to spend herself into destruction." The endless schemes of planners to spend the American Republic toward destruction are without end. Is it only a coincidence that this mad spending fits perfectly into the well-known and diabolical Communist objective to bankrupt us? Where will this proposal to pour money into every trouble spot in Europe end?

From a humanitarian standpoint we should be willing to aid starving people abroad with our surplus food and supplies, but we cannot continue to consistently finance the rest of the world without eventually bankrupting our own country.

If we really want to aid the peace movement we should pass House Resolution 73 which abolishes compulsory military training throughout the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the matter of Greek-Turkish assistance, now before us, can properly and promptly be resolved if you will ask yourselves these few pertinent questions:

Are you for or against communistic encroachment upon the world?

Are you for democracy's survival or against it?

Are you of normal vision or myopic?

Are you sincere or hypocritic?

Are you debating or just gassing?

Are you thinking or just guessing?

Are you saving or wasting precious time?

Are you talking cash or conversation?

Are you talking sense or nonsense?

Are you putting up or shutting up?

Are you serious or just demagoging?

Are you saving or wasting?

Are you penny-wise or pound-foolish?

It is as simple as all that.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, for many weeks, the Congress has been reviewing appropriation bills for every domestic purpose. Discharges of millions of employees have been demanded, and to the extent of at least a million of such employees have been released. The activities of departments have been and still are being curtailed. Projects which have been under way have been abandoned, and others forbidden. Even now, in appropriation bills still to be considered, threats are made regarding appropriations to expand the Rural Electrification program, which has become so essential to agricultural progress in all parts of the country. Other activities for the benefit of agriculture likewise are being condemned. The reclamation policy also is to be crippled and denied the loans through which expansion would be possible.

There is scarcely a program or policy relating to domestic affairs which will escape the ban as the fiscal measures are brought in. The Federal budget is to be balanced and a reduction of income taxes brought about. Not in many years have so many proposals for economy in Government been proposed. Many of them are likely to become effective. Even the school-lunch funds, which have been so valuable to millions of school pupils, are under consideration for curtailment or abandonment. The many thousand young pupils in the day schools for Indians may be put on the list of the hungry, as well as the destitute, if the will of the advocates of economy is to prevail.

Hours might be spent in barely enumerating the items which it is proposed to pare down to the limit.

All this is necessary in the views of some proponents of economy. Our huge national debt is pointed to with shivers of fear. Our country is said to be in a sorry plight, and worse may come. Our economic stability is so seriously threatened, according to some, that only by the most drastic measures can it be saved. The prospect of an early commercial and industrial depression which will affect town and country alike, is emphasized among the dangers said to be imminent.

While all these dismal predictions are being made as to the fiscal situation, Congress is being urged to provide most expansive and extravagant appropriations to foreign countries, amounting to billions of dollars in the next year, with a continuance of the policy of extravagance indefinitely in the future. When considering domestic appropriations, the need of keeping America strong is declared. When pressure is applied from foreign capitals, we are asked to reverse our attitude and permit our country to become exhausted and possibly made bankrupt in an attempt to stabilize the economy of all other countries.

In our own affairs, every request for appropriations is carefully scanned. Every proposal must be justified in detail. In foreign loans and grants, the most meager information is acted upon, and not even investigation and supervision of expenditures is required.

At present, according to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the requests actually under consideration by Congress for the assistance of foreign countries amount to $1,995,000,000—nearly $2,000,000,000. The same committee compiles a list of estimated expenditures of such loans and grants which far exceeds the requests. Its total is placed at $3,643,000,000. That total does not include expenditures for our armed forces in occupied countries abroad.

The bill before Congress for assistance to Greece and Turkey is only one of the many which will come up for action. It provides $400,000,000 for its purposes.

Of that, $11,000,000 are proposed to be expended on the railways of Greece. There is not a word in the committee report as to how such a figure has been arrived at, nor as to how many private fortunes will be restored; not a word as to the foreign stockholders in such railways. Out of thin air, comes the estimate. No provision is made for a just and complete accounting of the moneys spent.

For the Greek Army it is proposed to expend $150,000,000. After VE-day, our Army had to exceed $10,000,000,000 of surplus war commodities abroad. It was sold or given away to various governments. Who is to furnish the additional supplies for the Greek Army? Are they to be bought in our own country, to the further profit of our munition makers, or sold by the nations which obtained such immense supplies from our surplus commodities practically abandoned to them under lend-lease or otherwise.

Similar questions might be asked regarding the $20,000,000 for agricultural rehabilitation, and $50,000,000 for reconstruction. How much of the $80,000,000 for consumer goods will go for the poor and destitute, instead of for commodities less essential. Over $50,000,000 now are available under other appropriations for the direct relief of the destitute of Greece, and other funds are available from UNRRA. This bill and the committee report do not give any assurance that the poor of Greece will be cared for. Our experience under the distribution of foodstuffs by UNRRA was so deplorable that even the facts about it are unobtainable. Why should Congress blindly vote away $400,000,000 without even the possibility of knowing for what it will be spent, who will get it, and who will make exorbitant profits at home or abroad because of such congressional indefiniteness in the measure under consideration.

For Turkey, an even $100,000,000 are provided, mainly for the armies of that country to be expended by the Government of Turkey. Not a line provides for any accounting, any explanation of how it is to be spent, nor where and to whom.

This step toward sending out more billions of money to foreign lands for uncontrolled spending is justified by some as necessary to fight communism and stop the expansion of Russian power in Europe. However commendable such a purpose may be, will this measure prove effective? Is it the first step toward another World War, as some seem to fear? The vast majority of our people are opposed to communism in our own country, and to its spread in Europe. They are as strongly opposed to Russian domination which in the remotest degree threatens the security of our country at home or abroad. But will this measure bring any assurance that it will prove effective?

Have we not had our own experience in Yugoslavia, where Marshal Tito's military dictatorship wheedled over $600,000,000 from our post-war relief program? That dictator built up his army and his political gang with the funds. He now is an associate in any plans for Russian aggression, and spread of communism. The poor and destitute of his land received almost nothing. The funds were spent to build up a totalitarian dictatorship whose existence has became an additional threat to Greece. Because of it, this measure is deemed necessary. Our generosity has been turned against us by Tito and his gangsters.

Days have been spent in debating this measure in the House. Minor amendments have been appended in the other House. It remains incomplete for our own protection and for the purpose for which it is proposed. Before Congress sends more funds abroad, it should make a full and complete investigation as to what has been done with the billions already spent. It should safeguard any further appropriation against wanton waste, extravagance, and squandering which has characterized all our endeavors to win peace for the world by huge sums from our own treasury.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it has been fully evident throughout this debate, that we have all been gaging the risks that are potentially inherent in this measure. There are some who do not see the necessity of intervening in any situation anywhere beyond our boundaries. Some would not intervene here in Greece and Turkey but would step in somewhere else.

For my own part, I have come to the considered conclusion that it is time to draw the line—now.

It is time to give the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States force and effect now.

It is time to say "Thus far and no farther" to Communist leadership and design. So far, Communist policy has

done nothing but push and shove to expand its frontiers.

Unchecked, Soviet leadership will inevitably challenge the world and, therefore, challenge our own American security and interests.

The threat of communism in the Greece-Turkey area must be halted. Today, in Greece, we are witness to communism ruthlesly pushing its way through the creation of strife and turmoil, poverty, hunger, through the desperations of a stricken people.

If we are concretely, realistically, to champion the rights of freedom, we must help sustain those things freedom means. Without our helping hand, through the practical aid that this bill would afford, there is no other outlook in this now blighted area of the world except of human subjugation, human degradation, and political chaos. Communism is on the march, communism that fattens on poverty and the desperate discouragements of human beings; communism that counts on such situations for its acceptance that contrives and connives at conditions where a stricken people, in order to live, will exchange freedom, self-respect, human dignity, for a minimum of protection and existence.

It is unfortunate that the United Nations today are not in a position to undertake directly to prevent Communist aggression in this near eastern area and to help in the rehabilitation and strengthening of Greece and Turkey. Certainly, if the United Nations today were not powerless to act—and we all know why it cannot act—it would be its objective, as it is ours, to aid in the rehabilitation of this area.

We all know the strategic importance of Greece and Turkey in world geography. Control of them means control of the "underbelly of Europe." It means control of the Mediterranean; it means control of the Dardanelles; it means flanking pressure on all the borders of the Mediterranean area.

If communism moves in, it will have a strong strategic position from which to maneuver and to mount pressure campaigns on southern Europe, Asia Minor, north Africa, and eventually South America.

Knowing as we do the history of Soviet actions and policy, I simply cannot bring myself to believe that Communist leaders would be reluctant to seize this opportunity, should we provide it by failing to give support to Greece and Turkey.

It is not enough to think in terms of the world today. It is not enough, also, to rest on our own power and strength as we know it today. The world will move on and we are under the heavy obligation to leave nothing undone at any time to strengthen our present and future security position.

We should not be willing to gamble the future of the United States for the sake of attempting to save the sums of money represented in this Greece-Turkey aid proposal. It is an investment that I feel we should make, both for our future security and to help achieve lasting world peace.

If Communist leaders want peace, a simple matter of aid to Greece and Turkey will not break it. If they are bent on war, no amount of appeasement can stop it.

The choice, then, is not in our hands. We have no choice but to take our stand, with that of other peace-loving nations, at key points of the world, and take it now while we still can fashion and influence the things to come.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the debates on the Greek-Turkish loan with intense feeling. The issues are complex and clouded by many excellent bursts of oratory and fine speeches, but under the maze of arguments a true and strong undercurrent flows. The basic issue, as I see it, is the defense of the United States.

The great majority of the Members of this Congress are utterly opposed to the ideology and practice of communism. The defense of this continent and the world from the imposition of Communist government and rule calls for varied plans and courses to follow.

This particular piece of legislation sets forth one of these plans in strong language. It serves notice upon the Russian Government that the United States is still willing to make sacrifices to attain the goals for which its sons have fought. It is a complete reversal of the heretofore prominent approach of appeasement, which so miserably failed against Hitler, and is so miserably failing against Stalin. Appeasement has always been the approach of the democratic countries, where man has faith in his fellow man, where war is abhorred at almost any price. But there are some things which no freedom-loving man will endure, and when appeasement fails time after time, war stalks the world.

Today we are called upon to act to end the period of appeasement of Communist rule. It has been eloquently argued that this is a commitment toward war. But it has been equally well argued that this is the better calculated risk. It is better to call a bluff when you know the strength of your opponent's hand than to wait until he has gained strength by effectively manipulating his bluffs over a period of years.

The people of the United States have showed almost unanimous accord in supporting the trend to be positive in our dealings with Russia. When the Honorable James F. Byrnes was Secretary of State he was lauded for his efforts to be firm with Russia. Secretary Marshall has been praised for continuing and strengthening this stand. Today Secretary Marshall and the President are asking for our support of a positive program to oppose the spread of communism into the free countries of the world.

If we let them down here, as the representatives of the people of this great Nation, we are giving Stalin and his puppets the green light. Theodore Roosevelt urged that the United States speak softly, but carry a big stick. Secretary Marshall is asking for a big stick. Shall we give it to him, or shall we tell him to continue his fight with words without the true support of the Nation? The basic problem is one of defense of this Nation from Communist aggression. Viewing the problem in this light, I feel that the Greek-Turkish loan merits my vote.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, such prolonged debate on the vital question before us as that to which we have listened in all probability will not change a single vote.

I do not propose to discuss the matter at any length, because, in the first place as I have said before, I reiterate, the time for talk has passed. We face today the heavy responsibility of bringing peace to a war torn world. The unsettled conditions which make this problem so difficult of solution are familiar to us all. They present a real challenge to our generation; one which we cannot ignore nor fail to meet. The course which we chart during the coming months will determine whether the world is to march forward into an era of lasting peace or merely snatch a fitful breather before plunging headlong into another war.

The framework for peace is, in the main, being designed by two great nations—our own and Russia. The struggle for its design goes on apace. Anxious eyes follow every move of these principal contenders, seeking to determine the shape of the final outcome. The attitude and statements of our representatives to the United Nations and to the peace conferences are being analyzed in the light of the actions we are taking here at home.

As Delegate Warren Austin has repeatedly said, the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations, but is and would be a most necessary and contributing support to the United Nations Charter.

We need to act promptly, in the interest of international peace and to attune our military policy to the requirements of our foreign policy. We should move without further delay to strengthen our hand at the peace table by enacting the proposed legislation. Time is of the essence. Unless we stop talking and go to doing something in our own interest we will wake up again to find we have done too little too late. Can we learn nothing from experience?

In my judgment the passage of the act before us will prevent, it will not provoke, war. So I shall vote for it and against all crippling amendments.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, it seems to me, involves four over-all broad considerations:

1. THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM WITH ITS DENIAL OF WESTERN CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

This is not the first time the East has challenged the the West. Attila and his Huns were turned back at Chalons in the fifth century. The Mohammedans were turned back at Tours in the ninth century. Both movements reached France and were there stopped.

In the sixteenth century, the Turks drove to the middle of Europe. They have gradually retreated under pressure to the Dardanelles and have remained at the Bosporus because of their international value in guarding this ancient strategic bridge between Europe and Asia.

The world is big enough for its peoples if properly oriented. They have terrible times keeping settled down. Between ambitious, selfish, and power-drunk leaders and the people imagining vain things, there are political eruptions here

and there at times engulfing the whole planet. The age of the aggressor may not be over; but nations and peoples that selfishly throw their weight around are no more to be tolerated. Communism has ample space in eastern Europe and Asia to work out its destiny.

2. THE FEAR OF WORLD WAR III

This can never be prevented by placing our country in a "sitting duck" position. America should have a positive, affirmative, foreign policy. The nations of the earth should know, without the peradventure of a doubt, where we stand and what we stand for. They should feel the full pressure of our implementation of that policy. Let us never be a saber rattler nor a pollyanna appeaser. Unskilled diplomacy follows these bankrupt policies. Both of them invite war. America should stand for justice and freedom, fair and mutually reciprocal economic relations, religious and social education leading to practical ways of peace, and a spirit of good will without complacency to all peoples. All peoples and nations have their points of interest.

3. THE BYPASSING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I have been an advocate of a League of or a United Nations since the days of Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. I still believe in a World Court and the development of international law. The United Nations can never act as an executive force until it has a police force. The nations have not gotten around to this yet. Some day they will. Atomic energy and modern implements of war may drive them to it before they can be educated to the ways of peace. Otherwise many may prepare to go the way of Babylon, Athens, Rome, and Angkor. I do not think this bill bypasses the United Nations in practical effect. It is unfortunate that the action proposed in this bill has not grown too vigorously out of its Council and Assembly, but it apparently could not. On the other hand, I have not liked some implications involved in the early approach to this legislation. I hope they prove unfounded, and that the implementation of this legislation will be placed on the highest level of moral, social, and patriotic consideration.

4. THE EXPENDITURE OF $400,000,000

I would like to save that, too. We could well use it here at home. But if it forestalls a third world war, it will be well spent. If the communistic forces in eastern and central Europe want peace, our action will not provoke war. If they want war, this action may prevent it.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this bill saw fit to divide among themselves the majority of the time to be devoted to this debate. At first I did not like the idea, as I felt that those who were opposed to this bill should have equal time. However, it is just as well because the more the advocates of President Truman's measure talk, the easier it becomes for Members of Congress to vote against this bill. The smoke screen is lifting. We are seeing this thing more realistically. The proposal first started out on the claim that it would stop communism. It is seen now that it will not stop communism and was never so intended. One gentleman was very frank when he said, "The resolution is military in character and for that reason and that alone I give it my wholehearted support." Another gentleman said, "I do not know much about the detail of its import, nevertheless, I am convinced that it is for the best interests of our country that it be adopted."

It is slowly becoming quite apparent that the stopping of communism and the spreading of freedom are phrases that should not be used in this discussion. The figure $400,000,000 should be erased and a blank left in its stead, because it is admitted by proponents and opponents of this bill that this is liable to cost us between fifteen and twenty billion dollars. The most energetic advocate for this proposal guarantees nothing and assures nothing.

What we are going to do if we do anything is to protect a lot of international interests, and they are not necessarily American interests in the Near East. Why not be frank about it? Why deceive ourselves as to what the true object is? The real advocates for this bill are the big international interests. I have no quarrel with the international interests. If they want to protect their properties I hardly blame them, but they are not going to protect them with American boys and American dollars. We have just emerged from a very weakening World War. We are just digging ourselves out from all of the restrictions that go with a war and a Commander in Chief. To engage upon this hazardous venture would mean the return of price controls, rent controls, the impossibility of even considering corrective labor legislation, or reducing the budget or cutting taxes, or any of the things that we set out to do so bravely when this Congress first met. I shudder when I think of the possibility of the passage of this measure.

When the President spoke to this body at a joint session on March 12 we were told that this was an urgent matter that must be completed by the 31st of March. The 31st of March has come and gone, and this is no more urgent now than it was then. If it ever becomes necessary for us to take such a dangerous step, we can always do so. Delay will result one way only, and that is to make America strong. The best safeguard against communism or any other false ideology is a strong United States. I am beginning to believe that the urgency that existed before March 31 was for the purpose of making a show of strength when General Marshall went to Moscow. If that was the case, it is no longer necessary, because General Marshall is back home. The outcome of his visit to the Kremlin is fairly well known. If we really want to show our strength to Russia we will in the future insist that any future conference of an international nature involving the United States should be held in the city of Washington. This should be the meeting place and not the Kremlin.

To those of you who may be in doubt as to how to vote on this bill I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in supporting H. R. 2616, the Greek-Turkish loan, I am doing it with a conviction that we are obligated to uphold Secretary of State Marshall who has made a last minute appeal to the House for passage of the bill. I still have some doubts about the advisability of this action, but feel that we must resolve these doubts in favor of the bill when a man in a position of Marshall has asked such cooperation.

Russia, it seems, has most respected us when we have been firm with her. This bill is a definite move in the direction of a firm policy toward her.

The situation today resembles a similar one before World War II. One of the saddest stories of that war was the way we treated Finland, the only nation who honored her debts with us to the last. Yet, theoretically she was our enemy. Why? War makes some strange bedfellows. Because of being allied with Russia we had to treat Finland, who had ruthlessly been previously overrun by Russia, as an enemy. Finland naturally fell in line with Germany as her only source of redress. If I were a leader of that hapless country, I may have voted to do as she did.

Russia had a treaty with Germany before she was attacked by the hordes of Hitler. It was doubtful which way she was going until Germany struck. Furthermore, previous to this as the German armies pushed through Poland, the Russians stepped in. Why, to help Poland? No. For her own selfish interests, in taking sections of Poland which she now retains.

What has Russia done with the three little Baltic countries, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? She claimed to take them during the war into protective custody, but I notice that she is still protecting them. At least, from the Soviet's way of thinking.

And so it will be with Greece and Turkey if the United States does not actually assist them.

I have heard some say this aid is in violation to our Monroe Doctrine, but it is not. Greece and Turkey have asked for this assistance. The passage of this bill is a continuation of an international policy of ours for half a century or more. On their invitation, aid was sent Cuba and the Philippines in 1898. Had it not been for American intervention following the Boxer uprising in China in 1900, that nation was heading for vassalage or partition, but John Hay, American Secretary of State, stubbornly insisted on the open-door policy.

Of course Russia and her sympathizers are against this bill. That is proof to me that her plan is to gradually allow these countries to weaken, even she appears to participate in it, and then take them over as she has done with others, one country after another.

If this bill is defeated now, it will be taken as a vote of confidence to Russia, and a signal to the world that we are again going to take the position of isolation which we were accused of before World War II.

It is my belief that in every country where communism now dominates, except Russia, it is where a strongly organized minority have taken over the Government by force.

Some have claimed that passage of this bill will bypass the United Nations, but that is not true. For months Greece has asked for assistance from that body, but due to Russia's clever plan of hindering action, nothing has been done thus far.

Senator VANDENBERG's amendment to this bill permits the Security Council of the United Nations the right to defer United States assistance by a majority vote, and we waive our veto.

I have confidence in democracy and the American way of life. This bill to aid Greece and Turkey is a step to continue its principles and prevent the spread of communism, the greatest threat on earth to democracy today.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, as the House has debated through three long days this properly controversial measure to grant $400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to the Greek and Turkish Governments, almost every point of contention has been reviewed, and many has been repeated, as speaker after speaker came to the well of this House to express approval or disapproval of the so-called Truman policy.

I have wondered if I had any reason to rise to speak beyond the desire to give emphasis by repetition of the able remarks by colleagues who feel as I do in this matter. It has occurred to me that perhaps there are a few thoughts I might add in justice to the constituents I have the honor to represent. May I preface my remarks, however, with the observation that I face this issue convinced there is no division of opinion on either side of the aisle or within the ranks of either party as to our motive in this legislation. We are as one in seeking to pursue the course best calculated to preserve for this Nation the honored institutions of a free people devoted to the cause of liberty at home. We are as one in our desire to extend a helping hand toward people elsewhere similarly devoted to free institutions and equally willing to pay the price of liberty. And, finally, we are as one in our firm determination to take the course best calculated to protect our own land and our own people from the threat of destruction from any source, internal or external.

I submit, therefore, that our only point of difference is whether the legislation proposed will accomplish its purpose. I contend it will not. I contend it will not bring us added protection abroad. I contend it will not shore up the forces of freedom abroad. I contend it will not implement the cause of peace so dearly won. Rather it will add new fuel to which the spark of world conflagration might be applied at any moment with consequences too catastrophic for the human mind to grasp.

The sum of $400,000,000 will not buy continued peace abroad. If appeasement is to be shunned, then the attempt to settle the problems of the world with American dollars is to be shunned for it is nothing more than a financial Munich.

Even the proponents of this legislation hesitate to say these dollars will do the job. There is an implication amounting to admission that more will be necessary—and more, and more, and more. Where will it stop and where will it end? It will stop with the complete financial collapse of the only world power left today with a hope of solvency and it can end only in an America reduced to the helpless, hapless level of the lands and the people we seek to help.

Proponents have argued that we must not put a price tag on liberty. They remind us that this Congress has voted billions without question to battle the forces of aggression and to crush the threat to our land and our people. Of course you voted those funds, and properly so. We were at war and our enemies were at our very doors. But Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize with all the power at my command that we are now at peace. The shooting war is over. Now it is time to think in terms of a peacetime economy. Now it is time to think in terms of statesmanship calculated to preserve that peace rather than to talk, as so many have talked in this very spot, of a World War III. Now is the time to bend our energies and direct our action toward preserving our victory in peace. Now is the time to count costs and calculate risks with deliberation free from the hysteria rampant in the world since Hitler's legions first marched against the world.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we will permit deliberation to replace hysteria, if we will permit facts to replace wishful thinking we will be forced to the inescapable conclusion that we cannot dissipate our resources around the world and remain the great hope of the world for the preservation of self-government, individual liberty, and the dignity of the individual. If we are to divert $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, if we are to divert other and perhaps even greater sums to other nations, if we are to saddle the American taxpayer with the task and the cost of policing the world, we will find our own land impoverished financially and physically. Here is the real threat to our security. Here is the real hope of the great force now arrayed as opposed to our way of life. An America dissipated of its resources will be vulnerable to the very forces we seek to guard ourselves against. A strong America, a solvent America, a sound America need fear no one.

May I make one point further by way of a partial answer, at least, to the implication that those Members of this House privileged to serve in World War II, are convinced of the wisdom of the course proposed by this bill? I will not undertake to speak for others, but may I say as one of them that there is a certain tragic familiarity in the step we now propose to take. We hear once again the cries of emergency, the shouts of threats from abroad, the requests of other nations for American dollars and American supplies, military and otherwise. We are going to send a military mission, if you please. Where—and when—and under what circumstances have we heard all that before? We know where it took us before. What reason now prevails to indicate it will take us on an opposite course in the future? No, my colleagues, the veterans of World War II, privileged, are not as one in urging that we retrace those tragic steps. I am sure they are as one in urging that we avoid the mistakes of the past, that we weigh with due deliberation our course for the future.

Ours is the solemn responsibility of choosing the course. For my part, I will rest my faith on American strength at home, not on American dollars abroad.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, on March 15, 1947, after President Truman had addressed the joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, I released to the press the following statement:

> The United States should give prompt aid to Greece and Turkey in my opinion. However, I emphatically differ with President Truman and the Department of State in the manner in which aid should be given. They would continue to follow a foreign policy of a unilateral course of action which will ultimately lead us down the primrose path to imperialism and World War III. I believe in collective security of the United Nations and have not been in sympathy with the recent course of our foreign policy. The world had a right to expect something better of us after our foreign policy declaration of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." During the congressional campaign of 1946, I made numerous talks throughout San Diego County on "America at the Crossroads," and pointed out that at Yalta and Tehran we had already departed from our former announced foreign policy of the Four Freedoms.
>
> The only hope for world peace and mutual respect among nations rests within the framework of the United Nations. Aid to Greece and Turkey should be given by us through this channel. All other nations should at least be given a chance to give in the same manner that the British Government has already voted $36,000,000 to Greece.
>
> Only through this collective security of the United Nations can sufficient moral and military force be massed to protect the freedom-loving nations of the world from agressor nations.

Since I released the above statement the bill, H. R. 2616, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey has been reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that it do pass.

I have not changed my views from those I formerly expressed, and still believe that we should give prompt aid to Greece and Turkey as urged by President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and our other diplomatic and military leaders who have available top secret information not made known to the public. However, I have continued to insist that the only hope for world peace and mutual respect among nations rests within the framework of the United Nations. With this thought in mind, the Senator Vandenberg amendment has become a most important part of the bill. In this amendment the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized by the bill if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds—with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto—or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Warren R. Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, stated that in his opinion the United States program as planned in the bill, H. R. 2616, for aid to Greece and Turkey, does not bypass

the United Nations, and on the contrary, he stated he believed the passage of the bill would support the United Nations Charter and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations. I also hold this viewpoint and intend to vote for this bill, which, in my opinion, is for the best interests of all Americans.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the proposal of President Truman with regard to Greece and Turkey confronts the United States with one of the gravest questions in its history.

Acceptance of that proposal involves complete reversal of our long standing policy in foreign affairs. It involves intervention and participation in and responsibility for the internal affairs of other nations. It involves an economic drain on the people of this country which, from a relatively small beginning, may proceed to an extent which no one can now foresee. More than that, it involves employment of the military power of the United States—again apparently on a small initial scale but again also with no predictable limits. It projects this country directly into the complexes of both Europe and the Middle East under circumstances which may well lead to war.

It has not been established why it is to the vital interest of the United States to take this step. Nor, if it can be conceded that the vital interest of our country is actually affected, has there been any revelation of the facts in this situation that make hasty action imperative.

All that the Congress or the people have been given is the President's assertion that the vital interest of the United States is involved and that immediate action is essential. And the President's address is much more remarkable for its vagueness and resort to generalities than for any light it has shed on the reasons for making it.

As a matter of plain common sense, however serious the straits of Greece and Turkey, they cannot become too much worse in the time that will be required for the open and thorough discussion of this situation which alone can give the American people the opportunity to know what they are being asked to do, what the material cost will be, and what commitments of other natures are to be made in their name.

It is the plain duty of Members of Congress to prevent hasty action—to insist that all the facts are made known—to see that these facts are laid before the people in understandable terms—and finally, to take action in the light of the facts and the expressed will of the people.

Members of Congress can serve no good purpose by premature and ill-considered statements of opinion. Such as "we must uphold the hands of the President." Certainly, our history gives abundant evidence that Presidents can make mistakes. The welfare of the country is always a consideration of far greater moment than support of the President in either national or international affairs.

Twice in a single generation our country has become involved in the wars of others. In each case, the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals. In neither case have they seen those ideals realized. On the contrary, this country emerged from each war weaker than it entered, and after each war the world in general was in a worse condition than before. We lost men and wealth, we exhausted irreplaceable natural resources, and we bred conditions that caused widespread dissatisfaction and doubt among the American people concerning their principles of government and way of life.

Intrinsically, we are a weaker Nation today than ever before in our history. We appear strong only by contrast with a prostrate world. In this weakened condition are we now to embark on a new adventure about which we know nothing, but which may lead, first, to war and, second, to the final demoralization of the world and the disappearance of the slightest hope for an orderly society?

The two world wars caused the virtual destruction of the great British Empire Is that not a sufficient example to make us pause before starting down a road which may lead to the same end?

The President said:

> There is no other country (except the United States) to which democratic Greece can turn.

What does this statement mean? That no other country cares anything about Greece as a democratic country? That no other country cares enough to help alleviate the physical want of her people? Or that no other country has the resources to extend aid?

Under any interpretation, the implication of the President's words are far reaching. There are 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Out of this number can the 140,000,000 people who comprise our Nation be the only ones who can assume the burdens of weaker countries? Is it a practical possibility? If so, can we do it, or even attempt to do it without destroying ourselves?

The President said:

> The United States contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace.

Where is the freedom and where is the peace? Is the world we have today the kind of a return on "investment" that justifies the beginning of a new outpouring of funds?

The President said:

> The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment.

Does the President or anyone else think for a moment that the amount he proposes will be the whole amount? Obviously, $400,000,000 will be only the start. It will be followed by other millions and billions in those countries and in other countries which, with Greece and Turkey as precedents, will make claims on our generosity.

The President said:

> The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists.

If a government is so weak that it cannot cope with several thousand armed men under any leadership, there is reason to conclude: First, that if many of the people of the country do not actually sympathize with the several thousand, they at least do not care much one way or the other and, second, there is little that an outside power can do to aid such a government.

If we take this action in Greece, we will in effect say to Russia, "We are opposed to communism and intend to help the governments of Greece and Turkey oppose it." Under the circumstances, is not Russia likely to reply, "You are free to do that, but if you do, we will take measures of our own to support communism." It must be remembered that Russia has many means, short of war, to foster the spread of communism; many more, in fact, than we have to oppose it. Unpalatable as the idea may be, we must also realize that many people in countries throughout the world look with favor on communism and regard it as a superior form of government. In our own country, we have a Communist movement which is far from large, yet there is little we can do to halt its acceptance by some of our people. You cannot stop a political growth any more than you can stop a religious growth—particularly by use of force. And the adventure in Greece, whatever its other aspects, is basically a use of force.

At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, commitments were made for the American people without their knowledge or consent. Secrecy was excused by those who indulged in it on the ground that it was essential to war security. Yet there is little doubt today that those secret deals, in which a few men around a table played with the destiny of nations, were important causes of the world's present condition. There is no excuse now, not even a lame one, for asking the American people to move blindfolded and in haste into a situation of most serious consequence. Certainly, the time has come to end secret diplomacy.

The urgency, the need for haste which the President so strongly emphasized has an artificial quality. It smacks of the "rush act" of the high-powered salesman. Britain accepted Greece as a responsibility during and after the war. Admitting that Britain's economic condition is unhealthy, why does it suddenly become absolutely impossible for her to continue that responsibility beyond the outside date of March 31—just 19 days after the President's address? Would Britain collapse if she stayed in Greece until April 30 or May 31? Or was an almost immediate date selected to force Americans to act before they could think?

Although it has been mentioned only in passing, the thing of paramount importance in this entire matter to the United States and her people is the interest of the United States, not only the immediate interest but also long-range interest. Certainly if it is not in the interest of this country to take a step, then there can be no other good reason for it in Greece, Europe, the Middle East or elsewhere. With its present huge debt

and the other weakening influences of the War, the United States should regard any commitment with caution. This caution should be doubled and redoubled in the face of a step as grave as that into Greece with all the implications of a continuing economic drain if not the actual threat of another war. Might not the United States best contribution to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can in fact remain the strongest bulwark of free government?

These questions should be resolved before we take an action which may prove to be a costly gamble. Today, the American people do not have the information on which to base either support or rejection of the President's proposal. Congress alone has the power, and it must exercise that power, to see that the people get the facts, all the facts.

We urge that Congress decisively reject the President's request for $400,000,000 to be expended on supplies and equipment for the Greek and Turkish armies and on economic aid and for authority to send military and civilian personnel to these countries to train their armies and supervise the expenditure of funds.

Of the utmost gravity in itself, this request is the more menacing because, as is evident to all, it marks only the initial move in a new course of action on which this Nation is now asked to embark.

That course is a complete negation of the American tradition in the field of foreign affairs. True to the lofty principles of the Declaration of Independence upon which our Nation was founded, it has been our historic position to abstain from interfering in the internal affairs of other peoples and to extend our sympathetic understanding to their struggles for the establishment of forms of government conforming to their needs and desires. President Truman now urges Congress to scrap this great tradition and to commit American dollars, American arms, and American military technique to bolster up tottering reactionary regimes in every corner of the globe which, but for our intervention, could not withstand the opposition of their own people.

President Truman's proposal is equally a reversal of the solemn commitments which our Nation has entered into with its allies and made to the people of the world. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt and with the full support of the American people, our Nation shaped a one-world foreign policy. In concert with our allies and in consonance with that policy, we established the United Nations as the instrument for the realization of man's hope for a world of peace and security based upon friendship and collaboration of all nations.

President Truman now urges the Congress to scuttle this policy, bypass the United Nations and take unilateral action in pursuit of a program of aggressive American interventionism. His proposal reverses the firm policy of friendship with the Soviet Union inaugurated by his great predecessor, betrays the wartime alliance which resulted in victory over the enemies of mankind, ignores the Soviet contribution to that victory and all that it meant in terms of saving American lives. It presents a great and friendly nation in the guise of a menacing enemy to be blocked at all costs.

The consequences of this policy could only be to undermine the whole structure of the United Nations, divide the world into two hostile camps and destroy the very foundations upon which the nations of the world are attempting to build a stable and an enduring peace.

Such a policy will be disastrous to the economic well-being and the national security of the American people. It will require the maintenance of an enormous military establishment and render illusory the hope for speedy universal disarmamant and relief from the crushing burden of military expenditures. It will require the appropriation of increasingly larger sums for expenditures abroad. These will never be repaid since they will not be devoted to productive purposes.

Such a policy will inevitably consolidate the democratic forces of the world into a solid block of opposition to us and turn the reservoir of good will, upon which Wendell Willkie found America could draw, into a source of enmity and hatred. Such a policy, far from protecting our national security, will be its greatest menace, since it sows the seeds of international dissension and conflict which can only lead to war.

Since President Truman's proposal holds these consequences of gravest import to our national welfare, it is necessary that the reasons he urges for its justification to be subjected to searching and critical examination.

THE PROBLEM OF GREECE

The President bases his request for aid to Greece on an urgent appeal for assistance from the Greek Government, citing its poverty, its cruel devastation by the Germans, and internal strife as the reasons for its plight. He accuses a militant minority of exploiting these conditions to bring Greece to its present chaotic state. He asks for supplies to help the Greek armies repress this minority—composed of the very resistance forces whose heroic struggle against the invaders contributed so greatly to allied victory.

No one denies the present tragedy of the Greek people nor their need for assistance. But let us face the facts as to where the responsibility lies.

It was not the British who liberated Greece. The liberation was accomplished by Greek patriots, 2,000,000 of whom were organized into the EAM, the Greek Liberation Front, and ELAS, its military arm. Milton Bracker, New York Times correspondent, reported from Greece on October 6, 1944:

> It is apparent that the entire visible population here and, most notably, the clergy, are on the side of the EAM and the ELAS.

Other reporters confirmed that EAM included all the democratic forces in Greece, with the Communists making up only some 10 percent. After liberation EAM agreed, under British pressure and in the interests of unity, to support the Greek Government in exile and its weakling Premier, George Papandreau. When the latter took repressive measures against EAM and went back on his pledges to remove the quislings and collaborationists from power, the Greek people organized a peaceful demonstration to protest Papandreau's violations of their democratic rights.

The British-supported police fired on the unarmed crowd. So began the war on the Greek people that was later carried on under Churchill's leadership by British soldiers, tanks, planes, and the Royal Navy. Thousand of Greek patriots were murdered and driven into the hills. British tanks paved the way for the restoration of the Greek monarchy, and for a succession of inept and corrupt regimes that have continued a reign of violence and repression, failed to take any effective reconstruction measures and reduced Greece to its present state of misery.

President Truman puts the plea for aid to Greece on the ground that it must have this assistance "if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy." He calls upon the United States to take over the role of Britain in supplying aid.

We submit that the policies of Britain have meant the destruction of Greek democracy and that aid from the United States of the kind President Truman has outlined will serve only to continue that policy, will make the Greek Government more effective in stamping out opposition, and will be of no avail in rendering Greece self-supporting.

President Truman excuses his failure to place the matter before the United Nations and its related organizations on the grounds that the situation is urgent and that they are not in a position to extend the help required.

To bypass the United Nations and take unilateral action on a vital policy of this character is to undermine the basic instrument of world cooperation on which our only hope of future security depends. If we are so concerned with the sufferings of Greece and other countries, why did we scuttle the UNRRA program? Why did we refuse to help set up a new fund for rehabilitation? Why did we oppose the Soviet request to bring up the Greek issue in the United Nations a year ago? Why do we now rush into action without even waiting for the findings of the United Nations Commission investigating conditions on the spot? The United States does not want economic aid to Greece to be extended through an international agency. President Truman insists on arrogating that function to the United States alone.

THE GREEK ELECTIONS

President Truman, acknowledging that the Greek Government is not perfect, insists on the representative nature of the Greek Parliament, and says that foreign observers considered the elections fair.

An Allied mission did, to be sure, whitewash the election results. Chicago Sun and PM Correspondent W. M. Fodor reported that its members were unfamiliar with Greece, saw little of the countryside and drew their information largely from Royalist circles in Athens. An examination of press reports before and during the elections of March 31 last, and the plebiscite of September 1, reveals that a wave of violence and murders preceded the elections.

Not only Leftist, but Centrist groups demanded postponement of the March 31 election date on the ground that fair elections were impossible under such disordered internal conditions. Ten cabinet ministers quit their posts in protest over the early date of the elections, but Britain and the United States insisted there be no postponement. Left wing groups boycotted the elections and official government figures, reported by the UP, the AP, and all the major correspondents, showed that over 50 percent of the electorate failed to vote. In addition, it was generally conceded that the registration lists were padded with dead men, and that the Populist—pro-Royalist—vote was swollen by "repeaters." How could the slight majority of the votes won under such conditions by the Populists possibly be considered a true and free expression of the people's will?

The plebiscite on the restoration of the monarchy which was held September 1, was similarly preceded by a wave of terror, assassinations and jailings. British troops were in the country, American warships steamed into Greek ports. Under such conditions the fact that some 65 to 70 percent of the voters presumably cast their ballots for the King's return likewise cannot be considered the freely expressed will of the majority of the people. The actual plebiscite results are unknown since the government issued at different times contrary sets of figures.

The nature of the monarchy we are now asked to support, was reported on shortly after the plebiscite by several American correspondents, who took a 7-day jeep trip from Athens to the Yugoslav and Hungarian frontiers.

The New York Herald Tribune of September 16 headlined Seymour Freidin's story "Reporter finds reign of terror rife in Greece, says monarchists belittle democracy in crushing all foes of their regime." Wrote Freidin:

> The fury and hysteria attendant upon the Greek Government's campaign to efface opposition to the restoration of the monarchy are cutting entire communities off from food, wrecking the UNRRA antimalaria program and consigning thousands of innocent women and children to exile or prison * * * the word "democracy" is becoming synonymous with death and slavery.

And on September 15:

> The prevalent sentiment among officials in the region is that all nonmonarchists are per se Communists. The officials say they will hunt them down and exterminate them. * * * The Government, moreover, has sanctioned the activities of at least two large bandit groups.

Robert Conway, of the New York Daily News, reported:

> The Greek Government's Army and gendarmes are waging a pitiless war on scores of thousands of women and children in a desperate effort to halt a growing rebellion and wipe out not only Communists but all democratic, liberal, and republican elements. This correspondent is compelled to state that the supporters of King George II are now staging a total civil warfare of the cruelest and most inhuman sort.

Shall America give dollars and supplies to enable the Greek Army to carry on this work?

TURKEY NOW NEEDS OUR SUPPORT

The President found it necessary to put the question of aid to Turkey in somewhat blunter terms. For Turkey was not ravaged by war. On the contrary, Turkey not only refused aid to the United Nations but under the cloak of neutrality, sold vital war materials such as chrome to Germany, and permitted German and Italian warships entry into the Black Sea to fight our Soviet allies. Moreover, there can be no pretense that the Government of Turkey is democratic. The President therefore bases his plea for aid to her on the alleged necessity of defending her national integrity, and preserving order in the Middle East. To these ends we are asked to help maintain her army of a million men since Britain is no longer in a position to do so.

Let us speak plainly. Against whom are we to maintain Turkey's national integrity? The Soviet Union? The Soviet Union is not threatening the national integrity of Turkey nor of any country of the Middle East. The Soviet Union is deeply and justifiably concerned with her own security in the Straits, and has requested that this be assured through appropriate international agreements. Is this an unreasonable request? If we are concerned with maintaining control over the Panama Canal, some 1,300 miles from the tip of Florida, if Britain is concerned with maintenance of control over the Suez Canal, over 3,500 miles from Britain's shores, why should not the Soviet Union's security interests in the Straits, about 350 miles from the port of Odessa, receive serious consideration? The United States and Great Britain would surely resist international control of waterways of such strategic importance to themselves. Why then should we wonder at the attitude of the Soviet Union in insisting that the control of the Dardanelles is a matter for the Black Sea powers and that the Soviet Union and Turkey should jointly fortify them to prevent their use by other states for inimical purposes?

The best guaranty of our own security would be to recognize the right of the Soviet Union to secure its own borders and hold the key to its own house, just as we insist on that right for ourselves and for Great Britain..

A PROGRAM FOR POLITICAL AND MILITARY INTERVENTION

We now come to the basic motivation for the program proposed by President Truman:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. * * * We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.

Since neither the Greek nor the Turkish Governments meet the description of "free people maintaining free institutions," the whole case for aid to Greece and Turkey on these grounds falls apart. The program is revealed in its naked reality—a program for American political and military intervention to keep down people's movements in any state where we fear that popular elements might gain control and friendship with the Soviet Union prevail.

This is in direct contravention to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in violation of the United Nations Charter. It is designed to prevent democratic movements of the people from determining their own forms of government. It reverses the whole policy of cooperating with the Soviet Union as a friendly partner in the making of the peace as she was a valiant ally in the war. It assumes a threat of aggression from the Soviet Union of which there is no evidence, while on the contrary there is every evidence of the desire of the Soviet people and their leaders for peace and for continued cooperation among the wartime allies.

This is the logical projection of the program inaugurated last year by Winston Churchill in Fulton, Mo., where he called for an Anglo-American diplomatic offensive to block the Soviet Union. The British have failed in their part of the arrangement and now we are asked to take over the whole bankrupt policy.

FREEDOM VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM?

The charge that a number of countries have had totalitarian regimes thrust upon them against their will, referring to certain countries of eastern Europe, cannot be substantiated. These countries today have more democracy than they have ever known before. Reactionary, feudal regimes which were subservient to fascism have been replaced by people's governments. The use of the phrase "totalitarian," a term applicable only to Fascist states, is out of place both in relation to the Soviet Union and to the new democracies in eastern Europe. The Soviet Union has not sought to impose her own form of government on other peoples. The type of state being developed in eastern Europe is indeed in many ways closer to the program advocated by the British labor government than it is to communism. To speak of coercion and intimidation in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria while upholding and planning to take over the British policies in Greece is the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, after listening to hours of debate on this bill and the many proposed amendments, I have decided to vote for it on final passage, but I do so with a heavy heart. This is one of the hardest votes—at least one of a half dozen of the hardest votes—that I have had presented to me during the years of my membership in Congress. As I said in the House yesterday, I have appreciated the assurance given me by several leading men in our Government and that assurance has been repeated on the floor of the House today, and it has eased my mind with regard to this necessary measure, but still it is a hard vote to cast. I feel that this move is a necessary thing to be done and I understand the necessity of our Government's acting at once and acting alone. It is indeed a matter of our national concern and one on which our national safety depends, to keep Russian communism from taking control of the eastern Mediterranean lands. We must see to it that

the peoples in those strategic areas shall not be obliged either by want or by military strength to adopt a way of life contrary to their own choosing.

What is it then about this affirmative vote that I am to cast that I most regret? Of course, it is the circumstances which make this action necessary and imperative. It is the fact that, under all the circumstances, our Government must act unilaterally in this case because the United Nations cannot do what ought to be done. The comforting assurance that I was given yesterday and again today that this action does not really by-pass the United Nations eases my mind, but I am still disturbed that this action may adversely affect this young international organization which is the hope of the world for peace. I do not believe that this action on the part of our Government really means a turning away from the United Nations organization, nor that our act will discredit this infant organization which we have struggled for so long and helped to create.

My real fear is that having acted unilaterally in the case of these eastern Mediterranean countries in this instance because we had to do so, may be partly the cause for by-passing the United Nations organization at some future time when it is not necessary for us to act alone but instead where wisdom would dictate that we act as a member of the United Nations. This unhappy necessity of acting apart now should determine us all the more to act through the United Nations later always whenever possible and to build it up and to strengthen it for the great task it has to accomplish, working toward peace.

I have heard a few speak disparagingly of the United Nations here when they need not have done so merely to say that in this particular instance it is not authorized to do what needs to be done and does not have the funds which would be needed and does not have the power required to do the work. It is a sad thing for any Member of this body to speak disparagingly of this infant international organization which is the result of so much effort and which grew out of blood and tears. The very fact that America is taking this momentous step alone, and not through the United Nations, makes it all the more logical and necessary that we increase our efforts to strengthen the new international organization, to increase its powers and use our influence to ripen its maturity. I believe the American people insist that we do everything in our power to support the international organization of which we are a member and by our help enable it to accomplish its mission of establishing justice and peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, since March 12 when President Truman delivered his message on assistance to Greece and Turkey, my mind has been beset by many questions. I have attended every meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee, listened to every witness and read all that I possibly could on the subject matter at hand. I have tried to consider this particular legislation and all its connotations with an open mind because I realized from the beginning the implications and possibilities involved. The road into the future is not always a straight one nor can its twists and turns be seen beforehand. Nevertheless if this measure passes, it will be clear to the world what our policy will be as our commitments will be definite; our purposes specific and the responsibility our own.

Perhaps, it was the absence of such clarity that was one of the contributing factors to two world wars.

The reasons given for this legislation are many.

At the present time there is an internal rebellion going on in Greece. This rebellion, while centered mainly in the north of Greece, is also in effect in other parts of the country as well. The number of guerrillas is estimated at anywhere from twelve to twenty thousand, and it has been brought out that while the great majority of the guerrillas are not Communists, they are in all instances under the leadership of members of the Communist Party directed from the outside.

Aid is being given these guerrilla forces from over the borders in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. There is a school maintained at Boulkes near Belgrade wherein certain guerrillas are sent to receive courses in indoctrination for the purpose of carrying on future activities in Greece in behalf of communism.

Insofar as Turkey is concerned there is, and has been for some time, a war of nerves being waged against the Turks by the Russians. This has been carried on through the use of radio broadcasts from Russia into Turkey; through Russia's demands for the return of the Turkish provinces of Ardahan and Kars and also through Russia's repeated demands that she be given joint control of the Dardanelles. These reasons have been given to us by various members of the State Department and others who are intimately connected and concerned with the present situation as it exists in both Greece and Turkey.

I am under no illusion about the types of governments which exist in both of these countries. It is my hope that if this legislation passes, we will do our utmost to help bring about needed reforms in both countries so that the greatest number of people possible will be allowed to select the type of government they desire; so that the tax structure will be revamped to such an extent that there will be no favored exemptions as at present; and so that both these countries can achieve the peace and security which, I believe, is every nation's right.

It might be well for us to ask what might happen if this measure we are now discussing fails of passage. I believe that one of the first results would be an all-out civil war in Greece, and that as a result of this war, a government under the leadership of Napoleon Zervas, the present Minister of Public Order, would result.

Then there would be a counter revolution staged by all the dissenting elements under the leadership of the Communists who would be aided by outside help from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. This then would mean the setting up of another satellite state within the orbit of the U. S. S. R. If this measure were to fail it would very likely mean that the U. S. S. R. would take it as a green light to carry out its war of nerves still further against the Turks and eventually the Turks would crack and that country would be overrun. It is well to point out that if an active armed clash occurred between Turkey and Russia the Turks, according to the most reliable information the Foreign Affairs Committee has been able to receive, would not be able to stand up for more than a matter of weeks. Furthermore, Turkey, like Greece, would then be within the Soviet's sphere and Russia would be down not only to the Mediterranean but would be very close to the Suez Canal as well.

It is my opinion that, if what I have said should occur, Greece and Turkey would certainly not mark the outer limits of Soviet expansion but, in effect, that expansion would continue still farther not only to the south but to the east, covering Iran, India, Burma and southeastern Asia, and also to the west covering Austria, Germany, Italy, and France as well. What then would our position be? Would we then contemplate the passage of legislation such as this which we are now considering? Would we then become aware of the fact that the expansion of Communist spheres of influence is something that should be stopped? Or should we insulate ourselves in isolation on this hemisphere against a doctrine which we think is insidious and dangerous to our way of life and which, if it achieves the success which it hopes for in Europe, Asia, and Africa will, without a doubt and in time, reach the shores of this hemisphere as well? We know, of course, that communism has penetrated in some degree or form into every country of the Western Hemisphere at the present time. It appears to me that to deny passage of this legislation would, in effect, bring us closer to war than would be the case if we were to pass it today. It seems to me that once we have laid down a policy to the entire world that it is up to us to carry through on that policy and not to indicate weakness and thereby give encouragement to the very things which we despise.

If this measure fails and more countries are brought within the sphere of the Soviet Union, it will mean that the iron curtain will be extended that much farther and that we will have lost our contact with that much more of the world.

Such in brief is the picture as I see it and understand it. I realize what we are up against and I also realize that we Americans have no taste for foreign adventure in times of peace. We very naturally and logically have many questions concerning the possibilities and potentialities of this new policy. We may ponder and debate this question but we cannot dodge the inescapable fact that President Truman's address has in the eyes of the world committed this Nation to a new policy. Our new course will take all our wisdom and skill to make it successful. No man in this Chamber can tell what the outcome of the President's and our decision will be. The issue has been raised and the die has been cast. Not to act now, not to follow through,

would, in my opinion, be most dangerous.

We are not seeking to impose our way of life on either Greece or Turkey. We are extending this assistance to enable them, in time, to select the kind of government their people want. The purpose of this new policy is to oppose forcible Communist aggression—either directly or through satellite countries—on weaker nations opposed to such a philosophy.

Personally, I am sorry that this matter was not referred to the United Nations before it was presented to the Congress, instead of after the President made his speech. On the basis of the evidence before us it appears certain that the United Nations could not have acted, as yet, because it has neither the funds nor the organization to meet such a situation, and, secondly, any such action as here contemplated would be blocked by the veto of a single power.

I believe that it is possible for the United Nations to achieve sufficient strength in the future to take over this task. I shall welcome the day when we may resign this responsibility to that organization because I believe wholeheartedly that only in the United Nations can we eventually find the peace all mankind craves.

Much will depend on how the administration of this policy is worked out. Much will depend on how soon genuine democracy follows our assistance and replaces the kinds of dictatorship now in force in both Greece and Turkey. I believe we can provide the right kind of administration but, in the matter of democratic governments, that is something that only people—and not outside pressures—can decide.

I am going to vote for this bill but not with any enthusiasm. Like all of you my lack of enthusiasm springs from the fact that no one can tell ultimately where the policy on which we are about to embark will lead. We do know, however, that the ideology which we oppose is being spread by force, infiltration, occupation, and revolution. It is a policy very similar to Hitler's policy of grabbing off one nation at a time in the hope that eventually the rest of the world will become so weak that no one power will be left to challenge it. If we reject this legislation we give notice to the U. S. S. R. that we do not propose to do anything to stop or to interfere with its expansion policy. If we accept this legislation we give notice to the U. S. S. R. that we are giving this help in order that Greece and Turkey may continue their own existence, and, I think, we will be putting up a sign which all the world will be able to read and understand. Our policy of appeasement since the end of the war has, I think, run its course. We have allowed nations like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and others to become satellites of the U. S. S. R. even though the majority of people in each country concerned is opposed to communism as an ideology. We know at the present time that Hungary, though having a legally elected anti-Communist government, is slowly being made into another satellite state because of the pressure from within exercised by the Communist minority there. We know also that the Communist minorities in France, in Italy, and elsewhere are exercising power far beyond the numbers they actually control. We have seen too many countries go by default. We have offered every inducement we possibly could to get along with all our neighbors but our efforts so far have, in large part, been in vain. The time has come for the United States to take up a burden very few of us like to assume but take it up we must with fortitude and courage.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I have obtained this time so that I may express my position in connection with this legislation. I speak in dead earnest when I say that things have come to a pretty pass when the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives brings out a measure sponsored by a Democratic administration and then has the unmitigated gall to bring in a rule limiting the debate of those Republicans who are opposed to the measure. The rule adopted for this bill which starts us on the road to international ruin and eventual bankruptcy allowed only 3 hours' time for those of us who oppose the legislation but gave 6 hours to those who support it.

The people of this country ought not to hold this against all Republicans. They ought to search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carefully to see that some Republicans—perhaps a minority, but still some of them—fought this bill that changes the whole course of our ship of state and takes us out on an uncharted sea that may be filled with unseen perils.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to comment on another puzzling thing that occurred to me as I sat here and heard speaker after speaker get up and make talk for the RECORD. It struck me as ludicrous, if not tragic, that some proponents were playing Charley McCarthy for the Department of State. I suspect that some of the speeches were "ghosted" in the Department of State. I marveled at the manner in which the speeches that were delivered on both sides of the aisle in favor of the new policy were perfectly synchronized. It was passing strange that different points were brought out by different speakers without the usual overlapping that can be heard in normal debate.

How naive and how very short-sighted are the supporters of this legislation, considering the long future, may not be known until our children and our children's children have had to bear the burdens that will come as a natural result of this so-called Truman policy.

We talk about a bipartisan foreign policy, Mr. Chairman, and it is true that both Republicans and Democrats will support this Truman policy. It is also true that both Republicans and Democrats are opposing this policy and that they are men of every political color under the American sun. Many Republicans supporting it forget that it will be administered by a Democratic administration that hardly has become noted for its nonpartisan attitude.

I think it is more correct to call this new departure in our foreign policy today the most partisan foreign policy that could be evolved. The policy was put out by the President with two big aims in mind—first, to garner additional political support for 1948, and, second, by trial and error to attempt to find a way to quiet the demands for a whole reexamination of our foreign policy as practiced by the New Deal Party since the end of World War II with such disastrous results to Europe and Asia.

In addition, it was formulated and put forward with the thought in mind that perhaps the people would accept the new policy and sooner or later forget the United Nations organization fiasco which was ballyhooed to the skies until it was deflated by Moscow's constant use of the veto.

That is why I have said before, and I say now, that the new so-called Truman policy is a policy of desperation. It was conceived as hastily as it was presented to the American people, and the men who sponsored it were more interested in their domestic political lives than they were in the long-term best interests of our whole Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called Truman policy for four distinct reasons. I am not ashamed of my all-out opposition to this policy, because, regardless of the men who are on my side, I am convinced by my study of history that such a policy as this has been followed, on a smaller scale, by other nations and always has led to a bad end.

The first reason I oppose this legislation to spend American money in Greece and Turkey is that the policy will bring more inflation in the United States. It is a matter of public record that I opposed the British loan and that I opposed many another American loan that has been used by other nations to increase inflation in the United States.

Before last November, it seemed that the Republicans were pretty unanimous—and that the people agreed also—that our inflation in America was caused by our overseas fiscal policy, among other things. Nothing has happened in recent months to make me feel otherwise. The British, the French, and other nations still are bidding for American wheat and other products in this Nation and are getting these products. In so doing, they have boosted the prices which American consumers must pay at home.

This is true because, speaking broadly, the United States is the only Nation that has had a surplus of food and of other commodities that could be shipped abroad. The people are all against further inflation. Even the President has embarked on a Don Quixote campaign to knock down price windmills with his symbolic sturdy steed and his long lance.

As every man who has served for long in this House of Representatives knows, the mere fact that this first step will cost the United States what many say is the trifling sum of $400,000,000 is not at all indicative of what the policy will cost in the long run. I have served here for more than a decade and I can speak with the voice of experience on this one phase of our work. When we embarked on lend-lease, only a few billion dollars were said to be involved. Before it was

over, tens of billions of dollars went down the drain—much of it to the same Russia against which we have planned this so-called Truman policy.

Mr. Chairman, you and I know that when this bill is passed and if it is put into effect, as it probably will be, it will not be 6 months before there will be demands from other nations claiming to need our help to oppose communism.

Some Republican leaders who support this policy have said that the sum requested by the President could be appropriated and that it would not necessarily interfere with our Republican program of lowering taxes and reducing over-all Federal expenditures. I am willing to say that if the sum were merely $400,000,000 this likely would be true. But all of my experience in Congress teaches me that the $400,000,000 is only the beginning. It is just the nose of the camel edging into the tent. After a little while there will be other requests and the same men who hollered "wolf, wolf" about the so-called Soviet menace in Greece and Turkey will be crying "wolf, wolf" about these other requests. The so-called Truman policy will not be cheap. It will be an expensive policy, just as every other policy followed by this administration in the past 14 years has been expensive.

The Republicans running for office last November very explicitly promised an over-all and significant decrease in the cost of government. They also promised lower taxes. If, by supporting this measure and bringing on other similar measures, they make inevitable a welshing on that policy, they will be doing their party irreparable harm.

The people will fast lose confidence in our Republican Party, as they have lost confidence in the Democrats, if we allow ourselves to be deluded by such catchwords as "let partisanship stop at the water's edge." There can be no such thing in actuality. Our foreign policy is inextricably tied up with our domestic fiscal policy, and if we embark on this new so-called Truman policy, we will see that we have wrecked our domestic Republican fiscal program. The principal men who talk about a nonpartisan foreign policy are those in the Democratic administration who know that it will be administered by Democrats, the salaries paid to Democrats and overseen by a Democratic Cabinet and a Democratic President. Those few Republicans who are appointed to play a part in it will be put in the picture merely for window-dressing and will be expected to stand around and say "Me, too" every time the Democrats make a suggestion.

The second big reason I oppose this measure, Mr. Chairman, is that we are rushing to the assistance of governments that could not be termed "representative republican governments" by the most fantastic interpretation of the term. We have in this country a representative government. It is not perfect, but it probably works better than any other similarly constituted government on earth. We have a free press. We have freedom of speech. We have freedom of movement. We have freedom of religion. All these are parts of our governmental fabric, and without any one of them neither we nor other nations truthfully could call our Government a representative government and our people a free people.

Is there one who will stand up and say that there is a representative republican form of government in Turkey? Is there a thoughtful, intelligent man in the United States who seriously will contend that this is the case? I think not. Just a few weeks ago I read a dispatch from Turkey by Constantine Brown, the foreign-news analyst for the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers. He pointed out that freedom of the press is being allowed temporarily in Turkey to influence Americans. One Turkish official was quoted as having said that the Government deliberately not yet had suppressed one paper because of the possibilities of American aid.

What a travesty on words and the meanings of words it is to call Greece and Turkey democracies in the same breath that we call England and the United States democracies. That is twisting the word as much as Molotov and the other Russians are twisting it when they persistently refer to Russia as a democracy.

The third principal reason I oppose this measure, Mr. Chairman, is that it will project our soldiers into new areas of danger where they may ignite the spark that will start World War III. When World War II was ending, the Democratic administration claimed to have a program that would banish war forever. The United Nations was uncovered in all its pristine glory. Never again would men have to engage in warfare. We could just talk our troubles to death around a council table and then every nation would forget its own self-interests and vote to do this, that, or the other.

A few realists spoke hopefully of a peace of 25 or 50 years, at most, unless the hearts of men everywhere were changed and unless somewhere along the line a miracle in human relations was passed. But now, we are not going to have even 25 or 50 years of peace. The Truman policy in effect is an economic declaration of war on Russia. And when we send military "observers" into Greece and Turkey, we will be running constantly the grave risks of de facto, if not actually declared, war.

It is contrary to all the lessons of history to believe that we can send our soldiers into Greece and Turkey and that there will not be accumulated new "incidents" which can be used as kindling wood to ignite a major bonfire of war. A clash here, a clash there, and before we know it we again are involved in mortal combat.

The amazing thing, to me, about this so-called Truman policy is that it could be sold to the same people in America who only a few short months ago were sold on the United Nations. Their gullibility is as dangerous as it is surprising. If these people this quickly can have their minds diverted from one set course to another set course in foreign affairs, then there is no telling to what lengths they can be led by high-powered propaganda that can be turned on and off like a faucet.

O Mr. Chairman, I know that the United Nations will be defended by many Democrats and Republicans here as they vote for this policy. They will shed many a crocodile tear about how much they hate to take part in such a thing and to leave the poor UN with nothing but a grant of land.

But the truth remains that the so-called Truman policy is an open, flagrant, willful by-passing of the United Nations, on which our Nation spent so much time, effort, and money, and that as this policy is expanded, it will be seen that every new step of the new policy will mean another nail in the coffin of the United Nations organization. This, I think, can hardly be disputed, although it will be disputed for the record and a lot of politicians who are trying to play both ends will try to convince the people that I am wrong.

The fourth principal reason I oppose this policy on which we seem determined to embark, Mr. Chairman, is that it negates the recent Republican platforms and contradicts those Republicans who said before the election last November that when the people had had enough, we would take powers away from the President and return these powers to the Congress, the States, or the local governments. This bill actually represents a sweeping new grant of powers to the President, whoever he may be at whatever period. If I had no other grounds for opposing this bill, I would oppose it for this reason.

We in the Congress have been eating at the second table of government for, lo these many years. Many Democrats have observed this as well as many Republicans and one Member of Congress, our good friend Hatton Sumners, even went so far as to resign his seat here so that he could get out and tell the people about the trend without being accused of speaking politically.

Yet, I have heard men get up and defend this bill who only a short time ago were deploring the increased centralization of power. Why, I would like to know when you will find an issue of centralization of power that is more clear-cut than the issue in this bill. The President can plunge us into war almost any time he pleases. He can precipitate an emergency a month before the next election. And as the inevitable results of this policy bring an enlargement of the funds we will have to spend, there will, of course, be an enlargement of the powers granted to the President.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I am in the minority when I speak against this bill, although I am a Member of the majority party. Our time in this debate has been limited by our own leadership and we of the majority party who are speaking against this radical, new departure in our foreign policy are temporarily out of public favor, at least around the Capitol.

But, I went home last week end and had a visit with some old friends up and down Main Street. I talked with several men in service stations. I talked with the town banker. I visited with the hardware merchant. I contacted a few editors of country newspapers.

I found them rather perturbed about high prices and I heard all of them say that they wished some way could be

found to bring some value back into the dollar. I went out with some veterans who are trying to buy, rent, or build a home and I heard them gripe about prices and how hard it is to get anything done in this new America the New Deal brought to us. I asked them all how they felt about sending some more money overseas to stop communism, or to bolster a corrupt government or two. They were unanimously opposed to it. They were quick to note the connection between our spend-lend-send overseas policy and the increasing worthlessness of our dollar at home and the difficulties of getting anything built that would stand longer than a few years.

It did not take my experience back home to put me against this Truman policy, Mr. Chairman, but the knowledge I gained did not hurt any. Some day, we are going to legislate the straw that breaks the back of the American people. This may well be that straw.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state that it has been agreed to close debate. The Chair would like to divide that time as much as possible among those who wish to be recognized to speak on the bill. I assume that that was the intent of the gentleman from Ohio in making the motion.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Ohio understood that there were four amendments pending, and it was the hope of the committee that the authors of the amendments be given time to explain each one of them and similar time be given to some one who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How come, with a preferential motion up there, I cannot be considered? I offered it a while ago and made a point of order on it, and I was overruled. I want to know under what rule you may disregard the offering of a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not seeking to disregard the gentleman in that regard, but there were some Members who indicated that they wanted to extend their remarks, and the Chair sought to recognize them at that time. The Chair has withheld recognition from the gentleman from Colorado until these unanimous consent requests were taken care of. If the gentleman wants to make his preferential motion at this time, he will be recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would just as soon wait until the gentleman from Colorado finishes, but I want recognition on it sometime.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clarify the position that I have taken before this body in debate. I spoke as effectively as I could in favor of passing this whole problem to the United Nations. I am in complete agreement with those Members who believe that this problem is so critical that we cannot delay action. We must act now. This problem is so important to our national self-interest that we cannot adopt a do-nothing policy. However, I should like to suggest to this body that there is another path, that there is another road. It is true we must not fall into the trap of doing nothing, for that would really endanger our Nation, but I suggest to you that there is another way instead of taking this path alone, ignoring all the nations of the world. They, too, have an interest in world peace. I am very sincere, and I am very serious about this matter.

The President presented this legislative program on March 12. The President stated there was a grave crisis confronting the world. He has said that there exists a threat to world peace. Now that the President of the United States has spoken in this fashion, I say to you that that is the very purpose for which the United Nations was created. That is what was meant by collective security. All nations must band together to overcome any threat which endangers the peace of the world.

I should like to demonstrate in the closing minutes of the debate that there is another road that we can follow without joining those who really want to kill this legislation, and that path is this: There will be submitted here a motion to recommit. Under that motion to recommit, $100,000,000 can be used now by the President of the United States for the purposes stated in this bill. The President can act quickly to relieve economic pressures in Greece. No one can say we are delaying treating the crisis which confronts the world. We are not delaying that at all. We are moving forward to take care of that problem which affects our national self-interest. At the same time the military problems confronting Greece and Turkey will be given the United Nations for proper disposition.

Mr. Chairman, every educator, every religious leader, every world leader who understands the history of civilization has been encouraging all the nations of the world to get together for collective security. Let me tell you what happened yesterday in England. Prime Minister Attlee declared on the second anniversary of VE-day:

> The dangers to world civilization from another world war are greater today than they were between World War I and World War II.

It seems incredible that after only a period of 2 years' time there is such a real danger to world civilization. I am confident that the people at home do not know the nature and the extent of the threat to the peace of the world. Had they that knowledge this Congress would not dare pass legislation which ignores the United Nations. In view of this dire threat to world peace, we should be calling upon the leadership of the world to join with us in making the United Nations strong, vigorous, and effective. We should be bringing into play the brains of the world. We do so to wage war. Why do we not do so in the cause of peace?

The scientists have shouted to the politicians of the world that they must change their method and manner of thinking. They have urged the politicians that they must catch up with the advance made by modern science; that if they do not do so the next war may be so terrible that our civilization, as we know it now, may pass from the earth. Another terrible war will destroy democracy and representative government beyond question of a doubt. Must we wait until we emerge from the ruins of a third world war before we acknowledge and accept the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations?

How can we treat this problem so lightly when we are now producing an atomic bomb that is capable of killing 100,000 people over a wide area? How can you stand before the people of your districts when you return home and say, "The United Nations is too weak to be used at this time." I say to you, if it is weak let us make it strong. Now is the time to throw the combined political, financial, and military strength of this great Nation behind the United Nations, demanding that all of the nations signatory thereto act now to preserve the peace of the world. In that manner we can again give moral and spiritual leadership to the world. There is no basis for moral and spiritual leadership if this bill is passed with this possible exception. The President and the Members of this body have said this measure is designed to strengthen the United Nations. It may be that it will work out that way. The good faith of these statements will be subject to careful scrutiny within the next 12 to 15 months. I admit that the President, if this bill is passed, may by vigorous leadership during that period of time revive the hopes of the people who believe in the United Nations.

Again let me clarify my position. If you fail to recommit this bill, in view of the threat to world peace I am going to vote for it because there is no other alternative. I cannot do otherwise, joining with those who want to hide their heads in the sands of isolationism. We must go forward. It may be that by going to the United Nations there is only a remote possibility of peace, but it is the best choice we have now. At least, if war comes eventually, we shall be supporting the intent and spirit contained in the Charter of the United Nations. By our individual action this Nation may incur the fear and the hatred of the people of the world, some of whom have just cause for seeking social and political changes. I plead again, let us use our vision and leadership, making the United Nations strong now.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 8. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States had adopted as its policy in international affairs (1) intervention in civil strife, civil war, or political conflicts in foreign countres; or (2) unilateral action, either now or in the future, in disregard of its obligations to the United Nations.
>
> "(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms the basic policy of the United States to bring before the United Nations all economic, political, or military conditions which may endanger the peace of the world."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two or three observations.

First, in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] regarding the President's declaration of this being the United States' policy. I remember very well the bill that was brought up in the last session of Congress—that is, the work or fight bill. I remember that was a Presidential "must" also, but when it went to the other body it went out the window. Then, too, I remember on that historic day when the railroad brotherhoods threatened to go on strike and the strike had already been settled, the President came up here and got us all worried and sick about what we were going to do about legislation. We passed it, and in the Senate in a few days it too went out the window.

I am not very much disturbed about these Presidential "must" measures, especially when we have a policy as important as this is to our country which constitutes a departure from the traditional foreign policy of our country. I am not disturbed about Presidential "must" bills.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if in his opinion he thinks any man, including the President of the United States, has the right to put this Congress and the people of the United States in the position where they have to vote for a bill of this kind or else "lose face" with the world.

Mr. BENDER. I have heard that argument used in the other body about losing face. We have lost face so many times, but as long as the American people keep this a Christian Nation, which they have, they are not going to lose face in the world. When we depart from that philosophy, we will lose face, and we are losing face here. We are embarking on an uncharted course fraught with danger.

This amendment provides for the turning of this problem over to the United Nations. If it fails there, then we can take proper action.

Mr. Chairman, two basic facts about the present bill trouble the American people. First, it, in effect, creates a military alliance between the United States and the Greek monarchy and the Turkish dictatorship. In doing so, the present bill is in direct contradiction to the traditional historic American foreign policy of avoiding entangling military alliances with foreign powers.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What will the people of the world say about America when they start out on their own hook to try to militarize Greece and militarize Turkey? The first thing you know, we will have to go to every country in Europe, and then they will be asking us to go down to South America to arm some of those countries. When are we going to stop?

Mr. BENDER. And Mr. Chairman, the second basic thing that troubles the American people about H. R. 2616 is the fact that it stabs the United Nations in the back because, Mr. Chairman, we undertake by unilateral action to make decisions in regard to aggression everywhere and anywhere in the world. We and we alone make the decisions. We and we alone on the basis of this bill will attempt to police the world. But by so doing, we will destroy collective security. By so doing, we will undermine the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, the Truman doctrine, by breaking faith with the United Nations and flaunting the Administration's disregard for its solemn commitments to the United Nations, is the first long and dangerous step down the road to a new American isolation. The overwhelming majority of the American people know that the hope for peace in the world lies in a strong and effective international organization. The Truman doctrine is the most insidious kind of isolation because it masks itself as "cooperation," because it pats the United Nations with one hand and stabs it with the other.

Mr. Chairman, the two basic principles of American foreign policy—namely the avoidance of entangling military alliances with foreign powers and wholehearted support for the United Nations—these two basic principles to which the American people are absolutely and completely devoted—these basic principles will be destroyed by the Truman doctrine as it is embodied in the present bill before the House.

Mr. Chairman, because I earnestly and sincerely believe that 85 to 90 percent of all American citizens do not wish us to engage in a policy which involves us in entangling military alliances everywhere in the world, I have offered this amendment, and, Mr. Chairman, because I believe the American people are overwhelmingly right in their conviction that peace can only be maintained by a powerful, strong, and growing United Nations—this also is my reason for offering this amendment.

The House of Representatives, I believe, faces in this bill the most far-reaching and serious change in national policy ever adopted in the Congress since I have been a Member of this body. It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress should repudiate the historic foundations of American foreign policy. It is inconceivable to me that, having come through two devastating international wars in our own lifetime, we as a body would turn our backs upon the organized conscience of all mankind, focused and formulated through the deliberations of the United Nations.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; all of us know some few people who forget that America consists of 140,000,000 people in a world population of 2,000,000,000. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we know some very few individuals who forget that perhaps 20,000,000 Chinese will starve to death this year, and that another 10,000,000 starving Indians in that vast subcontinent of Asia will die because of the failures of our own human institutions.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; there are a few people mad with the lust for power—careless and ruthless in their disregard of the great, crying needs of all mankind for food, for clothes, for education, for all of those things that make life rich and beautiful.

There are in America today, Mr. Chairman, those who are willing to plunge the entire world into another devastating and monstrous blood-bath. It is their thinking which President Truman has expressed in the Truman doctrine, and it is their plan—their mad plan—for world power which is embodied in the present bill before us.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; we have the atomic bomb. Yes, we have the food reserves of the world when hundreds of millions are hungry. Yes, we have half the industrial capacity of the entire earth. Yes, we have the liquid capital—some financial resources which could be extended to assist in reconstructing and in rebuilding the industries of peace and well-being throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said: "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely." We have power, Mr. Chairman, and there are some demoniac characters in American life who want absolute power—not just here at home, but also in the entire world. It is from their mad drive for world power that springs the doctrine for world-wide military alliances and world-wide unilateral action on the part of the American Government without regard for our historic American foreign policy and without regard for our commitments to the United Nations. This policy means war. Let no Member of the House hide from this fact. In our hands we hold the destiny of America and the world. Ours is the responsibility. In the name of all that is holy in American traditions of democracy, freedom and peace—let the House in good conscience and good faith adopt the proposed amendment.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that if the Treasury floated a bond issue to support this program that it would sell overwhelmingly to the American people?

Mr. BENDER. If we floated a bond issue to support this program, you ladies and gentlemen know that the people back home have written to you and the Members on my side, practically every one I have talked to, say that his mail is anywhere from three to six to one against it. Now you are giving the people something they do not want, that they are afraid of and do not understand.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate comes to a close within a few moments. There has been a great deal of discussion and confusion which has been preponderatingly on one side. I rise at this time to point out what I think are the salient issues involved in this legislation.

First, no matter how much the proponents of this legislation may try, they cannot get away from the proposition that the United Nations has gone into this matter. They cannot escape the proposition that the United Nations, through one of its organizations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, has

made recommendations with regard to economic rehabilitation in Greece; nor the fact that that same body recommended that action be taken by the United Nations.

I read to this House the other day some of the important recommendations made. The difficulty has been and is that the present regime in Greece refuses, and has consistently refused, to adopt the reforms recommended by the United Nations. In refusing to adopt elementary democratic reforms, this regime backed by British imperialists has caused the civil strife in Greece. The question in Greece is not one of communism. The question involved in Greece is bread, land, equitable taxation, liberty, a square deal for the peasants. This regime refuses to give that to the people of Greece. If this regime gave freedom to the Greek people and adopted the reforms recommended by the United Nations organization, there would be no civil strife in Greece. Why does not this regime accept those recommendations? Because this regime is a Fascist regime. You cannot get away from the fact that we will be giving money to a Fascist regime to shoot down men and women, yes, call them guerrillas—yes, some of them Communists, many of them non-Communists—who fought on our side during the war. You are giving money to buy bullets and guns to shoot down those who saved the lives of Americans with their heroic sacrifices. You are giving that money to whom? To big quislings and petty quislings and Nazi collaborators. I just wonder what the average ex-GI will say when he learns that the men and women who are going to be shot at with the money and material that we provide here were the men and women who fought on his side. What will he say when he learns that we are providing the bullets and guns of the present rulers of Greece who aided and collaborated with the Nazis and Fascists during the last war.

Let me also point out that the United Nations not only went into this question through the Food and Agriculture Organization but even, according to Mr. Austin, the Security Council is already acting on that aspect of the Greek question with which it is now prepared to deal—conditions on the northern frontier. The United Nations Council is in it. It is dealing with this problem. So that when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and others say that the United Nations Council cannot deal with this situation and will be barred from dealing with it, they evade the reality that the United Nations is and has been dealing with this problem.

The mistake we are arrogantly making here today is that we are weakening the United Nations by taking this action. The United Nations finds itself in the same position that the First Congress found itself in in 1789 when it met in New York City. Several States were attempting unilateral action on some questions. Unilateral action was threatened by a few of the States then. It was said that the Congress was too weak to deal with the problems facing the country. It was said that the Federal Government could not act, that it was impotent. But patriots insisted that the Nation could be strengthened only by respecting the right of the Federal Government to act, and they have been vindicated by history. Americans of that day did not weaken the Nation, they strengthened it by supporting its right to function on important problems.

The hope of the world is the United Nations, yet we are weakening the United Nations by the action we are taking here, just as some in 1789 sought to weaken the United States. We are at the same time aiding Fascist interests all over the world by the action we are taking. We do it by raising the anti-Communist cry. It is a Fascist technique. It will not succeed.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 8. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to abolish within 90 days all hereditary offices and titles under such government; (b) to hold within 90 days free and democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive officer of such government and the membership of its legislative body and to grant prior to such election universal suffrage for all persons over the age of 21; (c) to afford to all political parties full opportunities to participate and engage in election activities prior to the holding of such elections; and (d) to grant immediate amnesty to all political opponents of the persons or parties in control of the government requesting such assistance."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in 1776 the American people demonstrated by rebellion that they had had a bellyful of monarchy. For 150 years the American people have distrusted and disliked the entire institution of monarchy. There are, Mr. Chairman, no hereditary titles in America. Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Chairman, undertook to establish the American Bill of Rights. We have free speech, free assembly, free religion, and free association. We have free elections, Mr. Chairman. We have opposition parties. We do not have concentration camps, and for anyone who might think that at some future time the American people will submit to the destruction of their democratic liberties and to the establishment of the tyranny of a few, let it be said now that their efforts will be struck down by an aroused and enraged American citizenry.

Mr. Chairman, a corrupt and venal monarchy exists in Greece. That monarchy has been fought by Greek patriots for 120 years. Those Greek patriots succeeded in driving three Greek kings from the throne to the abject exile they deserved. One Greek king was assassinated. It is indicative of the corruption and degeneracy of the Greek monarchy that the one and only Greek king who died on the throne died from the bite of his pet monkey.

Greek patriots today as in years of old are fighting for the establishment of democracy free from monarchy. They want free and democratic elections. They want full opportunity of all political parties to engage in election activities. They want universal suffrage. They want an end to political concentration camps.

Mr. Chairman, none of these things exist in Greece today. It is a nation under the iron heel of a bought and paid-for monarch, and open agent of the imperialist armies of Great Britain whose bayonets alone maintain him in power. Thousands of Greek patriots are fighting the occupation troops of Britain. Thousands of Greek patriots are dying in the concentration camps of the British monarch. The free and democratic elections which reputedly were held are known by all of us to have been a sham and a lie. Less than 15 percent of the population participated in these elections and then under conditions of terror.

Mr. Chairman, when my constituents ask me if I voted to give $300,000,000 to a dictatorial and corrupt monarch in Greece, I will be able to answer that I did not do so. When I am asked if I voted to throw American arms behind a government known to be undemocratic and maintaining concentration camps—thank God, I will be able to say I voted against it. Mr. Chairman, the insanity of the State Department is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in its utter disregard of the principles of democracy on which America has grown strong. Our State Department officials have never considered the ethical and political desirability of establishing a genuine democracy in Greece. It has never occurred to them that American citizens do not want to pour out their substance to maintain corrupt and venal governments. It apparently has never crossed the minds of the fantastic Machiavellian characters at the other end of the Avenue that we want no part—that we want no dealings with governments who in their very nature are antidemocratic.

Mr. Chairman, as for me, I pledged myself in my oath of office to uphold the principles of the American Constitution and the democratic principles for which the patriots in American history have given their wealth and their lives. I refuse to vote for a bill which violates those principles—which violates the intent and the history of American life. The House, Mr. Chairman, in the vote on this amendment has the opportunity to reaffirm the democratic heritage of the American Declaration of Independence and our Constitution given us by our forefathers. Mr. Chairman, I now present this amendment to the House and in all good faith ask that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall (a) register with the United States Treasury Department all holdings of gold

held by such government, and by the nationals of such government, both at home and abroad; (b) register with the United States Treasury Department all foreign assets, stocks, bonds, or other holdings of such government and of the nationals of such government; (c) make public the full foreign and domestic indebtedness of such government to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, since 1932 the RFC has been functioning. In every contract and in every loan made by the RFC to American businessmen there has been a clause which states that the payment of indebtedness incurred shall take precedence over any current indebtedness of the business involved. The RFC states that all other indebtedness shall be relegated to a subordinate position.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, in the financial operations of the RFC we have introduced sound banking principles, and, as all of us know, the RFC has served a highly useful and successful purpose in stabilizing the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, is there any Member of the House that can advance one good reason why this principle should not be applied to the lending of our money to foreign nations? We have applied it successfully for 15 years to the dealings of the American Government with American businessmen. Why should not this principle now be established as a legal condition for any future foreign loans extended by our Government to other nations?

How can any Member deny the validity of applying to foreign nations the same principle which we apply to our own citizens? I believe that the House will want to consider the question of this principle very seriously because France, China, Britain, Italy, Korea, the Philippines, Finland, Hungary, numerous nations in South America, including Mexico—all of these nations have in some form or another made clear their intention to request loans of the American Government. If we lend to the Greek Government without the RFC condition, are we not setting a precedent from which it will be most difficult to escape in the consideration of any future loans to be made to foreign governments?

Mr. Chairman, in the case of Greece, the RFC principle is particularly pertinent because Greece already owes roughly $500,000,000 in foreign debts—95 percent of which are payable at the Hambro Bank of London. These debts, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, have accumulated over the past 100 years as the result of the extravagances of the corrupt Greek monarchy and the machinations of the international bankers of London in the political affairs of Greece. It is a curious fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Greek monarchy, frequent Balkan wars, and repeated foreign loans from the London banks have gone hand in hand in Greek history. Will our money be used to pay the interest and principal of the Greek foreign indebtedness to the London bankers? Is that why Great Britain wants us to assume her obligations in Greece? Are we to bail out the British despite the fact that they have already collected three times the principal in interest and carrying charges of the original Greek debt? Where will the American dollars lent to Greece finally come to rest? Will they be paid out in dividends to the family of Winston Churchill through the Hambro Bank in London?

Mr. Chairman, common sense—ordinary horse sense—regular sound business banking practices persuade me that the RFC principle which regulates our dealings with our own businessmen should be a standing, standard requirement of all foreign loans made by the United States Government. Now let us establish this principle in the case of Greece. There has already been too much scandal attached to international finance in this country for the Congress of the United States to assume the obligations of the debts of a corrupt and venal monarchy without any attached conditions and with no controls established. There is no reason under God's sun for the Congress of the United States to sign a blank check for President Truman so that he can send it to Athens and have the Greek King fill in the amount—particularly when the Greek King is told what amount to fill in by the Hambro Bank in London. The 58,000,000 Americans who worked for wages and salaries and who earn their living in the sweat of their brow will never be able to understand the thinking of a Congress which refuses to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in all good conscience and good faith, I urge the House to adopt the amendment which I now introduce.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and the nationals of foreign governments."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, that great and august body, the Senate of the United States, without dissent and without any question of its propriety and without any question of its relevancy, adopted the amendment which I have just read.

Mr. Chairman, as I believe all of us know, one-half to three-fourths of all the oil reserves of the world are today believed to be in the Near and Middle East. Those oil reserves are under concession to the great oil companies of America and England, and even while we deliberate here in the Congress secret negotiations are under way in London over the method and manner of exploiting these oil reserves.

Mr. Chairman, pending before the Senate of the United States Foreign Relations Committee is an international oil agreement. Pending before the Brewster committee is a scandal involving purchases by the United States Navy Department of oil from American companies in the Near and Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has stated that the present Greek-Turkish military alliance bill smells of petroleum. Other competent investigators have suggested that this bill is nothing but a $400,000,000 subsidy to the American and British oil industries. Mr. Chairman, whatever the truth may be in regard to these allegations, it is clear that the private oil companies of America have no right to bind the Government of the United States by their private agreements. Mr. Chairman, frequently in American history dollar diplomacy has been denounced. It has also been said, Mr. Chairman, that American guns will follow American dollars. It is interesting that one-fourth to one-third of our entire investment abroad is in the oil industry. This simple fact raises the question of what importance the oil industry has in the formulation and development of American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, the American people do not want war. The American people want peace. For my part, I would not shed one drop of blood of a single Ohio boy for all the oil of the Middle East. Let us make clear, Mr. Chairman, that this bill before us is not an international charter for unlimited oil imperialism. Let us make clear that the private international cartel agreements now being negotiated in London cannot be considered in any way binding upon the United States Government. Let us separate the questions of oil and our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there will be opposition to this amendment. In all good conscience and good faith, I now introduce this amendment into the House and ask for its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN 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. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, that motion has already been made and was voted down once.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been several amendments adopted on the bill, it has been changed since that motion was previously acted on. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, debate is limited on the bill by action of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has offered a preferential motion which is in order in spite of the agreement on closing debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

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, pursuant to House Resolution 205, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and wa read the third time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the committee on the minority side who is opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit?

Is the gentleman from California opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"SECTION 1. It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States, through the appropriate representative of the United States, shall initiate in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations proposals designed to insure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey, and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum not exceeding $100,000,000 for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation of the Greek economy. The President may expend funds appropriated pursuant to this provision through existing agencies of the Federal Government and through transfer of such amounts as he deems appropriate to the Government of Greece and the Secretary General of the United Nations for expenditure by them. Such funds shall be expended for the purchase and other provision of supplies for the civilian economy of Greece, including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services, but no part of such money shall be used for the provision of military supplies or services."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 107, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—287

Abernethy	Donohue	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Dorn	Jones, Wash.
Allen, Calif.	Drewry	Jonkman
Allen, La.	Durham	Judd
Almond	Eaton	Karsten, Mo.
Andersen,	Eberharter	Kearney
H. Carl	Elliott	Kearns
Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	Keating
Andresen,	Elston	Kee
August H.	Engel, Mich.	Keefe
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kefauver
Andrews, N. Y.	Evins	Kelley
Arends	Fallon	Kennedy
Auchincloss	Feighan	Keogh
Bakewell	Fellows	Kerr
Barden	Fernandez	Kersten, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Kilburn
Bates, Mass.	Fletcher	Kilday
Battle	Fogarty	King
Beall	Foote	Kirwan
Beckworth	Forand	Lane
Bell	Fulton	Lanham
Blackney	Gamble	Larcade
Bloom	Gary	Latham
Boggs, La.	Gathings	Lea
Bolton	Gearhart	LeCompte
Boykin	Goff	LeFevre
Bradley, Calif.	Goodwin	Lesinski
Bramblett	Gordon	Lewis
Brooks	Gore	Lodge
Brophy	Gorski	Love
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	Lucas
Bryson	Grant, Ala.	Lusk
Buchanan	Griffiths	Lyle
Buck	Gross	Lynch
Buckley	Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Hagen	McCormack
Burke	Hale	McDonough
Burleson	Hall,	McMillan, S. C.
Byrne, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	McMillen, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall,	MacKinnon
Camp	Leonard W.	Macy
Canfield	Halleck	Madden
Cannon	Hardy	Mahon
Carroll	Harless, Ariz.	Manasco
Carson	Harris	Mansfield,
Case, N. J.	Harrison	Mont.
Case, S. Dak.	Hart	Meade, Md.
Chadwick	Hartley	Merrow
Chelf	Havenner	Michener
Clark	Hays	Miller, Calif.
Clason	Hébert	Miller, Md.
Coffin	Hedrick	Mills
Cole, Kans.	Heffernan	Monroney
Cole, N. Y.	Hendricks	Morgan
Colmer	Herter	Morrison
Combs	Heselton	Morton
Cooley	Hess	Muhlenberg
Cooper	Hill	Mundt
Corbett	Hinshaw	Murdock
Cotton	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Coudert	Hoeven	Nixon
Courtney	Holmes	Nodar
Cox	Hope	Norblad
Cravens	Horan	Norrell
Crosser	Howell	Norton
Cunningham	Huber	O'Brien
D'Alesandro	Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole
Davis, Ga.	Jackson, Wash.	Passman
Davis, Wis.	Jarman	Patman
Dawson, Utah	Javits	Patterson
Deane	Jenkins, Pa.	Peden
Delaney	Jennings	Peterson
Devitt	Johnson, Okla.	Philbin
Dingell	Johnson, Tex.	Pickett
Domengeaux	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Poage	Sadlak	Tibbott
Potts	Sasscer	Tollefson
Poulson	Scott, Hardie	Towe
Price, Fla.	Seely-Brown	Trimble
Price, Ill.	Sheppard	Vorys
Priest	Sikes	Wadsworth
Rabin	Simpson, Pa.	Walter
Rains	Smathers	Welch
Rankin	Smith, Kans.	West
Rayburn	Smith, Maine	Wheeler
Rayfiel	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Redden	Snyder	Whittington
Reeves	Somers	Wigglesworth
Richards	Spence	Williams
Riehlman	Stevenson	Wilson, Tex.
Riley	Stigler	Winstead
Rivers	Sundstrom	Wolcott
Robertson	Taber	Wood
Rogers, Mass.	Talle	Worley
Rohrbough	Teague	Zimmerman
Rooney	Thomas, Tex.	
Ross	Thomason	

NAYS—107

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Phillips, Calif.
Arnold	Gillie	Phillips, Tenn.
Banta	Graham	Powell
Barrett	Granger	Ramey
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Gwynne, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.	Hoffman	Rees
Bishop	Holifield	Rich
Blatnik	Hull	Rizley
Boggs, Del.	Jenison	Robsion
Bradley, Mich.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rockwell
Brehm	Jensen	Russell
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath
Buffett	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Busbey	Jones, Ohio	Sanborn
Butler	Kean	Sarbacher
Celler	Klein	Schwabe, Mo.
Chenoweth	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Chiperfield	Kunkel	Scoblick
Church	Landis	Scrivner
Clevenger	Lemke	Shafer
Clippinger	McCowen	Short
Cole, Mo.	McGarvey	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	McGregor	Smith, Ohio
Crow	McMahon	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Maloney	Springer
Dague	Marcantonio	Stanley
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Dolliver	Mason	Stockman
Dondero	Mathews	Stratton
Doughton	Meyer	Twyman
Douglas	Miller, Conn.	Vail
Ellis	Morris	Van Zandt
Fenton	Murray, Wis.	Weichel
Gallagher	O'Konski	Woodruff
Gavin	Pfeifer	Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Folger

NOT VOTING—35

Angell	Gregory	Ploeser
Bland	Hand	Preston
Bonner	Harness, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	St. George
Clements	McDowell	Scott,
Davis, Tenn.	Mansfield, Tex.	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Ky.	Taylor
Dirksen	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Vinson
Fisher	O'Hara	Vursell
Fuller	Owens	Wilson, Ind.
Gifford	Pace	Wolverton

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Miller of Nebraska against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Owens against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Vursell against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Folger against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mrs. St. George against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Preston.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. Angell with Mr. Gregory.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Clements.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BONNER. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, it is now in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in the bill H. R. 2616.

The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 938 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in the bill H. R. 2616.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings under which the bill H. R. 2616 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the House the program for next week.

Monday will be District Day. The Consent Calendar will also be called on Monday.

On Tuesday we will begin debate on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. I do not know just how much time will be devoted to the debate. That is to be determined, of course, when the bill is taken up, but it will very likely continue through Tuesday.

On Wednesday we will continue with the consideration of the appropriation bill, and also on Thursday if it is not completed before that time.

The following bills, if they are not disposed of earlier in the week, will be called on Friday and Saturday:

S. 814, a bill to provide support for wool.

There has been a bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture. No rule has been granted. Of course the action on that measure would depend upon the action of the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 2780, which has to do with the completion of veterans temporary reuse housing program.

House Resolution 176, an investigating authority for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and similar resolutions, House Resolution 93 and House Resolution 141, for the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Armed Services.

Then House Resolution 153, a continuation of an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter dated April 22, addressed to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Austin, our representative with the United Nations, signed by 30 Members of the House making certain inquiry with respect to the attitude of the United States representatives on the Palestine question, together with a copy of the reply sent to these Members by the Secretary of State as well as a list of the signers of the letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in today's Star entitled "Arms, Not a Loan, What the Turks Want."

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain excerpts and quotations.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article in the New York Times by Hanson W. Baldwin.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement by David Wills.

FREE COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION CONFERENCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, has the gentleman from California taken this up with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have. I have taken it up with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is present. It is a unanimous report from the committee.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prohibit United States communication common carriers from rendering free communication services to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUST FUNDS HELD IN JOINT OWNERSHIP BY SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1098) entitled "An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation," with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "to a trust fund" and insert "in the principal."

Page 1, line 10, 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 fund account for."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Comptroller of the United States."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "to" where it occurs the second time and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury shall."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "earned" and insert "shall accrue on the principal fund only."

Page 2, line 11, after "annum", insert "and."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "principal" and insert "interest."

Page 2, line 15, after "the", insert "principal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gen-

tleman taken this up with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. BARRETT. I have consulted with the minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and with the ranking member on the minority side on the committee, as well as the majority leader and chairman of the committee, and it is agreeable to all of them that this action be taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARBLEHEAD MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 450), an act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "directed", insert ", upon payment to the United States of the sum of $5,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by a distinguished special writer of the Boston Post, Mr. Robert L. Norton, on March 16, the title being "Mr. Truman and the United Nations."

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted on next Monday and Tuesday for Members of the House who are members of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, which was put off yesterday and today because of duties on the floor of the House.

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

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAND, for 5 days, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), adjourned until Monday, May 12, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

665. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

666. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, of amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

667. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 for the Civil Service Commission in the amount of $16,160,000, and for the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the amount of $8,740,000, in all $24,900,000 (H. Doc. No. 242); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

668. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $12,115,000, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $15,285,000, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 243); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

669. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 1, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 5, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

670. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Henderson River, Ill., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2746. A bill to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges; with amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 565. An act to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins; without amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins; without amendment (Rept. No. 343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 969. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pensions payable to Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents; with amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1054. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); without amendment (Rept. No. 341). 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. DONDERO:

H. R. 3391. A bill to provide for the sale by the Federal Works Administrator of the property situated in Washington, D. C., known as the Capitol Park Hotel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3392. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3393. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to

acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3395. A bill to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3396. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the destruction of the battleship U. S. S. *Maine* on February 15, 1898; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3397. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the destruction of the battleship U. S. S. *Maine*; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3398. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3399. A bill to provide office space at first-class post offices for certain Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3400. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the Postal Service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3401. A bill to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3402. A bill to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. R. 3403. A bill to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unlading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside of regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3404. 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 Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3405. 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 Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PACE:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution relating to peanut marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 196. 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.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution declaring that the state of war between the United States and the Government of Italy has ended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the right of naturalization to all persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Herrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Kiichi Yajima (formerly Kiichi Matsumoto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 3408. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph L. Rolewicz against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3409. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Mark D. Williams, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3410. A bill for the relief of James Lekos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Polvere, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3412. A bill for the relief of the estate of Howard Cletus Malkmus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

476. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of T. C. Thompson, general chairman, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, and 20 transportation employees of Rapid City, Lead, and Deadwood, S. Dak., covered by the Railroad Retirement Act, expressing opposition to any changes in or repeal of the so-called Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

477. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 180 residents of Colville, Wash., 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.

478. By Mr. KELLEY: Petitions from residents of Westmoreland County, Pa., urging the $5,000,000 appropriation for the next fiscal year to permit continuance of the construction of the Conemaugh Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

479. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., urging the enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

480. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Lee Dix and 25 other residents of Linn County, Iowa, urging the enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

481. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of El Paso Voiture, No. 605, 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, that time limit under Public, 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, be extended so that qualified servicemen who become veterans subsequent to June 30, 1947, may receive the benefits of this act providing automobiles for certain amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

482. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tyrone, Pa., 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.

483. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Los Angeles Irish Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to furtherance of the principles of self-government and self-determination, consistent with the welfare of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

484. Also, petition of members of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the Third Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

486. Also, petition of membership of the Crescent City Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

487. Also, petition of members of the Jacksonville Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.