salem and Bethlehem; and fourth, full safeguards for the holy places and especially for the Christian churches throughout the whole of Palestine. The only alternative plan suggested to the Assembly was to establish a unitary state under Arab domination with no adequate safeguards for the protection either of the Jewish people or of the Christian churches. This alternative was plainly inadmissible and was rejected by an overwhelming majority. The United Nations decision was reached by more than a two-thirds majority, the only dissentients being the Arab States and certain nations very closely associated with them. The decision was a just and impartial one and must not be lightly set aside.

"The United Nations did not intermeddle in the Palestine matter. It intervened only after the United Kingdom Government had especially requested the United Nations Assembly to handle the matter as all previous efforts at reconciliation between the Arabs and Jews had entirely failed. At the United Nations the British Government did not itself propose any solution and announced it would accept the United Nations decision. In these circumstances Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand all supported the proposal finally adopted. After all that had occurred to throw the solution into the melting pot again may be very damaging to the authority of the United Nations. It has been contended that the enforcement of the Assembly's decision is not possible. Had the great powers who supported the proposal at Lake Success, N. Y., adhered firmly to it there probably would have been little difficulty. In any event under the Assembly's decision the new Jewish State and the new Arab State was each to be entitled to establish its own militia forces for the defense of the new territory and this decision clearly carried with it the right of Jews as well as Arabs to import arms and equipment for the purposes of defense. It is impossible to pass final julgment on the new proposal because no one has explained it as yet. I was chairman of the committee which worked assiduously to obtain a just solution. The committee repeatedly modified its proposals at the suggestion of the mandatory power in order that the United Kingdom should be able to withdraw its forces after its long, its thankless, but on the whole, successful development of the Palestine area since it was captured from the Turks by the British and Australian forces in 1918.

"In my opinion, the United Nations decision has been gradually undermined by intrigues directed against the Jewish people. It would be little short of a tragedy if the fundamental rights of self-government were to be denied to both the Jews and Arabs as it is guaranteed to them under the Assembly decision just as religious freedom is also guaranteed to the Christian churches throughout Palestine. The only considerations that influenced the United Nations Assembly were those of justice and fair dealing to all concerned. It would be most disturbing if mere considerations of power politics or expediency were allowed to destroy the decision. However, if a special United Nations Assembly is called it is hardly likely to accept any plan which involves the annihilation of the previous decision unless new facts of overwhelming cogency are proved to exist.

"I need hardly add that under the United Nations Charter the Security Council has no power whatever to overrule the recommendation of the Assembly."

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING, ETC., OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate may receive a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes, as the law will expire tonight. I further ask that the President pro tempore may sign the enrolled bill during the recess following the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before moving a recess I should like to announce for the record that it is the intention to attempt to conclude the consideration of the pending bill, the Federal aid to education bill, by tomorrow night. There is still to be considered one amendment, possibly there are two or three, and it is the hope to get them out of the way first, because there will be Senators who would like to speak on the bill as it shall have been amended, if it shall be amended. I wish to state for the record, and bring to the attention of Senators, that it is possible there will be record votes on one or two or three of the amendments tomorrow afternoon.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be captains

Inez I. Baum, WMSC (PT), M443.
Olga S. Heard, WMSC (Diet.), R75.

To be first lieutenants

Phyllis D. Barsh, ANC, N773722.
Roberta Broyles, ANC, N790616.
Catharine A. Burgmeier, ANC, N779920.
Kathleen R. Creech, WMSC (Diet.), R648.
Evelyn C. Ekstrom, ANC, N754110.
Virginia M. Elder, ANC, N723862.
Ruth M. Engel, ANC, N778098.
Juanita E. Fannin, ANC, N768913.
Lu Gomez, ANC, N788919.
Lulu J. Hartman, ANC, N768377.
Mona O. Hetland, ANC, N777355.
Elizabeth A. Hughes, ANC, N745171.
Esther M. Knoedler, ANC, N732206.
Jean M. Lang, ANC, N721159.
Edna H. Livaudais, WMSC (PT), M1232.
Helen Logan, ANC, N787308.
Frances A. Lusas, ANC, N751622.
Rose M. MacKellar, WMSC (Diet.), R190.
Ethel S. Madden, ANC, N785083.
Ann Markey, ANC, N731072.
Alice M. McDowell, ANC, N768192.
Agnes L. Miller, ANC, N727259.
Alyce G. Milne, WMSC (OT).
Nadine A. Neisig, ANC, N772760.
Rita M. Pfeiffer, ANC, N773595.
Edna L. Phariss, ANC, N732558.
Mary E. Pierce, ANC, N728765.
Olie B. Reed, ANC, N724951.
Margaret J. Rice, ANC, N759617.
Helen A. Rydzewski, ANC, N755886.
Edythe B. Sanborn, ANC, N752594.
Catherine E. Sanford, ANC, N723466.
Dorothy F. Shaw, ANC, N783003.
Barbara M. Short, ANC, N775527.
Carol V. Smith, ANC, N775342.
Virginia L. Smith, ANC, N773897.
Betty J. Snyder, WMSC (PT), M2496.
Doris M. Vance, ANC, N732635.
Tannie E. Westmoreland, ANC, N764987.
Mary W. Wilborne, ANC, N759122.

To be second lieutenants

Gloria F. Coradi, ANC, N754740.
Frances A. Foley, ANC, N792054.
Marjorie A. Mell, WMSC (OT).
Miriam A. Schulz, ANC, N796722.
Gisela M. Zernick, ANC, N800184.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

POSTMASTERS

Mrs. Wilberta G. Silveira to be postmaster at Searchlight, in the State of Nevada.

Clarence K. Kratz to be postmaster at Silverdale, in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1948

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

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

Eternal and ever-loving Father, we praise Thee, we magnify Thee, we give thanks unto Thee for Thy great glory. It comforts us to know that when wicked men seek to destroy the blessings that are dear to the human heart Thou dost ever uphold the order of this world.

O give us minds to understand that by our endeavors and generosity the welfare and peace of all men are advanced. Stay Thou the injustice that binds heavy burdens upon the weak and cruel wrongs upon the innocent. For hesitation, give us insight; for prejudice, give us open minds; from spiritual bondage, give us a blessed relief.

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2393. An act to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to China.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5314) entitled "An act to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

RECORD and include a radio address recently delivered by Hon. ABE MCGREGOR GOFF.

DISMANTLING OF GERMAN INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, although there has been widespread speculation in this country as to why the German dismantling program would continue in spite of the widespread outcry against it, it does continue. The 500 plants which are still left on the list to be dismantled can yet be saved. And European recovery cannot occur without them.

Most branches of American public opinion, and foreign opinion as well, have gone on record in favor of a more sensible treatment with regard to our former enemies. There will be no peace if we continue to maintain a persecution complex. Fortunately such widely divergent groups as the NAM, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the CIO, and the A. F. of L. are in agreement. They are all in concert because they are proud of, and solicitous for, the international good name and economic welfare of the United States, and they know that it is neither good publicity nor good business for us to run the Reich as a combination penal colony and economic slum.

From the economic point of view, the A. F. of L., in the words of President William Green, states the case:

If we consider the problem of steel shortage on a western European basis, the first obstacle to increasing output quickly is the program for dismantling plants earmarked for reparations. But, put into operation in their present place, they would get European economy under way more economically and expeditiously. Time is a vital factor for the success of this undertaking.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune dated March 19, 1948.

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

Mr. O'HARA asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE KNUTE ROCKNE

Mr. O'HARA. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago today, near the little village of Flint, Kans., a plane crashed to earth. A newsboy in Atlanta, Ga., that late afternoon gathered his armful of papers and flung them conveniently on the pavement and sat down to select a suitable scarehead to attract purchasers. He read the mass of letters of the headline: "Rockne dies in plane crash." He read no more. Half blind with tears, forgetting his supply of papers, his precious wealth of the day, he staggered away. His idol was dead. The bottom had dropped out of the world for him. So had it for millions of others.

It is an amazing tribute to Rockne the man and Rockne the football coach that, though it is 17 years since that fateful crash, he not only still lives in the heart of Notre Dame and football's hall of fame, but likewise as an inspiration to the youth of this country. Unquestionably football lost its greatest leader and personality.

"Rock," as he was known to his boys, was not just a teacher of football and the physical side of athletics. He instilled the intellectual and moral values into athletics. He taught his players that sports were something clean and elevating and that clean living and straight thinking were the important parts of victory.

In my lifetime I have seen and heard speak many of the great world personalities, but to me the outstanding one was the immigrant Norwegian boy named Rockne.

The great tragedy of Rockne's death has been suffered by the youth of America for the tremendous influence for good which he exerted upon them. Rockne was, above everything else, a builder of men.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 1 hour.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS TIME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works are presently holding hearings on the disposal of temporary housing constructed under the Lanham Act of 1940, H. R. 5710.

Paul V. Betters, executive director of the conference, informs me that at the recent annual conference of the United States Conference of Mayors held in New York City on February 18, 1948, this conference went on record by resolution to the effect that—

RESOLUTION PASSED BY UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, FEBRUARY 18, 1948

TEMPORARY HOUSING

Whereas the Director of the Public Housing Administration is proceeding to dispose of war housing, both that classified by them as temporary and permanent, in cities throughout the country; by sale of such housing for off-site removal and sale on site for occupancy; and

Whereas the Public Housing Administration feel they have a mandate from Congress to dispose of such housing as expeditiously as possible, based upon the Lanham Act as last amended in July 1943; and

Whereas these housing units were originally contemplated as temporary shelter, required in certain areas, to further the national defense during the war period and for the duration of the emergency, and not as a permanent subdivision development; and, as such, should be considered as an expendable byproduct of the war; and

Whereas the imperative need of all cities is for low rental housing, and it is the belief of this conference that the community's interest and well being should receive precedence over recovery value to the Federal Government; and

Whereas, international developments presage the continuation of an implied emergency period; and

Whereas these housing projects are operated on a low-rental basis that still results in a high rate of return to the Federal Government; and

Whereas most of this housing was built without regard to local building codes, and in its present status does not conform, precluding the advisability of annexing or leaving it as a permanent dwelling in the various cities; and

Whereas in the Congress much legislation has been introduced to authorize Government participation in low-rental housing construction, and on the other hand the Public Housing Administration is currently proceeding to sell, thereby eliminating all housing under its jurisdiction from the rental market, which is inconsistent with the current needs of the people represented by their officials at this conference: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the United States Conference of Mayors, That legislation should be passed by the Congress stopping the sale or disposal of emergency housing built under the Lanham Act, and as amended, by an agency of the Government, until such time as the supply of rental units more nearly equals demand, with such eventual disposal or a plan for such disposal being mutually agreed upon between an agency of the Government and the local governing body of the cities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a list prepared by the United States Tariff Commission comparing old and new rates of duty on various tariff classifications.

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

Mr. RICH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from a constituent in Lockhaven, Pa., on international affairs.

Mr. SHORT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks which he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a radio address he intends to deliver over Station WMEX tomorrow and in the other to include a newspaper article.

Mr. WHEELER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from

the Rehabilitation Service Bulletin published by VFW.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances, in two of them to include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 33]

Abbitt	Gore	Powell
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Rains
Andrews, Ala.	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Jarman	Richards
Blatnik	Jenkins, Ohio	Rooney
Boykin	Kennedy	Sadowski
Busbey	Lesinski	Sikes
Carson	Lewis	Somers
Celler	Lichtenwalter	Stratton
Clark	Lucas	Taylor
Coffin	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Cravens	Manasco	Vail
Dawson, Ill.	Mason	West
Dingell	Mitchell	Wilson, Tex.
Dirksen	Norrell	Wood
	Passman	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 377 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include some radio comments by Mr. George Reedy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis, persuaded by a court order, finally put in an appearance before the President's fact-finding board.

This cantankerous gentleman is trying to prove that the Taft-Hartley law is too drastic. On the contrary, he is proving that it is not drastic enough.

The irony of this situation is that this law which Mr. Lewis condemns can provide relief for his United Mine Workers if he is right in his contentions.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, first of all, he could obtain an interpretation of this contract through the courts; and secondly, if, as he alleges, the mine operators have broken this contract, he can take them to court and sue for damages. There is some question in my mind as to whether or not the Taft-Hartley law will prove adequate in dealing with Mr. Lewis or any other person of such arrogance. Therefore, I have just reintroduced language from the original House bill which twice passed this House by an overwhelming majority which would apply the Sherman and Clayton Acts, the antitrust laws, to a labor monopoly in restraint of trade in the same manner as we apply it to a business monopoly.

This strike of the United Mine Workers, and there is no doubt that it is a strike, if continued much longer may have a disastrous effect on our entire economy and even threaten our national safety and security.

I want to show the people of this Nation that its representatives in the Congress are ready to meet this challenge.

RADIO COMMENTARY BY MR. GEORGE REEDY

Last July the always amazing John L. Lewis presented the southern coal operators with one of the most fantastic choices in American history. Either they must break a law clearly spelled out by Congress, or they must close down their mines.

He was allowing no ifs, ands, or buts. Halfway measures were not enough for the shaggy-browed boss of the United Mine Workers. Either they would capitulate or they could go under. He indicated he did not particularly care which course they chose to follow. The law he was asking them to violate was the Taft-Hartley labor law. That law specifically stated that State laws banning closed or union shops would take precedence over any Federal statute.

Lewis was insisting that all operators sign an agreement including a closed-shop arrangement. The law worried him then not in the slightest. As one of his lieutenants put it, the quicker we get that law into the courts and get it tossed out the better.

Just 3 weeks ago today, March 2, to be exact, I called attention to the fact over this microphone that Lewis had never let a year go by without creating at least one crisis. I also pointed out that 1948 promised to be no exception.

I observed also that most of the operators had resigned themselves to a major strike, complete with Shakespearean quotations. And that they were ready for the eyebrow waggling and table thumping that always accompanied a Lewis campaign.

Never let it be said that John L. Lewis is one to disappoint anyone in that regard. A work stoppage in the coal mines is now in its third week. Mr. Lewis, John L., that is, says that no action of his or the United Mine Workers is responsible for it.

Apparently there is no evidence available that he—or the United Mine Workers have. But there is no coal being mined, and your Government, and mine, and John L.'s too, would like his cooperation in getting the matter ironed out.

So, President Truman appointed a fact-finding board to get at the cause of it all. This was in accord with the Taft-Hartley law provisions. Mr. Lewis does not like the Taft-Hartley law, and he has said so. In fact, he called it a slave labor law.

When the Board requested his voluntary appearance before them to acquaint the Board with his story to help them in making their report to the President, Lewis' cooperation was contained in a letter to the Board outlining his disinclination to appear as requested. A subpena was then issued by the Board, requiring his attendance yesterday afternoon at 2 p. m. But evidently that was Mr. Lewis' day to get a haircut or something, for he paid no heed to the subpena either.

So the Board obtained a court order directing Lewis to appear in Federal court at 11 a. m. this morning to explain his stand to a judge. If Lewis fails to show up this morning, however, he may be held in contempt. And the judge can slap on any penalty he sees fit.

If Lewis or his lawyers do appear, a ruling on the fact-finding board's subpena will be made. If it is held binding Lewis will be given a second chance to testify. The second time, however, will be under penalty of contempt.

This is not to comment on the merits of the mine workers' dispute with the operators, if dispute it is. The important thing would seem to be the apparently callous disregard of the processes of the laws of this Nation in times of at least near crisis, by citizens who deem themselves a law unto their own.

It is a strange situation. One that could well make the founding fathers of our Republic rub their eyes with amazement and ask themselves how well they had wrought.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to an amendment to the Bureau Budget Act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MUHLENBERG asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a letter.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include certain newspaper items.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous material.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948

Mr. VORYS. 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 (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance

of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

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 S. 2202, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the Clerk had read through section 114 of the committee amendment. Are there any amendments to this section?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 81, line 17, strike out the words beginning with "from" through and including line 19, and insert "for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this title."

Mr. VORYS. This amendment is a technical amendment made necessary by the fact that the bill provides for financing by both loans and appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VURSELL: On page 82, line 11, strike out "$4,300,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me at this time. We have had ERP for a week, now I would like to announce a little "Burp" after the ERP, for the Cleveland Heights High School Band from my own city will be here at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning on the Capitol steps; and from 11 until 12 tomorrow you will have the finest band concert you ever heard in your life. We have a fine tuba player who will be burping for you for an hour, and you will enjoy it. I hope the wind instruments will be in better tune than they are on the floor today.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment striking $1,300,000,000 out of the bill will reduce the aid proposed in the bill from $5,300,000,000 for the European recovery plan to $4,000,000,000. It remains at this high level, after the reduction, by reason that $1,000,000,000 has been provided for to be handled through the Import-Export Bank for grants and loans. If we reduce the amount proposed by this amendment the bill will still carry for the children's fund, $60,000,000, for Greece and Turkey $275,000,000, and $570,000,000 for China. With this reduction the bill will still carry an appropriation of $4,905,000,000 in all.

Nearly all of the Members of Congress want to give such support as is necessary to the western European nations and to China as will help those countries from a psychological standpoint and in a material way to encourage them to fight off the rise of communism in such countries. We want to give them such aid as will prevent undue hardship for lack of food and clothing and will help them to rehabilitate their countries. Many of us feel that we cannot vote for the bill in its present form. I believe it would be a wise move on the part of the committee to accept this amendment to reduce the amount by $1,300,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the best the members of the committee supporting this bill can say for it is, it is a calculated risk. It is my opinion that this bill is not a calculated risk but is the greatest financial gamble ever taken by any government in the world. From my limited study of Europe with the Herter committee, I feel confident that if we reduce the bill by $1,300,000,000 it still will provide $1,000,000,000 more than is necessary for this Nation to make its greatest contribution against the encroachment of communism in western Europe and for the rehabilitation of the countries that really need aid.

There is little question in my mind but that the launching of the Marshall plan asking 16 nations to gather in conference and determine how much aid they needed from the United States was a colossal blunder in the very beginning. Now that the mistake has been made and that the international bankers, exporters, this administration, and the State Department, through the greatest propaganda drive in the history of the Nation have this measure before the House, I think it is incumbent upon the Members of this Congress who are the only representatives the people have, that they try to reduce the amounts, limit the program to 1 year, and set up the best possible management for the program. It will be less disastrous to this country if the Members of this Congress will now take over and have the courage to try to salvage what we can in the interest of our Government and the people.

Mr. Chairman, in the most reckless days of the New Deal through the past 15 years, even such advanced thinkers, liberals, and spenders as Tugwell and Harry Hopkins never dreamed up such a fantastic world-wide WPA as this Marshall plan.

So that the Congress and the American people, if they could have had the truth which they have not had, can better understand the obligations we assume under this plan, let me try to explain it in a few words.

This plan proposes to finance with supplies and materials 16 European nations in a manner to take care of what some of our congressional experts term "European balance of payments." That means, in short, that we propose to furnish to Holland or any other country enough money or supplies to put that country in position to maintain a standard of living equal to or better than they had prior to the war. Those are the deficits or balance-of-payment phrases which have been so glibly used by some Members of Congress. In other words, we pay the deficit for the nation and all of its people and for all of the 16 nations. Only we do not wait till the end of the year. We send thousands of trainloads of food at the expense of the American taxpayers to the various countries as fast as it can be assembled and be shipped out of the country.

The balance of payments have been arrived at in advance by a group of young men, little men, in the State Department averaging between 30 and 40 years of age. Young men, liberal in their thoughts and liberal in contracting for the expenditure of $20,000,000,000 which must come from the toil and sweat and taxes of the American people. Young men who have not had experience in business, none of whom have probably ever had to meet a pay roll. The State Department, or should I say, Bevin and the British politicians, have set the amounts this country should pay and the young men referred to have sought to justify those figures. The Foreign Affairs Committee has only had the menial task of trying to write legislation to provide these amounts and they have done a very good job with the task before them.

Mr. Chairman, all the United States Government has to do is to balance the books to determine at the end of the year whether for those European countries which have not been able to produce, manufacture, and export sufficient amount of goods, in volume and in value, to pay their own way. If they have not, we pay the balance or the deficit. That is what members of the Committee refer to when they talk about deficits or balance of payments. No balance of payment is made to the United States in this entire scheme. All balance of payments is made by the United States to other countries. It is a one-way street.

Mr. Chairman, the United States, when the tornadoes recently wiped out little villages in Indiana and Illinois, does not move in with a balance payment. Whatever the Red Cross does is the only aid our people receive when such disaster hits them. When 111 men were killed in the mine disaster a year ago at Centralia, Ill., and widows and children were left without support, the United States Government did nothing to help. When a man enters business, small or large in the United States, and loses at the end of the year, the Government does not step in and pay the balance.

If this country runs into a depression and we find ourselves with a deficit in the years to come, no government will be kind enough to send in their auditors to determine our deficit or balance and then send us a check or goods to take care of it.

Why not reduce this bill by $1,300,000,000? Why not give some thought today and some encouragement to the people who have trusted us to represent them? Why not make this reduction and probably we can do something in aid for education throughout the Nation. Maybe we can give a little help to the older people who are begging the Congress for relief; maybe we can give the postal and Federal workers who are urging this Congress for an increase in wages to help them meet the high cost of living; maybe, if we can reduce this bill, the thousands of veterans who are writing the Members of this Congress employed in the postal department and trying to maintain a family on $2,100 a year can be given a proper raise in salary.

Mr. Chairman, no Member of Congress, in my judgment, can escape his duty and give a satisfactory explanation to his people if he fails to vote for this reduction. The propagandists have not given the people the truth about this Marshall plan. You can vote to reduce this and when you explain your vote to the people at home they will praise you for taking such action. If we can reduce this to $4,000,000,000 we will at least have saved the people the waste of $1,300,000,000, which can be used in the interest of our own people. I urge the Members to have the courage to stand up and do the thing they know in their own hearts is right.

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

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not object. This is the first time I have asked for time. It is an important amendment and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to reduce the amount, and I shall address myself particularly to the $5,300,000,000 for the European program.

It will perhaps be remembered that on previous occasions I fought very strongly to reduce the amounts that were authorized for foreign aid. In each of those instances I could give a reason for the faith that was in me. It not only proved wastes but requests for authorization which could not be justified and constituted, in fact, operation "rat hole" requests. I offered to reduce the residual-aid bill last spring by $150,000,000, and the argument I made at that time still stands. Last fall, when we had the interim-aid bill before us, I offered an amendment to reduce it by $300,000,000. Every argument I made at that time still stands. However, I feel that in this particular case there are no good grounds for reducing the amount. In this bill I did just as on previous occasions, I asked the State Department to give me a balance sheet showing not only how it arrived at the total, but giving the dollar value of each commodity proposed for each country. This would be altogether too voluminous to analyze before the House. But I want to say that unlike on the three previous occasions I found no items of which I could say that on their face they looked "phoney.'

In the first place, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the amount has already been reduced from $6,800,000,000 to $5,300,000,000, this notwithstanding the fact that word came down from President Truman himself, and also from Secretary of State Marshall, that it should be $6,800,000,000 or nothing.

Now, some of the Members may say that we have correspondingly reduced the duration of this program. Those were the very things that I argued for in the other cases. I said then, "Why not cut off $150,000,000 or $300,000,000, and if they need any more, Congress will be here and can appropriate more." That is the thing that we are doing at the present time. We have said that we will cut it down to $5,300,000,000.

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

Mr. JONKMAN. I would like to use my 5 minutes. The gentleman has had his 5 minutes. I think the very fact that the time element has been reduced to a period of 1 year is something that we must not overlook and we can, if more is needed, review what has been done.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with those who say that you cannot see at this time what is somewhere near the correct amount that is needed for this program. As has been said so often on the floor, the main method of arriving at the amount is the balance of payments basis. That, of course, gives the Members very little to go by because that takes into consideration just the difference between, or the excess, of imports over exports, and imports may include a lot of luxuries and many things which give no real reasoning as to what is needed. I quite agree that you cannot say at this time whether $3,300,000,000, $5,300,000,000 or $7,300,000,000 is more nearly the correct amount that we should appropriate or authorize in this bill. That is something that cannot be done with any reasonable degree of certainty until the Administrator is appointed and his representatives go into each country and make up their minds as to what is needed to carry out this program. And I want to reiterate that the success of the program will depend almost entirely on the character and capability of the man appointed as Administrator. He should have ample funds; but he should inspire trust that they will not be wasted.

We must remember that this is not a relief program; it is not just a plan to keep people from starving with 1,500 calories a day. This program is far more ambitious. This time we propose to see that people get 3,000 calories a day so they can do a day's work. We propose to get them more raw materials and machinery to increase their production. I do not wish to detract a particle of the credit of our military forces for winning World War II. But all of us have said at some time or other that our production won the war. So to the extent that we get western Europe in production can we count on her as a bulwark against war and a protagonist of peace. In fact, Mr. Chairman, this program is an option on world peace. Already the 16 nations under the impetus of this legislation have shown a cooperative spirit, that since the dawn of history was considered an impossibility. As was said here yesterday, if we do not have the cooperation of these 16 nations in western Europe, and war does come, those who fail to take the precautions that we take at this time will have a great deal to answer for. The purpose of this bill is to perfect cooperation instead of discord between European nations.

Mr. Chairman, I still think that $5,000,000,000 is a terribly large sum of money. But it is true that sums of money are relative. Five billion is less than 2 percent of what it cost us to fight the war. It is 2½ percent of our annual national income. It constitutes 5 percent of the national production of the 16 nations. They themselves will produce the other 95 percent.

If the President appoints a competent Administrator we must accord him sufficient funds to carry out the objectives. Even though this has been called a calculated risk, a gamble, we should bear in mind that as above stated we are taking odds of 1 to 40 or 50 and even more. The amendment should be defeated.

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

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP THROWS AWAY THE OPPORTUNITY OF A CENTURY

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

Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed the march of the Republican elephant, when it stepped on the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] in its parade down the international avenue toward the economic ruin of the United States.

In fostering this legislation the Republican leadership has thrown away the oportunity of a century.

It makes me think of a crowd down at home watching for a street parade. When it turned the corner it was led by the elephant. A drunken Irishman looked at the elephant and said, "Here comes the whole kaboodle, but backwards."

Your party has reversed its position, and is now going down the road to international ruin for the American people.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] let the cat out of the wallet on yesterday when he said this fight was started by Peter the Great 200 years ago. This is the Bevin plan. Do not misunderstand it. You would have the same battle if the Czar was reigning over Russia today, you would have the same battle to expend American billions, and American lives, to keep open that commercial line of the old decadent British Empire to the Orient and to keep Russia out of "warm water" in the Persian Gulf.

No man on this floor has fought communism harder than I have; but I would certainly rather see Russia in warm water in that area for the time being than see the American people in hot water for the next generation or two. That is what you are getting us into.

This measure means regimentation. This is the greatest step toward socialism, which is the first long step toward communism, that we have ever taken.

You have just passed the bill extending rent control, that is causing the housing shortage all over the United States.

When you pass this bill, prices are going to spiral as they never have before. That is one reason the big oil companies are so much interested. They want to get as much for oil as possible. The Steel Trust is keeping its steel off the markets today. You cannot get steel for a rural power line because they expect to unload it abroad at your expense. When

this bill passes, you are going to have another price-fixing program. Then you are going to have rationing of purchases. That will mean regimentation for years to come.

In other words, this is the beginning, the first long step toward the economic bankruptcy of America, dragging us down to the socialistic level and the economic level of the poorest nations in the world.

That is what the enemies of American freedom have always sought and always clamored for.

I shall certainly vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]. I only regret that it is not an amendment to strike out the enacting clause and let this bill go dead.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] arose a while ago and paraded the fact that a band from Ohio is going to come down here and visit the Capitol. He had better thank his God it is not the voters of Ohio coming down here and looking in and finding out just what is going on.

We have gone through two world wars and I have seen the fathers and mothers and their sons in the great sorrow and sacrifice that they made. Those boys are buried all over the world today. The internationalists have clamored for years and years and years to drag us into this very situation.

I told President Roosevelt in 1939, and I say to you now, that with the proper statesmanship we could have kept England, France, and the United States out of this last war, and let Germany and Russia fight it out or frown at each other for the next two or three generations.

But our superinternationalists chose a different course, which left us with an enormous casualty list, and with a national debt that it will take us a hundred years to pay.

Now these same internationalists propose to add this burden to the load of the already overburdened taxpayers of this country, together with all its promises of poverty, bankruptcy, and regimentation that may last for generations to come, and from which this Nation may never recover.

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

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not thought to speak on this bill. I have addressed the House on but few occasions, but that is not because of a lack of understanding of the responsibilities which are upon us, or an understanding of the grievous nature of our problems; but rather because I thought if I could manage my own individual vote correctly, I would have made what contribution I might to this great deliberative body, which has so much more experience than I have.

This amendment, however, raises a question which gives me an opportunity to express one thought that I have not heretofore heard expressed. I have lived a long time. I have had some opportunity to observe the people of America and the people of the world. It is my conclusion that people are pretty much the same, wherever you find them. It is my observation, for instance, that the Czechs of Bohemia are more like Americans, more like Yankees, than any of the peoples of Europe. It is my confirmed belief that if we could know the Russian people, we would find that the Russian people are more like ourselves than we have any way now of knowing; but tragically, that does not make any difference. We are not going to be allowed to know what the Russian people are like, and they are not going to be allowed to know what we are like.

But we are endeavoring, it seems to me, in the measure which is now before us, to uphold the hands of the responsible people of western Europe. I want you to feel with me, if you will, that there are over there, as most of you know, just as there are here, a great group of responsible people who have to bear the burdens of civilization, and who have to carry the weight of civilization's faults. People who are responsible not only for their own conduct but for the conduct of peoples less able to think, and with less stability of character, and less know-how, less easily persuaded to bear the burdens as well as the benefits of democracy.

Some time ago when we were discussing the interim-aid bill, we were told it was a relief bill. It did not seem like that to me. I saw in that bill as you all saw, or at least most of you saw, this relationship between imports and exports to which reference has been made this morning. What does this mean? It means nothing less than this: There are in Europe, as there are in America, men and women who can be trusted in these troublesome times, who are laboring under greater difficulties than we, because they have suffered the wounds and destruction of war, as well as the economic burdens with which we ourselves are contending. Those are the people whose hands we must sustain. True enough, the emphasis of that bill was for relief, because if the responsible people of the world cannot find ways to see to it that the irresponsible people are fed and clothed, then government fails.

It does not seem to me that we owe any apology to anyone when we direct and channel our aid in sufficient and adequate amount to support the efforts of people like that, so that they in turn may carry with us this tremendous burden of democratic civilization, which without the integrity of that kind of people in Europe and that kind of people in the United States is bound to fail.

Therefore I must oppose this amendment, although I honestly think I know as much about the value of money, and the difficulty of bothering about the standard of living of other peoples, as most of you do. The democratic regimes are bound to fail unless we make adequate provision to help them. I think we should err, if we err at all, on the side of generosity, in view of the fact that no matter what we say here about this being for a 4-year period, we know that we must in the future face this question again next year.

I urge you, in the name of people like yourselves in all of the countries of western Europe—and I assume China, too, although I know nothing about that—I urge you that we do the adequate and the sufficient thing at this time. The eyes of the world are upon us. If there was ever a bill before the House in the two short years of my service here with which I have no difficulty, it is this bill. On this bill I am truly relaxed. I have been in favor of this plan ever since it has been projected; it is the only plan that is offered short of a shooting war. I figure that it has about a 50-50 chance to succeed, but that sounds like a sound speculation to me when the safety and security, even the very lives, of the people of the world are at stake.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on a limitation of debate on this amendment to 30 minutes, with 5 minutes for the committee.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object to that, unless we can get 5 minutes each.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, the remarks that we have just heard, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK], in my opinion, constitute one of the most powerful speeches I have ever heard during my years as a Member of this body, for logic and clear thinking. The remarks just made by our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] seem to me to be convincing. Let us pause for a moment and look over the world. In 1939, 1940, and 1941, we were fighting in this very Chamber to do the things that would meet Hitler and nazism, the first devil. We have got to be frank with ourselves and with each other. We had to lick the first devil first, for our own protection and for our own existence and for our own national interest. We have got to think clearly, based upon conditions that exist. We cannot let what we would like to see existing govern our reasoning or what we would hope for. We are faced with a very practical situation. We have got to view the practical situation that confronts us from a realistic angle. It is not what we would like to see or what we would hope and pray for. If we are going to do some praying, we might follow what the Right Reverend Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen said yesterday, that we do some praying ourselves, and pray that the good Lord will put into our minds thoughts to do the right thing, and that we will take the right course, not only for our own country but for a future decent world.

Now, what has happened? Where is Lithuania? Where is Estonia? Where is Latvia? Does that mean anything to any of us? Where is Poland? Where is Rumania? Where is Bulgaria? Where is Yugoslavia? Where is Albania?

Where is Hungary? What is the situation in Austria? What attempt is being made against Greece and Turkey? Who is doing it? Is it the United States of America? No. It is the Soviet Union that has done all these things. What about Finland? Does that mean anything to us from our own national interest in 1948, with the rapidity of travel, and the fact that 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean is no longer a first line of defense; and at a time in our world's history when we cannot afford to let the smallest speck of an island in the Atlantic get into the hands of a future potential enemy of ours; with a course that is necessary in our own national defense and our own national interest. What do you suppose will happen to Finland? What is the next step? Norway and Sweden? What about Denmark? As a matter of fact, I have no knowledge, but I would not be surprised if already the Soviet Union has not made demands upon Norway. If Norway comes within the direct sphere of the Soviet orbit, what effect does that have upon our national interest, not in 1848 but in 1948?

What about Greenland and the effects of pressure there, if successful? Yes; Iceland! What about the Lowlands of Europe? Then what about the attempt being made in Italy? If Italy goes, the chances are that all Europe goes. If Italy goes, there will be a pincers, one blade into the Mediterranean, the other into the Baltic and the Atlantic. What do those things mean to us, not from the angle of hope but from the realistic angle to make a future decent world, as well as for our own national interest? And our existence is linked up with an existence in a future decent world somewhere of other free nations, but from our own direct national interest what does it mean to us? So I like to examine it from the standpoint of the national interest of our own country. It is of vital importance that we act affirmatively and effectively, not only affirmatively but effectively.

Only a few days ago the great head of the Catholic Church, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, was speaking to 400,000 people in Rome, and nobody knows more about world conditions than he. He said, in the words of the Redeemer, "He who is not with Me is against Me," paraphrasing the words of the Redeemer. I say, "He who is not with America—the Communist—is against America." This observation also applies to any other subversive person or group.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Well, here we are again in the attitude of a psychological crowd, the same old story, trying to play upon the emotions of the people and dethrone their reason. But you are not going to fool the people back home this time; they have heard this before, they have seen it played for political purposes; this is once, though, they do not propose to be catapulted into a war, and they are not going to divest themselves of their own resources that are needed to defend themselves if it becomes necessary.

I remember being over in France at the time our first group of soldiers were marching up to the front. It was a wonderful and a glorious sight to see them and to hear the music. That was all fine. I saw them afterward, too. I saw them in the hospitals. So I know something about what war means or did mean then.

But just think of this—we were sending the flower of our young manhood to France to protect France, yet I have the documented evidence that when France was short of materials she simply sent word over to Germany as to what she needed in order to fight; and when Germany was short she told France what she needed in the way of war materials, and they were constantly exchanging war materials across the line while our men were fighting. Do not misunderstand me. I have documentary evidence to show that. That shows the rottenness of the whole world military set-up.

Now, what are we doing in this bill? During this last war we were shipping the material necessary for Germany which she got from European countries. I have the records of how much we sent. We sent war materials to Mussolini, and I have the record to show how much we were sending. We shipped war materials to Japan. I have the authentic record.

Do you think this ERP shipment of goods is going to stay in the 16 countries we are talking about? Do you think the goods are going to stay with them? You had better stop and do a little thinking on this subject. What is going to happen is this—the very goods that you are sending over there to the 16 nations will be seeping right into the satellite countries of Russia. Our allies are going to help her get our ERP goods.

Yesterday the question of the 1,100 locomotives that we gave to Great Britain under lend-lease was mentioned. Well, remember, she has a socialistic government and they are very sympathetic with Russia. Right now the engineers are here to find out if it is possible to narrow the gage of those 1,100 locomotives. Why? Because England proposes to sell them to Russia. Why?

As I told you yesterday, this whole thing is a gigantic fraud.

We should make our own Nation strong. We should show that we can make our Government work and the whole world will take notice. There will be revolutions in other countries to better conditions and bring about representative governments.

We can make this country strong. When the people gave us their mandate 2 years ago they did not think this Republican Congress was going to lead them into the greatest international boondoggling program that this country has ever seen. But they see it now, and you will hear from it when you go home; and do not make any mistake about it.

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

Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion yesterday on the way our relief goods are being distributed in Europe, I believe a letter received a few weeks ago from an American officer serving in Greece will be interesting as it contains some very pertinent information, particularly in view of the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

After the salutation, the letter reads:

> From reports from home, evidently the stories out of Greece indicate that there is a general civil war. But such is not the case. There is a small area in the north, some 300 miles from Athens, where guerrillas come down from the mountains and attack villages, burn houses, steal food, kill certain people, and conscript young men to go with them. It is estimated there are only a small group of bandits—possibly 20,000.
>
> I wish I could sit down and talk with you about the situation here. I am not impressed with the reaction of the Greek Government to our aid. As a matter of fact, they have taken this time to criticize all Americans instead of cooperating with them. The Greek politicians seem to think that Americans must, whether they like it or not, give millions of dollars to them to spend as they see fit.
>
> I do not believe the American taxpayers know that when consumer goods are bought with our money and sent to Greece that the Government of this country takes those goods and sells them to merchants. In many instances the merchant marks up his goods by at least 500 percent before he sells them. You may pass this information on to your associates.

This discloses the thinking of the people we are aiding and their attitude toward America and our people. It does not seem possible that we would vote to continue aid under these conditions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending amendment, and then I am against the bill, because we have to consider more carefully than we are just what we are doing by passing such legislation as this. Unless this bill is amended materially I could not be for it.

Mr. Chairman, on March 25 our country was $253,000,000,000 in the red, whereas all of the other countries included in the Marshall plan and this bill, except China, Japan, and Spain, are in the red to the extent of $181,000,000,000. We have a debt of over $70,000,000,000 more than the combined debt of those other countries. Then how can we finance the world? Why should you think we can?

Mr. Chairman, statements have been made by Members on the floor of this House that this legislation is at best but a chance. We do not know. We are hoping that it will do some good. We think so. We believe it is a 50–50 proposition. Mr. Chairman, if I were spending $17,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money I would want to know that it is definitely going to do some good. I would not have any doubt in my own mind that it is a chance. If we take from the people of this country through this legislation this tremendous sum of money, it should be something that is going to be permanently sound and permanently sensible. We should be sound enough to know it was money wisely and soundly spent for the benefit of our people.

It is stated that the people of the country want this legislation, but that is just

because of the large amount of propaganda that has been sent out. The people do not know what is involved. What is going to happen when the bill is passed, if we pass it today? The first thing will be that all merchandise in this country is going to advance 5 or 10 percent. Everybody knows you are going to buy the greater amount of merchandise here in this country away from our own people who are hollering now about high prices. Then we will have the unions after more money, because they cannot buy that merchandise. Why do you as Congressmen not give consideration to our own people, their welfare, their comfort, their needs? This money will most all be wasted, squandered, and do very little good to our own country, but will mean higher taxes and higher prices, also scarce commodities to our own people.

Now, what are you going to do? Are you going to take care of the American people or are you going to sink America by passing this kind of legislation? I want to say that it is about time that we woke up and looked after the people of this country. We have just got to think about some of the founders who established this country of ours. Just think of Thomas Jefferson. He said:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared.

I tell you men that with the debt we have now anything can happen to us if we do not look after our own country and our own people. You cannot take in all the nations of the world and expect to do everything that they want, and expect to keep this country in good financial condition. It just cannot happen. As a manufacturer, if I start to manufacture 100 articles and my salesmen want me to make everything they want to sell, I will have to make too many items, and I cannot manufacture them in proper quantity or economically, but if I take 10 items and manufacture them in a good, sound, business way, and market them properly I will make a success of my business. The same thing applies here now. Congress is now sticking its nose into everybody's business in every country in the world too much, too many, and Marshall is down in South America, and when he comes back he will have another program to consider no doubt. I have never seen in all my life such extravagance and such waste, why you do not have the proper consideration of our people, our country's welfare, or our ability to assume all this obligation. It has proven already these gifts are wrong. Look at England, $4,100,000,000 wasted, Greece and Turkey, $300,000,000 gone, 7,000,000 Czechs now in Russian hands. Lend-lease now building up Russia. Stop this bill; do it now, is my prayer.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with the greatest question that has come up in a long while. We ought to be able to get our heads out of the sand, take a look at things and realize that if that part of the world not already behind the iron curtain is not organized to the point where it can successfully repel the aggressions of Russia, all is lost. The pending amendment should be voted down.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, before I ask the questions of the Committee, which I rise to ask, I want to express my personal feeling, and I say this with respect to the Committee, that no more unfortunate thing could be done today than to limit debate. This debate precedes one of the crises in the history of the United States. We are today deciding the extent to which we will jeopardize the freedom and the liberty of the United States in the belief that that effort will, in turn, protect the liberties of people abroad when, in the minds of many people here, we should be strengthening our liberties and strengthening our country in order that we may protect the liberties of people both here and abroad.

My questions are these: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] offered an amendment to reduce the amount of money appropriated in this bill. There have been several altruistic speeches made on the basis that we should do something for the good of the people of the world. So I rise to ask a very practical question, and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] will give me his attention as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

When the 16 ministers met in Paris, upon whose studies and upon whose report this so-called Marshall plan is based, the details of which are very obviously not known to Mr. Marshall himself, when this plan came to Washington it did not contain a request for the amount of money embodied in the bill when the committee brought it to the floor. In other words, the foreign ministers, in the original conference in Paris, as shown in the report—and the page numbers have been recited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—when those foreign ministers met they did not expect the United States of America to put up $6,800,000,000, as the committee brings the bill to the floor. To say that it is $5,300,000,000 is, to my mind, meaningless. That is merely a translation of 15 months into 12 months, so we are talking about the same thing. The foreign ministers did not ask the United States to put up $5,300,000,000. They expected, boiled down, that the United States would probably be called upon for about $2,600,000,000. Their intent was to bring out in these countries their own currencies which were in hiding. Their intent, specified in their report, furnished every Member of this Congress and placed upon hi or her desk, was to use their own assets which are in other countries. They expected that where material or food came from South American countries or from Canada those countries should extend credit or take some of the load, and not that the United States should carry the entire load.

I will yield to the gentleman from New York for an answer to this question: Am I not right in the statements I am making, and has not the gentleman as well as myself placed those figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. GWINN of New York. The figures are in the report itself; the Paris report of the 16 nations confirms what you say.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The foreign ministers did not expect the United States to put up $5,300,000,000. In the face of that, and without other information from the committee which would deny these facts, which are printed in the report upon which the so-called Marshall plan is based, I ask the committee, why should not this Congress vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], which attempts to reduce the amount to a figure more nearly like that requested by the foreign ministers, upon whose studies and report the original request was based? That is my question.

Mr. VORYS. That is a long question, and I shall try to give a short answer. The amount which is in the committee bill was arrived at after screening by our own experts, by the Krug committee and by the Harriman committee, and represents a proportionate reduction in what the 16 CEEC countries hoped they would get. As the gentleman knows, they first wanted $29,000,000,000, then $22,000,000,000, and then we reduced their ideas to $17,000,000,000. This $5,300,000,000 would be the first part, merely the part for the first year. It is of course impossible in 5 minutes or 5 days to review the mass of material we have gone through that makes us feel the amount is justified.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman admits, then, that Congress does not have the information.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been trying to get myself in a frame of mind where I can support this bill. I intend to support this amendment. I may say that it is becoming for me more difficult every minute to support this bill at all.

I have had the privilege recently of being out in the Midwest. I find a rather amazing situation not only among the people but right here in this Congress, at least right in this House. Never, probably, in the history of America has any legislative proposal had the benefit of as great propaganda as this bill has had. The activities of P. T. Barnum would be nothing compared with the words that have gone out over the radio and in the press to sell this thing to the people for something that it obviously is not.

Incidentally, if this were a bill to aid hungry people, people made hungry and homeless because of war, you would pass it here with probably not a dissenting vote. I find here in the House, in spite of the fact that the leadership of two great parties are promoting this legislation, that there is a great lack of confidence in it, right here among the people who are going to vote for it. Now how do you explain that? While I was at

home and had the privilege of meeting many people, they asked me many questions about this bill which I could not answer and I am relaying them to you in the hope that perhaps you may be able to furnish the answer to me.

The people are pointing out that certain countries are included in the bill, which countries did not take any part in the war, for example Ireland, Portugal, and Iceland. My grandfather and grandmother came from Ireland. I have a great affection for the Old Sod. But why do we include Ireland, which was not in the war and which so far as we know did not suffer from the war. Then I told them that I had heard it had something to do with the balance of trade, which really means the balance of production. If the balance of trade is against Ireland or any other country, it means that the balance of production is against Ireland. If we are going to adopt that philosophy, where are we going to stop? Are you going to go to every country which spends more than it makes and make up the difference? Of course, we have done that in our own country, I admit. That is the philosophy upon which the New Deal has always operated. But I suspect that when you undertake to spread that doctrine all over the world, you are going to run into a bankrupt nation before you get the job done.

The next thing, it is said that this will prevent war. Let me tell you that the people do not believe that. Do not disillusion them any more. They are not in a mood to be disillusioned. They are very disturbed now, and the debate and the facts here show that we do not believe in this bill ourselves. While we are arguing about this bill which you claim will prevent war, in other places here in Washington they are urging large appropriations for national defense. I am in favor of that incidentally. I would like to see a big Air Force built up. It seems to me if the danger of war is so imminent, why not rely upon the only thing that has brought us safely to victory through two World Wars, and that is our own strong right arm? Of course, the people do not believe that this bill will prevent war. You do not believe it and the administration does not believe it.

Now I want to go to another point. They say that this will prevent communism. Many of you seem to assume that. You take it for granted. I have heard no explanation of how this bill will do that, but apparently you accept the philosophy that communism comes from hunger, and that if you are poor and are lacking in worldly goods, then you will be a Communist. If that had been true, Mr. Chairman, the people who built my State would have been Communists, because they had very little to start with. It is not lack of wealth which makes communism but lack of opportunity, and let us not forget that.

For years in this country we have been going down the road toward socialism. Through monopoly in business and labor unions and bureaucracy in Government we have destroyed opportunity for our young people. The lavish spending of Government money in this or any other country will not prevent the spread of communism, socialism, or any other form of statism, unless opportunity is once again afforded to our people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto with respect to the amount in this title close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto with respect to amount close in 35 minutes with the last 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some time on this amendment, and taking into consideration the number of Members who are on their feet who apparently want to speak on this amendment, that limitation of time would certainly cut them off.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, in this Chamber we have no peers. Some of us are better suited to serve in one capacity, while others are better fitted to serve in another capacity. I, personally, believe with all my heart the statement that this is the greatest deliberative body in the world. I may at times be disappointed in the way some of my friends vote. No doubt my friends are disappointed many times in the way I cast my vote; but I am never critical of them—that is a matter that each Member must decide for himself.

I have heard it said in the past few days around here, that if we were to have a secret ballot here on this bill, there would not be 50 votes for it. That, I don't believe, unless the roll call shall finally determine that to be true. If the statement is true that a huge portion of the membership of this body would cast a different secret vote than they would a public vote—which I again repeat, I do not believe—then God save the country.

It has now been a little over 2 years since the end of World War II, which cost us a million casualties and left us with a staggering debt of nearly $300,000,000,000. We annihilated Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and stopped them as the aggressors of their days; but in so doing, we were compelled to exhaust many of our resources, natural and otherwise. The whole thing has caused a terrific impact on our economy. Only an inflated and unparalleled continuance of an abnormal national income can prevent, in my humble opinion, national and personal bankruptcy. Certainly everyone I am sure will agree that in order to finance requested budgets, domestic and foreign, that it can only be done in the event our national income continues at substantially the present level.

We are now threatened—if we are to believe those who know in the executive branch of our Government—with another world war. Another ruthless dictator, one of our partners in World War II, is on the march. We are told, and from every indication, his intentions are to make the world safe for communism and to supplant with it every republican form of government and every representative democracy now in existence.

Every loyal American hates and despises communism. It acknowledges no God except the state, and it respects and recognizes neither freedom nor liberty for the individual citizen.

I am sure that every loyal American wants to do everything he can, regardless of cost, to stop the onward march of those who would destroy liberty and freedom and enshrine in their place slavery and despotism.

We were told and the country has been led to believe that this bill is designed to and would thwart and retard the march of communism by lending and giving economic aid and assistance to 16 countries in Europe who would band themselves together to fight the march of communism. Having been led to believe that this proposed legislation was to afford economic aid and security, and to assist this group of friendly nations in Europe to halt the march of communism, I had purposed in my heart to vote for the bill; but, Mr. Chairman, who do we now find?

This is not a bill to assist the so-called 16 friendly countries of Europe in the fight to stop the spread of communism. This is not a bill to make friends of hungry and naked people by feeding and clothing them. This is not a bill to support private enterprise in the countries of Europe and to assist them in rebuilding their factories.

On the other hand, in its increased and enlarged form this seems to be a bill to subsidize, indirectly at least, some segments of American business, industry, and to some extent American agriculture. You have millions in this bill to subsidize the American tobacco industry. Yesterday we subsidized the corn growers of America. Oh, yes, it is true that we limited it by saying that they could not use the corn to make whisky, but that seems to be the extent of the limitation. Are we going to feed the hungry people in Europe tobacco and clothe the naked with corn husks?

Yes, we are going to bail out in this bill bad and unwise investments of many groups and individuals here and abroad. We are committing ourselves not only to economic aid in Europe, but to military aid in Europe and Asia. There are no limitations in this bill as to the time, except a minimum of 4 years that we shall continue to donate, nor as to the ultimate amount that we will give away. We are starting on a program which I suspect if we can make it work at all, will ultimately cost us in China alone, $25,000,000,000.

Now I would not particularly be opposed to that, if the American people could afford it. I do not believe our economy can stand the drain that this bill now contemplates in its enlarged form, without wrecking our own Government and bankrupting our own people.

This bill as now contemplated, will leave us nothing with which to strengthen our own national defenses. If we are to be safe, in my judgment we need to augment substantially our Army, our Navy,

our Air Corps, and the entire over-all preparedness program necessary for our own national security and our national defense.

This bill as now written and enlarged, will, in my humble judgment, of necessity require a return to wartime controls, rationing, and the OPA. If this is done, we will not be able to reconstruct our own defense plants and take care of the absolute needs of our people to carry on the industrial pursuits and agricultural pursuits necessary to maintain our economy and give us a national income of sufficient portion and size to pay our bills.

If I should vote for this bill as now written and enlarged, I should certainly oppose tax reduction at this time and should vote to sustain the President's veto of the pending tax bill.

We just cannot have our cake and eat it too.

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

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, but I shall have to admit that the last hour of debate on yesterday and what has gone on thus far this morning would cause almost any Member of the House to worry about the purposes of the expenditures under this bill. It seems to me that a lot of work will have to be done by the conferees when the bill goes to conference ultimately to have a law that will satisfy the American people; and then we are placing a tremendous burden upon our Appropriations Committee to see to it that only so much money is appropriated for the various purposes as is truly justified. I would like at this time if I could, in view of the serious shortages of fuel oil in Massachusetts last winter, to find out from some member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] because he spoke yesterday about it, just what the intention is under this bill with reference to petroleum products.

According to the RECORD, page 3764, it is agreed that $3,500,000,000 is to be spent on petroleum requirements, petroleum equipment, and tanker shipping in the next 4 years. That would indicate that a billion dollars of this appropriation this year is going into petroleum.

The further statement appears that about 76.7 percent of the petroleum requirements will come from the Western Hemisphere.

I would like to have the chairman tell us whether or not in the determination of the amount of money for this year any thought was given as to how much would be spent next year for petroleum requirements?

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman was here yesterday, he will remember that the members of the great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee submitted a list of questions along this line and I agreed that I would have full answers for them later in the day. That will answer their questions and the gentleman's questions.

Mr. CLASON. In other words, the gentleman does not have the answer for them right now. Is that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. VORYS. I do not propose to take up time while we are debating the amount of this bill in going over, over, and over again the same thing when we are going to clear it up a little later in the day.

Mr. CLASON. Then it looks to me as far as the gentleman's committee is concerned that it is not in a position to tell the Members of this Congress at this time whether the people of western Massachusetts, the people who suffered during this past winter because of failure to receive petroleum products that they needed, whether or not they are going to have it next year and to what extent the future is going to be badly affected by the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. As I understand from the official figures of the committee, this bill provides for $3,500,000,000 in the 4 years for petroleum and petroleum products, steel and equipment. If we can cut out of this bill $1,300,000,000 we will have more oil left for the United States of America.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, on the point of cutting the bill $1,300,000,000, may I say that I am going to vote for the full amount of the bill. I shall hope that the conferees will come out with legislation under which the money can be spent in a manner that will safeguard the interests of our people. I am very frankly disappointed that during the hour of debate yesterday on tobacco, on liquor, and on everything else, no one seemed to be able to give to the House proper answers to questions which were raised here, as I see it, by persons who are anxious to support the bill. I am worried that one-fifth of the money to be spent on this program is to go into petroleum. It seems to me that we ought to have due regard for the interests of our own people. I certainly wish that the committee had reported a bill with the Herter proposal or set-up in it. I believe then we would be assured of a businesslike operation of this act. I am not so certain under this bill that we will have such operation.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. There are two points. One is the question of our own domestic economy. As the bill is now written the Administrator is instructed to protect our own domestic economy.

On the question of how much oil is to go out of the country, it is my recollection that the estimates of requirements, not what would necessarily be exported from this country, are roughly 100,000,000 barrels. However, there is specific provision in the bill that there is not a single commitment to ship out any commodity.

Mr. CLASON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill and I do that for one reason only and that is it will not achieve its announced objective of stopping the mad onrush of communism across western Europe. If I thought it would do that I would support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, may I say at this time that I am going to vote for all measures which I think will put this country in the state of preparedness that it should be, whether it be the revival of selective service or building up a 70-group air force. If you will remember, when Secretary Marshall made his Harvard speech, on the basis of that speech this bill was not designed at that time and it was not stated to the American people then that its purpose was to stop communism throughout the world. In fact Russia and her satellite countries were asked to participate in it and they can do that under this bill. But it was found that the bill would not go through on any such basis. So they have now given us this sugar-coat.

All of us, if we thought it would actually result in stopping communism, would vote for it. I listened to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yesterday, who told us about a laborer over there in Germany, Italy, or France who could not even lift a railroad tie because he was so weak. But how is that railroad worker going to feel when he has to pay black market prices to get this food we are supposed to be sending over there, and which the poor believe will be free? What is the psychological impact going to be on him? You know what it is going to be. In most cases those fellows do not have money to buy food. We cannot get the Foreign Affairs Committee to tell us why they make those people pay for those goods in local currency. They are as silent as a tomb on that. And it costs the American taxpayer just as much as if it were free to those people.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated before, I spent 2 years in France. I know those people. I paid out millions and millions of dollars of your money over there in foreign claims. I know the psychological impact of the people of France, Italy, Luxemburg, and Germany when they get American money.

You must always remember this: that you cannot bribe "Horatius to hold the bridge." If you think you can, I say to you that it is a foolish thought. Horatius wanted to hold the bridge. He didn't have to be paid. Let me ask you this: When we were sitting here as we did yesterday, when we were trying to write in the Colmer amendment and had the debate on the Mundt amendment, what did we find? We found the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] resisting it with all the vigor at his disposal. "Oh, no; we cannot make Russia mad. Russia is a friendly nation." And yet we find that here Thursday, a week ago, the President of the United States came in here and asked us for these three proposals, and telling us what a threat Russia is, and then we find him again last week saying that we have to keep on shipping more materials such as airplane engines to Russia, because she is a "friendly" nation. I ask you, how can we accept blindly such leadership? We have left such shipments to the discretion of the Administrator under this bill. If he is appointed by the President of

the United States, is he going to exercise any more discretion than Harriman, than Marshall, than President Truman in allowing war material to be shipped to Russia? Oh, no; they keep on shipping war materials over to Russia, and will likely continue to do so. How many of you listened to the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] yesterday, and the letter he received from the shipping people in New York showing the war material we are shipping to Russia? I say to you it is wishful thinking that the Administrator under this program is going to exercise any more discretion than Marshall, Harriman, and President Truman have exercised the last 3 months. I say to you that this bill is not designed to stop communism and it will not stop it in western Europe.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the statement ought to be cleared up. The gentleman comes from an oil State. This bill carries something like $3 500,000,000 for oil, to which we are committed, but if we only furnish $250,000,000 we must buy it from other countries and send it to western European countries at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is right. But how can you clear it up if the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VORYS], who is in charge of the bill, cannot or will not clear it up? They either do not know what is in the bill, or they will not tell us. I will tell you that the housewives, the farmers, the motorists, and the oil companies in this country that are short of steel and who are trying to produce domestic oil, are going to be vitally interested in this bill. The farmers are going to be interested in it when this bill goes through tonight, and they can't get farm machinery. Everybody is going to be interested in it also about 3 months from now when prices go up and when the OPA controls and rationing are restored. I think, even despite all of the dislocations and hardships that this bill will cause, I would be for it if it would do what it is supposed to do. But it will not. So I shall vote against it. The eighteen billions outlined under the Marshall plan should be used instead to build for us the greatest air force in the world.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that there are no delusions regarding where 60 to 70 percent of this money is going. Of this year's appropriations, about the first 60 or 70 percent is going to England, and that has all been agreed upon. If that is not true, will someone on the Committee on Foreign Affairs say so? Hearing no answer, I presume that that is true.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will answer it.

Mr. O'HARA. Very well.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill provides that that amount of money will go to England?

Mr. O'HARA. No; I understand that that is the agreement.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, there is no agreement.

Mr. O'HARA. There is nothing in the bill; no.

Mr. BLOOM. Not anything of the kind.

Mr. O'HARA. There is nothing in the bill, but does the gentleman deny that that is not the agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. That is not the agreement. There is no agreement specifically made for any amount of money allocated any place.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. From the specialists in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I got the figures that something like the figures that the gentleman gave are supposed to go to England; about 40 or 50 percent of the whole amount, I think.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. In view of the fact the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] knows what has been committed and what has not, I wish he would tell us some of the commitments made in the Yalta and Tehran agreements.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I would like to find out that information also.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. According to the answer that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] gave, he does not know what is in the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. I understand they told the Committee on Rules that when they were before that committee.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. There is a substantial amount of this money for China. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Committee on Foreign Affairs ever saw the Wedemeyer report?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not know, I am sure. I wonder if the Committee on Foreign Affairs happened to look up the fuel-oil-investigation report by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which spent many months last year and this year upon the fuel-oil problem. I wonder, if in connection with fuel oil and steel whether they know, if this bill goes through, that everything that the oil industry has planned for our own domestic oil and transportation of oil is knocked in the head, and at a time when our own citizens have been severely affected this last winter.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts is worrying about freezing to death next winter, I want to tell him that probably the people of Minnesota and North and South Dakota and a few other places will be freezing to death, too, but is any consideration given to our own conditions? No. We are thinking about all the world and forgetting our own people and our own economy, and the desperate shortage of critical materials.

For something over 6 months I tried to get a farm tractor for a farmer up home who needed it very badly, and I finally got it. We are trying to get fuel oil up there for our tractors now, so the farmers can plow, and we cannot get 120 tank cars. What is going to happen when you take out of this economy of ours all of these things, all of the tractors, trucks, and the other things our own people need? Are we supposed to have a complete destruction of our own economy? Is that the theory upon which we operate as legislators of the United States?

Mr. RFED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. In a warehouse in Athens there is $10,000,000 worth of tools shipped over there to UNRRA. They are still there. They were not anything they could use, and they had no facilities to use them. That is one instance and there are many more. Under this bill that sort of thing will go on, and the taxpayers will pay the bill for things that cannot be used over there.

Mr. O'HARA. Then we will have OPA. OPA will tell you when and what you can have. We will have that in this country following this bill. That is as assured as the passage of this bill. The President spoke awhile ago about being opposed to those things which lead up to a police state. When you have OPA and you have the draft and you have UMT and you have the Marshall plan, where have we to go from there? What is there left?

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. An Associated Press article appearing in the papers recently stated that Poland was shipping to England 400,000 pounds of pork and a million dozen eggs. I just wonder how Poland could be so well off and all the rest of Europe in a desperate condition?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not question the statement the gentleman made.

We are supposed to hurry this bill through so that it will pertain to the election in Italy. Is it expected that we are to influence or buy elections all over Europe? The implications of such a program is amazing.

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

Mr. Chairman, I never desire to and I always seek not to give offense, but I have heard some very familiar talk here today. I heard it in 1938, in 1939, in 1940, and even in 1941. We were trying in an appropriation in the late 30's to build 3,500 trainer ships. Some of the men who have spoken here today said, "Why so many airplanes? Whom do you expect to fight with 3,500 airplanes?"

The following year an appropriation was up for 5,500 airplanes.

And those who voted against all of our preparations for war before Pearl Harbor asked that question again. They asked "Whom do you expect to fight? Why 5,500 planes? Why all these trainer planes?" One after another we heard such questions resisting everything that we were trying to do to prepare this country to defend itself. It is a remarkable thing that in the debate on this amendment, I have heard only one Member who has spoken in favor of it even indicate that he was going to vote for any part of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on yesterday. He said he made mistakes in the late thirties. I think you are making mistakes today. And with reference to all this rot that if you had a secret ballot here this bill would not get 50 votes, in my opinion, and I have watched the House of Representatives for a long, long time—in my humble opinion this bill would get more votes on a secret ballot than on an open ballot. England? You say that some of this money will go to England? Who held the line until we could get ready to defend ourselves? You thought 3,500 airplanes were too much? You thought that 5,500 airplanes were too much? If we had had 25,000 airplanes fully equipped with men to fly them and bombs to fight with, we probably would not have been attacked at Pearl Harbor. Germany and Italy would not have declared war upon us the very next day.

Strip this measure of its humanitarian features. Strip it of the defense feature which to me is the main thing. I am casting a vote today that I believe is in the defense of the United States of America and in defense of our civilization. Strip it of such things as the defense of our country and humanity. Get down to the economy of the thing—the dollars and cents. It is as important to the cotton farmers of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Texas that western Europe be rehabilitated as it is for western Europe itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have my head in the sand, and I do not think my vision is obscured by any European fog. I came back to Congress to represent America and my district.

I have heard a lot of statements that this bill was written by Bevin in England; that it was written by the State Department. I have heard a lot of talk about the fact that we were all confused. But this committee is not confused. They tell you in plain English that anyone who reads can understand what the purpose of this bill is. I want to read it to you. You will find it on page 35 of the Committee on Foreign Affairs report:

The aim of the program is to restore Europe, not to save American interests from the impacts of peace.

I will read it again:

The aim of the program is to restore Europe, not to save American interests from the impacts of peace.

That is not obscure. You understand that. In other times and at other places this would be questionable language for an American to utter. That is the unconcealed purpose. It is for the interest of Europe, and not for the benefit of America.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for five additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. I object.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. VORYS. I object.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I was told last week in general debate on this bill that I would have time to talk about it this week. I think some of the rest of us know something about foreign affairs. Some of us served all the way from the coast of France to Berlin. I only wish I had an opportunity to tell you members of this committee some of those observations.

I listened with interest to the distinguished former Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. I also listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. He made a wonderful presentation. I find that one trouble with this Congress is that so few of us have the courage to stand alone. I believe that World War I could have been prevented. I believe that World War II could have been prevented. This Marshall plan will not prevent world war III. I say that for this reason: Even the proponents of this bill admit that the bill is a military measure. Do you think for a moment that Theodore Roosevelt, George Patton, or Andrew Jackson would support such a diversionary, defensive, such a passive bill? They would have sent word straight to Moscow and asked Joe Stalin to meet them in Paris, or somewhere, and told him in no uncertain terms, "We will prevent you from moving another foot in Europe or anywhere else." This bill is sending your wife out to confer with the neighborhood bully and tell him to please go away.

Mr. Chairman, sometime, some day, somewhere, you are going to have to face the masters of the Kremlin on the field of battle or else in a conference right now and tell them in no uncertain terms.

If you place the national security of this country under the Marshall plan, or the Bevin plan, or whatever you want to call it, it is only stalling for time. Who benefits by this time gained? Does the United States benefit? I rather think it is Soviet Russia, with their undeveloped resources. They are gaining militarily every day. If you pass this plan, in 5 years or 10 years they will be the strongest nation in the world. Today your Nation is the strongest nation. So I say, let us have a show-down now and not throw away this $17,000,000,000, which I personally believe, from my observation of Europe, Russia is in favor of.

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

Mr. DORN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Practically everyone admits that Russian could take all of Europe within a few weeks' time.

Mr. DORN. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SHORT. Why pour $17,000,000,000 over there, building up a prize for them to get, and sharpening the knife to cut our own throat?

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is exactly right, to gobble up, just as they gobbled up $300,000,000 of your money in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Chairman, I talked to Gen. Ira C. Eaker last year, a very great general. He said that Russia could overrun Europe in a few weeks.

This Marshall plan will not stop them. The only thing that will stop them is for America to have the greatest air force in the world.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has said that we should send somebody over to talk with Stalin. The gentleman referred to General Jackson and a few others. Would he send Harry Truman to talk with him?

Mr. DORN. I certainly would not as he met Stalin before at Potsdam and was in agreement with him. That is one of the reasons why I am voting against this bill, incompetent leadership. They have reversed themselves, and that includes the Secretary of State. They have reversed themselves on nearly every foreign policy they have promulgated.

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

Mr. DORN. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. SHORT. We adopted the Morgenthau plan. It was asinine, stupid, one that every person today repudiates. We walked uphill and we walked down again. We walked up the hill one day and walked down the next on Trieste, on the partitioning of Palestine, and on practically every other thing.

Mr. DORN. Practically every foreign policy they have started they later reversed their positions. And I would like to say this, you cannot create the peace of the world by a vindictive policy such as the Morgenthau plan. They are still destroying factories in Germany and in the same breath say that Germany is the key to European recovery. The leadership advocates this money to fight communism and the same leadership O. K.'s airplane engines for Russia. I wish they would tell us what their foreign policy really is.

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

Mr. DORN. I still ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DORN) there were—ayes 19, noes 173.

So the motion was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to make an announcement?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. HALLECK. Many Members have asked me about the possibility of another vote on the tax bill. I take this opportunity to advise the membership that until further notice I think they should hold themselves in readiness to vote on it this week.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

This, Mr Chairman, is not a simple challenge, it is a complex challenge. We are involved in a subversive war now. This bill is an attempt to respond to one aspect of this challenge. The strategy that we have to resort to now cannot be confined to one measure. So I think it is something of an oversimplification to say that we should forget about this and go ahead wholly on the military tack. We must consider all these elements together. These several segments of our Nation's foreign policy must be advanced on a concurrent front.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that the only attempts to defend this bill have been on an altruistic basis. Curiously enough the attempt of the gentleman from Illinois to diminish the amount in the bill will result in its being nothing but a relief bill because it is that amount over and above the amount for relief, which will enable Europe to recover and take the load of relief off our backs. Accordingly, if we want to do this in the most expensive possible way we should adopt the Vursell amendment, but if we want to enable these countries to recover and rehabilitate themselves, we should adopt the full amount provided in this bill. Of course, the full amount is subject to a great many variables. There is no accurate way that any one can foresee the future. It is based on the balance of payments, it is based on dollar deficits and it is my hope that substantial savings can be effected by the Administrator. On the other hand, there may be a deficiency. The amount expended will depend on prices, it will depend on the extent to which foreign currencies are devalued, it will depend on other things. There are many imponderable, unpredictable factors which enter into this matter. However, there is no question about this fact: If we cut this amount it will be a signal to many people in the world that we were not really behind them. It would be far better for us to pass the full amount now. We should give the desirable psychological impetus at this critical time, especially to those people who are hard up against the gun right now in Italy and who are attempting to withstand the onslaught of Communist tyranny between now and April 18. It is advisable, therefore, that we pass the full amount which, be it said, falls far short of the dollar needs of these people, and will provide at best an austerity diet. If we cut it more we are taking more of a gamble.

The thought has been advanced here that this is a terrible gamble. It is a gamble, of course, but life itself is a gamble. We are taking far more of a gamble if we do not do this. There is no security in that choice. Just consider what will happen if we do not do this. Unquestionably Italy will go under on April 18 if we do not do this. The campaign now on in Italy is being fought mainly around this program; it is focussed on this proposal. What will be the consequences of that? Do we believe for a moment that we can go safely on our way friendless and alone in a world which is subjugated and oppressed by Communist tyranny? Why do we believe that we are so blessed, so favored by the Lord that we are going to be allowed to enjoy our own prosperity undisturbed? Do we think that our particular civilization here is so sacred that all we have to do is to pull in our horns and attend to our own knitting and other people will leave us alone? I am sure that is not the meaning of America, I am sure that is not the challenge of America, I am sure that is not the objective that our forefathers had in mind when they met the great challenge of their day.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that what we are doing here is only supporting recovery to the extent of 5 percent or less of the whole European economy, which is on a $100,000,000,000 basis right now, that we are not by any means supporting the Europeans? There has been so much said about figures that I think they should be clear.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DORN moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill S. 2202 to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I am grateful, and I think the American people will be, that he has used this parliamentary device to get this time to show the Foreign Affairs Committee that the American people in reference to this bill want it thoroughly debated, that there are some Members of this House who might perchance know as much about it as the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman very much. In that connection I will say this, that there is no deadline on passage of the Air Force measures; there is no deadline on other measures and issues before this Congress, which are more important than this bill. You can pass this Marshall bill and you can still lose the national integrity and independence of this country.

I would like to say this: Far be it from me to take up the time of this House frivolously. I regret very much to have to resort to measures like this to get the floor, but I was promised time last week on this bill, and was not allowed to speak in general debate. I was given a few minutes and told to extend my remarks in the RECORD and that I could have time under the 5-minute rule. I regret to have to do this. I respect this House. I enjoy serving here. But, I do say this, that Europe's trouble is largely moral and spiritual. You cannot save Europe with relief and you cannot buy lasting love with money, and you cannot buy lasting friendship with money. You are trying to buy off the people of Europe to stand between you and the bully that some day you will have to meet some time somewhere.

Now in regard to the military aspects of this bill: You listened to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], intimating that you again will have to send your boys overseas. Let me say this, that if you ever send your sons to Europe you will never build as large an army to invade Russia as Germany had on June 22, 1941. She invaded Russia with the largest army and the best equipped army that the world has ever known or will probably ever see again. Where did she get? She reached the gates of Moscow, Leningrad and Stalingrad, which is nowhere. She would have had to advance 2,000 miles further to get beyond the Urals. So when you talk about sending an army to Europe bigger than that, with all of the incidental transportation and equipment, it is too ridiculous to even think about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me ask the gentleman from South Carolina this, in response to the question discussed by the gentleman from Texas a while ago. If the President of the United States would present a program calling for $6,400,000,000 for an air force, I do not think he would find the gentleman from Oklahoma or the gentleman from South Carolina opposing it as we are opposing this bill.

Mr. DORN. We would fight right here for that bill until it was passed, and I believe it would pass. You may remember that Napoleon invaded Russia, too, with the largest and best-equipped army the world had ever known, up to that time and had to retreat in the face of weather and expansive territory. Let us talk about military tactics and military strategy. Your men in Europe today, the 100,000 men, are tactically and strategically in an impossible situation if Russia

started to move on land with her great combat armies. So, I say the only sane argument to use with Russia is to tell her that we are not going to permit the world to be swallowed up by them. We could dispatch our airplanes to LeBourget Field at Paris, to Munich and to Rome and evacuate them in a hurry if necessary, but you cannot evacuate troops overnight. But, an air force could bomb Russia from bases in western Europe, then retire to northern Africa or to England, and strike again. So, gentlemen of the committee, let us look at this thing from a scientific military and tactical standpoint. This bill will not stop communism. This bill will not stop Russia. And, I want this House to know that I am going on record here today as saying that and remember that when you do go into world war III. Yes; I will be enthusiastic again. I will probably volunteer, as I did before resigning from the South Carolina Senate. So did a lot of the boys from South Carolina in 1942. But, let me tell you this. You told us then, that is, the leaders of this country at that time, that the world would be a Utopia if we just got rid of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. But, look at the world today. During the war in France, in Normandy, General Patton's lead tanks wired back saying that they only had 15 minutes of gasoline left and "shall we stand still or fall back?" George Patton said, "Don't do either; you go forward." With that remaining gas they broke through the last German echelons of defense, and the German Army fell back in retreat.

Mark my words, you have a few days left, a few months. If you do not take a stand now it will be too late. You cannot stand still and wait, you cannot fall back. You have only a short time left so let us go forward with an aggressive policy that Russia will understand. This Marshall plan gives Russia the precious time that she needs to get ready then she could take over all Europe, including these billions of dollars.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I am against the preferential motion and the amendment as well. May I say to my good friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] that as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I had asked for recognition in order to yield 5 minutes of my time to him, because I like to hear him speak. I think he has taken a fine position on having a strong air force so that we in America will be adequately protected.

I disagree with the gentleman on this bill because I feel that the rehabilitation program is necessary. I feel that we have to have the full amount of the bill because we cannot send a boy to do a man's job. We American people are risking only 3 percent of our total income as insurance in a measure short of war. The American Congress must distinguish between war measures and measures short of war. It is often confusing that war measures are both military and economic, and measures short of war are also military and economic. We are here trying to use economic means as far as Europe is concerned, to build Europe up, so that the countries of Europe may take their place with the democratic countries in the system of free nations of the world.

Poverty, disease, and underfed children cause people to turn to alternatives they would not otherwise use. We know these conditions cause totalitarian governments and communistic methods. So that if we build them up above this limit of starvation and above this limit they want to be democratic citizens of the world and we feel that they will again stand beside us.

The thing that worries me as a Member of the Congress is that we are running at the rate of a seven to nine billion dollar deficit in our foreign exchange balance per year. Unless the American people have goods coming back to replace that tremendous deficit, we are going to have a greater inflation than by passing this plan. We intend to spend only about $6,000,000,000 on this plan, while we are cashing a blank check with nothing behind it for foreign countries at the possible rate of $9,000,000,000 a year, and we are getting nothing back for it.

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

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. Is it not true that the only country that sort of balanced exports against imports last year was Russia? I looked over those figures just for my own satisfaction, and the only country that came anywhere near balancing by giving us something in return for the goods she took away from us was Russia. That has not been brought out on the floor up until now, but that is the truth.

Mr. FULTON. May I say to the gentleman that I am not particularly pleased about the balance of payments in respect to Russian trade because, as it turned out, the United States was very foolishly the largest buyer from Russia in the August fur market. We sent them industrial materials that add to their war potential and took in return furs for garments. If that is a fair balance of Russian trade, I think somebody in the administration should have his head examined.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I listened to the remarks of my friend from South Carolina. He says he would call a meeting and tell Stalin where he got off. We would have to have something to show if Stalin told us where he did not get off. As a matter of fact, the passage of this bill is very important in that connection. It shows that America intends to use its power affirmatively. It seems to me that the passage of this bill would be consistent with the reasoning of my friend from South Carolina, rather than defeating the bill and then having a conference in our present predicament, because if Stalin refused to cooperate we would have nothing to back up our position.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina that we should also have the air force, so that if he did disagree we would be protected.

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

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

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman of course recognizes that Eisenhower, Marshall, and "Tooey" Spaatz are great militarists.

Mr. FULTON. Correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. They are in favor of the Marshall plan not only for the reason that it has an economic benefit but because it has some military benefit.

Mr. FULTON. That is an excellent point, that you have both the economic and the military benefits, because building up the economic potential also strengthens you militarily.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Did building up the economic potential of Czechoslovakia help stop Russia? They have got every bit of it now. That applies to Tito, too.

Mr. FULTON. I was in Czechoslovakia 4 or 5 months ago, and I have never seen a finer people in the world. The country is much smaller than Russia and the analogy is not appropriate to a program of this size.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to our former Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], whom we greatly admire and respect. He was recalling those days back in 1935 and 1936. I too recall those days very vividly because at that time the Congress was controlled by the Democratic Party, and they had a very large majority so that they could put across any legislation that they wanted regardless of what it was. We recall also hearing "rubber-stamp" Congress. So it is ridiculous to charge anybody on my side of the aisle with the responsibility for the events of those days. I also recall those days when we were converting young hogs into fertilizer and distributing the fertilizer to the farmers to increase their yield and production, which was then plowed under. I remind my very good and able friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that in those days with a war around the corner we had the WPA, the PWA, and planned economy, and planned scarcities, and we had various economic

movements. We had the flagpole sitters, the goldfish swallowers, and the ballet dancers. So I cannot feel that my side of the House is responsible for anything that happened then. The other side of the aisle was in complete charge. The difficulty today with this ERP legislation is that we have lost confidence in the administration. We do not have the confidence that the people who are going to be entrusted with this program will do the kind of job that we want done to get desired results. Why do we feel the way we do? Well, when we were in Italy last fall, I was down at Nettuno where I saw the graves of 7,499 American dead. Many of them were boys from my part of the country. As I looked over that great sea of crosses, I thought of those kids fighting their way in at the Anzio beachhead at a terrific cost and tremendous price of American lives. I also observed while there that communism was rampant everywhere in Italy. Then somebody decided evidently, to appease, that we should pull our military out of Italy and we did last December. Later we decided to put in two or three hundred million dollars into Italy regardless of the conditions and regardless of the fact that we had settled nothing. The country was rampant with communism. There was no stability anywhere in Italy then or now. So what happened, we released the foothold which we gained at such terrific cost, and at the same time we were sending our troops into Greece and leaving our other flank open. You say why do we take the position we do? It is because of the bungling of the administration in handling these problems. Certainly it is time for good, sound, clear thinking. Certainly we ought to know who is going to handle this program. Certainly it is time to clean out this element who are responsible for the conditions and the chaos that we now find ourselves in. What we should have is clear, sound thinking, practical, realistic Americans, and not appeasers or world thinkers or do-gooders.

We should have sound, loyal, patriotic, dependable Americans who will look after our interests, keen minds to decide policies and programs, if we ever expect to return the world back to stability and peace. So the whole problem has us much confused. We are sympathetic to the whole program. We want to do something to help, but, nevertheless, we do not have the confidence that this legislation will assure us the kind of administration that will give us the results that we anticipate and hope for. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned, and rightfully so.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The former speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] referred to conditions in 1938 and 1939, but of course there was an election coming, and when somebody—and I happened to be one of them, and there were others—suggested a two-ocean Navy, what did the President of the United States say? "Why, that is just sheer foolishness." But 6 months later it was necessary to start a two-ocean Navy. At that time we were trying to stop arming Japan, but would they stop it? No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a Truman world WPA plan, which will further subsidize socialism in England, communism and other isms other than Americanism.

We are now discussing the Vursell amendment, to reduce the amount by $1,300,000,000. I hope the committee will accept the amendment and thereby reduce the ERP to which thousands of Federal pay-rollers hope to shift from other New Deal bureaus that are being reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I have these pay-rollers in my district waiting anxiously. I know them. They are waiting to shift to ERP. They are hoping that this measure will pass.

Mr. Chairman, you are tying the hands of our Appropriations Committee to reduce ruinous and costly bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, which authorizes an appropriation of $6,205,000,000 for the so-called Foreign Assistance Program, presents one of the most far-reaching and one of the most momentous questions to be considered by this Congress. During my many years service in this body, which includes the hectic days of the New Deal, the anxious days of the defense program, and the trying days of the war, I do not believe any issue has given me greater concern than that presented by this pending bill.

I have devoted many weeks of careful study and thought to this bill. There are volumes and volumes of official documents, congressional, and departmental, dealing with various phases of the program. There is the Krug report, the Harriman report, the report of the Council of Economic Advisers. There are the various reports issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and those issued by the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, under the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], as well as the extensive hearings held by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and our own Committee on Foreign Affairs, not to mention the informative debate covering many days both in the other body and here in the House.

As the committee itself stated in its report accompanying this bill:

> The sheer bulk of this material reached proportions probably never before achieved in a congressional study of pending legislation and its brief analysis into simple components has presented great difficulties.

Believing, as I do, that the destiny of our beloved country and perhaps the world may be determined by the action taken on this legislation, I have given much time to a study of all this material, even to the neglect of other duties, in an earnest and sincere desire to reach a sound decision. I have reluctantly concluded that I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill unless the amount is reduced, whatever may be the views of my party leaders and whatever may be the political consequences to myself for the position I thus take. While I do not vainly hope that by what I say here today will persuade someone to my view, I believe I owe it to myself and to the fine people I am privileged to represent to set forth briefly the reasons for my position.

Surely we all recognize that this proposed expenditure of a little over $6,000,000,000 as provided in the pending bill is merely the beginning of what is intended to be a long-range program involving many billions of dollars. It has been said that the total expenditures envisaged by the Marshall plan are around $17,000,000,000, constituting a downward revision from the $22,440,000,000 requested by 16 nations that participated in the Paris Conference. A total authorization of $17,000,000,000 for the program for the period April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1952, was the amount requested by the President in his special messages to Congress in December of last year.

But, in truth, no one really knows exactly what this program, once undertaken, will ultimately cost. No one knows where and when it will end, nor what the results will be. I venture the ominous prediction that this program, if carried through to its logical conclusion, will cost the American people considerably more than presently contemplated and will involve more than the 4-year period now proposed. As is invariably the case in such spending programs, there will be the unanticipated needs and new demands, and in their support there will be offered the usual and somewhat compelling argument that, having invested so much money in the program, it would be folly not to continue further.

Take, for example, the loan we made to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000 to assist her in postwar reconstruction. In the first 12 months she used up $2,450,000,000 of that loan, and we shortly heard the appeal for the pressing need for additional financial assistance. It was understood, however, that when the loan was made that it would last for a period of 5 years.

There is no doubt but that the American taxpayers were indirectly underwriting the socialistic schemes of the administration in power in Great Britain. Instead of pursuing policies that would lead to increased production, the British Government pursued policies which represented an additional burden on their national economy and, by their very nature, retarded economic recovery.

I do not intend here to enter into a discussion of the British loan and British domestic policies. My point is that when we made the loan of almost $4,000,000,000 it was expected that it would be used in a 5-year period and would serve to put her back on the road to economic recovery and stability. But, as it has developed, in a little over a year the loan was exhausted, and now there comes these requests for additional assistance and now there comes the forceful arguments about the need to keep Britain strong in our own self-interest.

To be sure, it is proposed by the pending bill that each year the Congress can

take a look at the program as it makes the annual appropriations, and the authorization provided by this bill is intended only for the first year. To be sure, section 122 of title 1 of the bill provides for a termination of the European assistance program on June 30, 1952.

That is the clear and unmistakable language of the bill. But we have had experience with such programs as this, if not internationally at least domestically. Let us be realistic. Such programs of spending always create vested interests, and in time there develops supplements and additions to it. As the expiration date approaches there develops a campaign to extend it for another year and then another.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, while we are today talking about a $17,000,000,000 program for a 4-year period, if we have learned the lessons of experience, we may well be talking about a program involving many billions more for many years to come. And we are asking the American people to make the sacrifices involved in such a program with absolutely no guarantee of its success.

In considering the vastness of this proposed program, for which the American people will be called upon to pay both in taxes and in high prices of things in short supply, I must take into account the aid which the American people have already extended to other countries and the burden it has represented. During the war itself we extended $50,000,000,000 of supplies to our friends and allies. And since the cessation of hostilities we have extended foreign assistance, directly and indirectly, to around $20,000,000,000.

And where are we? What has been accomplished? Indeed, the countries who have received this aid appear to be in worse condition than when the expenditures began. How long can this go on? Our people now carry a public debt the interest charges on which are $5,250,000,000 in the next fiscal year. Our people now pay the highest income taxes in history, and we have the largest peacetime budget in history, independent of the foreign-aid item.

The major argument made in behalf of this program is that it is necessary to stop the spread of communism and to prevent another war. If I thought for a single moment that this bill would serve that end I would certainly cast my vote for it. But, in this, as in practically everything else that has been undertaken in the field of foreign relations, we are being theoretical rather than practical.

Russia does not fear our economic aid to other countries. Her propaganda machine has been working day and night against the program. It has furnished her with the opportunity to attack us for imperialistic designs, which all of us know is far from the truth. No matter what we did, even if we did nothing, we can expect such propaganda attacks against the United States. Whatever we did, whatever policy we pursued, Russia would endeavor to attack it to try to discredit the United States in the eyes of other people. That is part of her strategy.

All that Russia fears is military might. And it seems to me that instead of wasting our resources on some such program as this, which may amount to no more than a world WPA project, the expenditures could be put to much better use in strengthening our own national defense. We have recently received recommendations for an increase in the appropriations for military purposes, in addition to the $11,000,000,000 proposed in the original budget. And the Joint Aviation Policy Board, established by this Congress, pointed out in its report a number of weeks ago the existing inadequacies in our air power.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we might well heed the words of former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, in an address he delivered in November of last year at Winston-Salem, N. C. He said:

> America must be strong if Americans are to remain free. If a choice ever has to be made between providing long-term economic aid to Europe and providing funds for the national defense, there must be no question that our duty is to provide our armed services. Freedom-loving people throughout the world are just as much interested as are the American people in our maintaining military strength.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is precisely the choice we have to make. We cannot afford to enter upon such a program as this and, at the same time, meet our defense requirements. We cannot do both and remain solvent. If there is anything that would further the cause of communism in the world, it would be for the United States to become economically weak.

I repeat what I have contended many times, both here on the floor and in the public forums, that national defense also involves a strong, productive economy. The last war is conclusive proof of the fact that the power to produce goods to support an adequate Military Establishment is as important as the Military Establishment itself. The size of the standing Army or the Air Force or the number of available ships is not the sole measure of one's military power. A nation's productive facilities and productive power is an important factor.

By entering upon fantastic, experimental programs such as envisaged by this legislation we are draining off much of our economic strength, and we are straining our whole economic structure. We are making ourselves weaker, with absolutely no guarantee, not even a hope as I see it, that our aid will really serve to make our allies stronger.

None of the countries in Europe are strong enough to resist direct aggression from Russia. It seems to be generally admitted that if Russia should decide upon a course of military aggression, in lieu of the indirect methods of taking over control of countries she presently employs, that none of the countries has the military and economic strength to prevent being overrun. And even assuming that our aid will enable them to become stronger, it will certainly be a matter of several years before they will be able to restore their productive power and attain economic stability.

Indeed, if the objective of the Russian Government is to bring the world under her control, as evidently it is, it would be in keeping with that policy if Russia were to wait until the United States has sent extensive supplies to a country and then proceed to take the country. She would thus obtain the benefit of the goods and machinery from the United States in furthering her objective.

It is an unfortunate fact, Mr. Chairman, that the international situation which confronts us today is the direct result of failures and incompetence and vacillations on the part of those who have been charged with the conduct of our foreign affairs in the executive branch of the Government. We are paying a high price today for these follies of yesterday. When we were extending lease-lend aid and when we had the finest Army, Navy and Air Force in the world, this great and powerful country was in a position to insist upon the adoption of principles that would make for a lasting peace. Instead, secret deals were made, probably because they were expedient at the moment, of which the people knew nothing, that are today producing this period of great anxiety, confusion and uncertainty.

The philosophy of the New Deal has always been that whenever any problem presents itself the solution is an expenditure of money for experimental purposes And that is exactly what is proposed here. Even the proponents of this program admit that it is an experiment. We know that it will involve many billions of dollars, that the people will have to pay for it in taxes and that they will have to pay for it in the prices they pay for goods in short supply because of shipments abroad. I cannot give my support to such a program.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the best way to combat communism is to make certain that we have an adequate national defense, that we have the finest and most efficient military machine in the world, in the air, on land and at sea, and that we have a sound national economy to support that machine. That is the first requisite. And that is the way to peace, security, and prosperity which, I pray, the American people will ever enjoy.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a freshman Member and as one from the Middle Western State of Wisconsin, it might be assumed that I would tend to be as much isolationist as anyone, and certainly as a freshman Member, one whose voice is not as persuasive as the majority of the members of the committee; but I should like to give you my reasons for believing this amendment should be defeated.

I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina that we need a strong Air Force, a strong military arm, but I believe that that in and of itself would not

stop the thing that is happening in this world and has been happening since the end of the war. A strong military arm alone right now, possessed by the United States, would not necessarily put us in a position to tell Joe Stalin that the Italian elections, for example, should go a certain way. The Communists do not work in the open, they work by penetration, they work upon the stomachs of the people, they use soap boxes, deceit, and infiltration and other means which the Army cannot reach.

In the program which we have set before us we must implement not merely the military arm but we must implement the economic arm and also the spiritual arm.

I contend that those Members who here today argue in favor of cutting down the program to the point where it will be ineffective, are persuaded primarily by, and are obsessed of the idea that we can lock ourselves up and pay no attention to world affairs. They are the members who within a very short period of time would bring down upon this country expenditures and appropriations far in excess of what we are considering here. They are the apostles of huge appropriations for the future. They are not the advocates of economy, they are the men who fail to see that we would then have to adopt a policy which would be far more expensive than what we contemplate now.

Suppose we did what they want, suppose we adopt a course of historical fatalism and permit Russia to take over the rest of Europe, northern Africa, China, and other portions of the world. Suppose they should reach that position, following the tactics she has already followed—and she moves very cleverly—what kind of appropriations would these gentlemen who now oppose this, be willing to vote for—if Russia stood astride the world and we were then isolated from the world? Mr. Chairman, the kind of appropriations we would then be faced with would be 5 or 10 times what we are now faced with.

Does the gentleman believe that Russia will not in a few years have developed the atomic bomb? Do these gentlemen believe they will not have developed biological warfare? When they shall have done these things—and they are now in the process of trying to do them—what kind of appropriations would these gentlemen support, when Mr. Stalin, or Mr. Molotoff, or Mr. Zhdanov at the time of a future American election said: "We direct that Henry Wallace be the President of the United States" and be able to implement their desire with sufficient force that even the threat of using it would effect Soviet policy for the United States. We would see repeated here what we have seen in Europe, only worse. Oh, yes; we would then have to have appropriations to move our cities underground. These gentlemen are the apostles of expenditures far beyond the wildest dreams of men now living, many times greater than this appropriation.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 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 Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a false economy move, this effort to cut the authorization for this year below the necessary level for success of the entire plan, is certainly it.

I really think that the figure of $5,300,000,000 is even short of the amount necessary to do the job. If you want to insure failure of this plan—to lose the goal we are seeking in helping to contribute to world peace, and to strengthen western European democracies, then vote for the Vursell amendment and defeat the good effects that can come from enactment of this plan.

No one knows exactly what this plan is going to cost, what is going to be necessary to pull Europe out even on the mere basis of existence. It is only if there is enough money in the fund to rehabilitate industry, to furnish the raw materials so they can become self-respecting and self-sustaining nations, can the idea of the Marshall plan work.

By adopting this drastic 33⅓-percent cut, this reduction, will force the Marshall plan to become only an international WPA because there would not be money enough left to do any general rehabilitation work and only a mere dole of sustaining food can be extended.

Europe needs the tools to do the job of becoming self sustaining, and the Vursell amendment would take the money for tools out of the plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, there are some of the items in this bill that can be reduced without any injury to the legislation. For instance, it is estimated that $900,000,000 under this program will be spent for tobacco alone. Two hundred and sixty-five million dollars has already been earmarked to be spent for tobacco during the next year. As I have said before, why not spend the $165,000,000 for food. It will do a whole lot more good to help save the lives of starving people rather than help take care of a surplus of tobacco in this country. Why should we send $7,000,000 worth of tobacco to Denmark in the next year; $23,000,000 to the Netherlands; $10,000,000 worth to France. We are even sending $2,000,00 worth to Ireland and $160,000,000 in tobacco to the British Isles. All in the name of European recovery.

I should call your attention to another item. Two hundred and eighteen million dollars is to be spent for tractors to farm lands of the European countries under this bill. In the first place, the European farmers are not accustomed to using tractors. The whole thing is impractical because the farms average only from 7 to 20 acres. Why should a farmer who does not know how to run it, have a tractor to operate a farm of 10 on 20 acres which any farmer knows is impractical. Instead of doing this you can use 10 or 15 percent of these funds and buy horses and mules and small implements. In other words, in place of spending $218,000,000, spend $20,000,000 for horses, mules and ordinary farm implements and save the other $200,000,000 for our own farmers.

There is a surplus of horses and mules in this country. They can be bought very cheap. Implements to be used with them are not expensive. As a matter of fact farmers in European countries have quite a supply of implements on hand. As far as feed for these horses is concerned, they will need little grain because horses in those countries live on forage which is in supply. If you will spend $20,000,000 in this way you can take care of more than a hundred thousand farm units, which is just as much as you will do by spending ten times that amount for tractors. And do not forget, these tractors will use a great supply of gas which is scarce and very expensive in Europe.

Farm tractors are scarce in this country now. Our farmers need them very badly. Why not be realistic about this whole matter. Here is something else. Just as soon as this bill is passed the Department of Commerce is going to issue a statement that commitments under this proposal will take 25 percent of the output of farm tractors and farm machinery during the next year.

The Administrator of this legislation does not have to follow that commitment. I hope he will use a little common sense and be realistic in dealing with this problem.

This legislation calls for $450,000,000 worth of nitrogen, potash, and phosphate for fertilizer. I am not going to object to some fair division of fertilizer. I would like to call attention to the fact that a considerable amount of nitrogen is going to countries abroad right now. I think you know that with very little processing it can be converted into explosives. In view of conditions it will be well to give this matter particular attention.

Having said what I have with regard to this matter, I am not unmindful that this program has the endorsement of the strong farm organizations of this country.

I hope these farm organizations will use their influence in seeing that their interests are protected by urging the things to which I have directed the attention of the membership of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the expense of this program can be reduced by several million dollars without injury to anyone. Of course, we want European recovery. In our attempt to render assistance to others we must be extremely careful that we do not weaken America in our attempt to reach this objective.

Mr. Chairman, because this program has the endorsement of many of the

great leaders of this country, who have given it a great deal of study and consideration, and because it has the approval of so many of our people who feel it may help prevent another world crisis, and for the reason it carries the hope it may help bring about a better understanding among the nations of the world and prevent the suffering of so many people, I shall support this legislation. I do it with the further hope that it may be administered wisely and that those in charge of its administration will spend the funds on the basis of real need, and with the realization that the funds expended come from the taxpayers of this great country of ours. I regret that I cannot be more enthusiastic with respect to this legislation. Again, I hope the adoption of this legislation will do the things its sponsors believe it will accomplish.

Mr. HOFFMAN. 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 Michigan.

There was no objection.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a boy I was allergic to poison ivy or poison oak or, as the State Department would put it, Toxicodendron radicans. Frequently, after a hunting or fishing trip, I had a very unpleasant time caring for an itching, painful skin. Some folks told me if, after being exposed to poison ivy, I would wash thoroughly and carefully with soft soap, with yellow soap, with tar soap, or rub myself with alcohol, I could expose myself to poison ivy, but it would not take. Those remedies and several others were tried, but I learned that if I did not want to be poisoned, I had better stay away from where the poison oak grew. The lesson finally was learned through repeated, painful experiences. Now I watch my step and avoid contact with the dangerous vine.

The Balkans, sometimes called the cockpit of Europe, and other European nations are, if it may be put that way, the natural habitat of war. For reasons which it is unnecessary to give, the nations of Europe are ever at war.

Our people do not like war. This is especially true of those who have to fight the wars and pay the cost.

There are, of course, a few with ideas of grandeur who like to strut the world's stage; others who are not averse to taking a profit even though it comes from the suffering and the sacrifice of lives of their fellowmen. There are others, kindly, sincere, generous folk unaware of the facts of life, who follow a program which leads to war. But the mothers and the wives—yes, and an overwhelming majority of the young men who have no voice in the question as to whether they shall fight, suffer, and die—are opposed to war.

As a people we know, too, that war seldom settles anything. History teaches that the issue which was supposed to be settled by war lives on and, the disputants being willing, breeds another war. The world knows, too, that hunger, sickness, epidemics, famine, sometimes starvation, always follow war—that it takes years for the nations which engage in war to be rehabilitated, and that to lessen the havoc wrought by war, hard work, thrift, and courage are necessary. This bill asks the American people to assume the burden which should be borne by the nations responsible for the war.

Nevertheless, knowing all these things and disregarding the sound advice of the Father of our Country to avoid entanglement in foreign affairs, we have during the last few years made it our business to, in one way or another, get into two world wars and to set the stage for a third one.

This Nation, if it would, could follow the sane, sensible course I followed as a boy, when I avoided pain and suffering as well as inconvenience by staying away from the poisonous vine, by watching my step, by looking where I was going, and attending strictly to my own business of hunting and fishing. If we would, as a Nation try to avoid settling the quarrels of other nations, we might avoid war. If we send our dollars and our armed forces into areas where there is war, we will be in it.

QUACK REMEDIES

In recent years we have had a foreign policy which is no policy at all, for a policy implies a continuity of consistent action. The present and the preceding administrations have written many prescriptions.

Among them are the following:

We had the neutrality declarations of 1914 and 1917. That was to keep us out of war. Then we had Wilson's 14 points. That was to keep us out of war. Then there was a covenant of the League of Nations. That was to keep us out of war. Then the Washington treaties of disarmament. That was to keep us out of war. The Kellogg pact to outlaw war. That was to keep us out of war. The Dawes plan and the Young plan to keep us out of war. The Stimson doctrine to prevent aggression. That was to keep us out of war. The London Conference. That was to keep us out of war. The Roosevelt Neutrality Act. That was to keep us out of war. The four freedoms. That was to keep us out of war. Hull's 17 points. That was to keep us out of war. Then came the Atlantic Charter. That was to keep us out of war. Then the Yalta declaration, to keep us out of war. Then there was lend-lease to keep us out of war. Then UNRRA to keep us out of war. And the Potsdam agreement to keep us out of war. And Bretton Woods to keep us out of war. And Dumbarton Oaks to keep us out of war. And Bank for International Settlement to keep us out of war. And Export-Import Bank to keep us out of war. And the United Nations to keep us out of war.

United Nations was given us with a great fanfare of publicity. It was the front page of the papers for weeks, and finally we took it. It was given us with the assurance that it would police the world—prevent war—need I say "Palestine." UN appears to be dead.

Recently, the Congress appropriated $65,000,000 to build a palace here in America on a bit of what might now be termed—international soil, for the outfit which will administer UN and which we, at great cost, will support—with a few dollars thrown in by other nations. United Nations was hailed as a great adventure. It has been a joy ride for a few, but there has been no profit, either material or spiritual, out of it for our people. It is doubtful, too, whether we have learned anything from this great adventure.

Lend-lease and the other money giving measures were characterized as great speculations. If there was anything speculative about them—and that I doubt—we have on every occasion been on the loser's side of the deal.

A NEW DOCTOR, A NEW PRESCRIPTION

Our past advisers and their prescriptions, having failed to keep us out of war, having failed to establish freedom anywhere in the world, having failed to give us peace, prosperity, or happiness, it would seem that another physician and new remedies would be welcome. As proof that the New Deal Administration—I will not call it Democratic, for that it has not been—is an utter failure, permit me to quote the former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], now the minority leader, who, on March 24, last, just last Wednesday, from the floor of the House said: "I am more distressed about the world situation today than I was in 1938 and 1939." A frank confession that the New Deal policies, which we have followed since the beginning of the Roosevelt reign, have brought us nothing worth while—on the contrary, have been a positive destructive force—have left us in worse condition than when the first emergency arose.

Notwithstanding the complete worthlessness, the excessive cost, the suffering and the burden laid upon the taxpayer by our present bipartisan foreign policy, we seem determined to insist upon swallowing another dose.

How many are aware that from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, we gave aid to foreign nations amounting to $24,099,211,087; that the bill, now pending before the House and which today we will vote upon, is the opening wedge for a program under which we will give to foreign nations, before it is finished, at least $17,000,000,000, and no one knows how much more—who will predict for how long the program is to run?

Just to show the taxpayers of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan what it will cost each individual if each paid his equitable share—which, of course, he will not—let me read the following figures prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

Share in cost of foreign-aid commitments and Marshall-plan proposals—Total aid apportioned on Nation-wide per capita basis

	Population, 1940	Share of foreign aid commitments fiscal 1946, 1947 population times $183	Share of foreign aid proposed 1948-52 population times $129	Total share in commitments and proposed aid	Taxes, 1945, at county, township, and village levels
Allegan County	41,839	$7,656,537	$5,397,231	$13,053,768	$678,779
Allegan City	4,526	828,258	583,854	1,412,112	155,084
Barry County	22,613	4,138,179	2,917,077	7,055,256	399,836
Hastings City	5,175	947,025	667,575	1,614,600	162,923
Berrien County	89,117	16,308,411	11,496,093	27,804,504	2,436,270
St. Joseph City	8,963	1,640,229	1,156,227	2,785,456	472,809
Cass County	21,910	4,009,530	2,826,390	6,835,920	376,129
Cassopolis City	1,488	272,304	191,952	464,256	14,772
St. Joseph County	31,749	5,810,067	4,095,621	9,905,688	647,757
Centerville City	812	148,596	104,748	253,344	7,512
Van Buren County	35,111	6,425,313	4,529,319	10,954,632	658,352
Paw Paw City	1,910	349,530	246,390	595,920	11,982

Sources: County populations from 1940 Census, Population, vol. 1; population of county seats from Rand-McNally Atlas; tax data from Michigan State Tax Commission, twenty-fourth report, 1945-46.

The aid which we have extended to foreign nations has laid upon each citizen of the United States a tax burden of $183.03. But some of us are going to pay more than that. On an evening when you have leisure time, will you sit down with pencil and pad, figure the total number of people who live in your block? From that total, exclude first the children, the sick, then those who cannot or will not pay $183.03. In short, determine in your own way and to your own satisfaction the number of people in your block in your home town, upon whom this tax burden will fall, and I think you will discover that each will pay from two to three times $183.03.

Then, if your pencil has not worn down, instead of amusing yourself with a crossword puzzle, figure what the proposed Marshall plan, assuming that it will cost no more than the $17,000,000,000, will cost you. If each citizen of the United States pays his equal share, your share would be $129. You know, however, that it will be much more than that. But let us assume, for a moment, that each child, patient in the hospital, inmate of any institution, paid his share. Add your $183.03 and your $129, and you will learn that this plan of aiding others has or will cost each of us $312.03.

Nor is that all the cost.

OUR RESOURCES ARE LIMITED

Even the most optimistic supporter of our present foreign policy will confess that no accurate estimate of our national resources, of our ability to pay and do, is at hand. Yet we give billions without a thought as to our ability to give.

A few things we do know. Even the dumbest recognizes the fact that we cannot use the same thing at the same time in two different places.

The housewife knows that if we send food, and money to buy food, abroad, she will find that her present difficulty in feeding the husband who must work and the children who must be fed, if they are to retain their health and grow, has been drastically intensified. Every time the housewife goes to buy an article of clothing, she will find that the price is going up. She will learn that there is difficulty in obtaining what she needs. That is one thing the Marshall plan will give the housewife.

The farmer who is asked to grow food for Europe will learn that the cost of his farm machinery and the labor cost are skyrocketing. He will learn, through bitter experience, that as his farm machinery wears out, he will have more and more trouble in replacing it. He will learn, too, that the price is almost doubled. That, the farmer will get out of the Marshall plan.

The veteran who finds, as time goes on, that his needs have increased, that because of the increased living costs, the allowance which, to him in the beginning, may have seemed adequate or generous, is now insufficient. But when he asks for an increase he will learn that the money which might have been paid to him has been sent to other nations who have used it to purchase and hike the price of the things he needs. He will learn that the things he needs are being given to some of those, and the dependents of those, who, in days gone by, confronted him on the battlefield. Less and less in purchasing power the Marshall plan will give to the veterans.

FEDERAL WORKERS

Yes, wage earners throughout the country, confronted by the increased cost in various items, will learn—and it should not be a surprise to them—that they will pay not only through the tax collector, but every time they go to a store or market in higher prices for the gifts which are being made to other governments who, in turn, sell at a profit to the very people we are supposed to be aiding.

And so the story might run on indefinitely, but the foregoing is sufficient to show what will happen, what we will get out of the Marshall plan.

Do we get peace, security, out of this bill and do these other plans, which have been made for us, give us peace and security? Oh, no. During the debate on this bill not one proponent of the bill has given it unquestioned support.

It has been described as a calculated risk, as an experiment, as something we must have. It is a remedy which may, it is said, give us peace.

The proponents of this plan are the same individuals, belong to the same groups, which heretofore have written prescriptions. We have taken their prescriptions, and none has kept us out of war. None has given or will give peace. Now they tell us that, in addition to this gift of anywhere from $17,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000, we should also accept at their hands compulsory universal military training, a renewal of the conscription law which will take the men of this land to fight again on foreign soil.

Yes; those things they advocate, knowing, as they must that every nation which has tried them has been the loser in every war where they have met our so-called untrained soldiers. They still urge these upon us.

There is no necessity for war. Russia is not now able to carry on a war, and she will not for years to come be capable of successfully making war if we will end our policy of building her up. We aided Russia in destroying Hitler, and in the process we created—so we are told—an enemy as strong or stronger than was Hitler.

CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY

And so you ask what policy do I advocate?

As the first constructive step, I would get rid of, lock, stock, and barrel, the present administration and those whose advice we have followed to our sorrow. And with them the Reds, the Pinks—those who seek to circumvent the laws and the Constitution.

Second, I would continue to give aid to the unfortunate in other lands, who need food, clothing, and shelter, but I would give it direct to the people through American administrators and, in return, I would exact work from those receiving aid directed toward rehabilitating themselves and their nation. Under no circumstances would the giving of this aid be permitted to impair our own welfare, and under no circumstances would I give aid to those who insist upon recreating a military machine.

Third, and perhaps most important of all, I would build up here, through every scientific method, our national armament. If there is anything to the talk which we were getting from our Armed Services a year or 2 ago as to the efficacy of the atomic bomb, then we have in our hands and under our control the secret which will enable us to hold all nations at arm's length. Instead of giving money to other nations to arm themselves and to carry on policies of aggrandizement, I would limit aid to that which can be used only to assist them economically.

Then, finally, I would quit trying by force, to compel other people and other nations to adopt our ways, our policies, do as we wish them to do.

If a program of that kind is followed, we need fear no one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken against certain parts of this bill,

but I want to say now that I support the committee on the measure as it now stands, and I oppose the reduction as suggested in this proposed amendment.

It is generally recognized throughout military establishments that any dictatorial power which controls all Europe endangers all peace-loving democratic nations of the world, and it seems to me that we must do the best we can to preserve the few friends we may still have in Europe. Predictions regarding military operations and regarding future wars are dangerous, indeed. Even the best professionals make lots of mistakes, and today, with submarines, and aircraft, and the atomic bomb, war would be terrible indeed. I think we should do everything honorable within our power to keep the peace. A cold war is a lot better than a fighting war in which hundreds of thousands of people are going to be killed and in which general destruction will be accomplished. I do not want to contemplate the death of those hundreds of thousands, even though they are chiefly the men, women, and the children of the enemy.

I support the measure as it stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the long debate on this bill has disclosed the lack of wholehearted support of the so-called Marshall plan. Many of us who are voting for it do so with misgivings. However, those of us who want to take positive action before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, on a program that will help to bring peace and stability to the world and give some hope to the devastated, war-torn countries of the Old World that they may be able to rehabilitate themselves and assume normal activities are forced to vote for the Marshall plan or do nothing. We have no other recourse. I am sure the American people want to do their full share in helping to restore the shattered, war-devastated countries of the Old World and to bring about a stable and enduring peace. I pray God that may be accomplished. My mail is heavy with requests to support such an objective. America has always had a sympathetic approach to distress throughout the world. We should provide a springboard for self-help, not a wheel chair for permanent doles. We must, however, bear in mind that our own financial resources are not inexhaustible, and that we now have a debt of approximately $257,000,000,000, a peacetime budget of forty billions, with additional billions now being requested by the President. We have the highest tax burden in all our history, and the American people have been pressed to the limit to finance this immense burden thrust upon them. There must be a limit sometime to this exorbitant spending of American tax dollars around the world.

The administration, which has played fast and loose with our foreign affairs, has supported no forthright, effective foreign policy which would result in a solution of the critical world problems facing us. It has been vacillating and has engaged in double talk and appeasement, as a result of which confusion has been added to confusion and a chaotic situation exists in the whole field of international relations. The personnel in the State Department charged with the responsibility of maintaining our foreign affairs, are inefficient, inept, and vacillating and they have failed miserably to effect any solution of these many problems. We were sold down the river at Potsdam and Yalta. The Palestine question has been bungled from the outset, and as a result the administration has not only sacrificed the Jewish people of Palestine, but has gained the enmity of all factions. It adopted the undefensible Morgenthau plan in Germany and forestalled recovery there.

In the Balkan countries, the administration has permitted the iron curtain to be drawn around one nation after another, and has been impotent to protect American interests after having poured literally billions of dollars into these satellite countries which are now under Russian domination. These American funds have gone to build up Russian war power.

Since the war in Europe ended we have sent overseas over $20,000,000,000 in an endeavor to give relief and help to rehabilitate those countries ravaged by that titanic struggle. During the war, we poured seventeen billions into Europe and Asia. We gave Russia $11,260,343,603 during the war under lend-lease. Since the war we have given Russia approximately $168,000,000. We have also contributed $301,000,000 to Yugoslavia, $174,000,000 to Czechoslovakia, and $349,000,000 to Poland, with lesser sums to other Russian satellite countries, thereby swelling the power and military strength of Russia itself.

No one can say that we have not fulfilled our full duty on foreign aid in the past. We have expended overseas, since the war ended, over $24,000,000,000 for civilian aid. Reports that come to us here in the Congress from our committees and representatives who have canvassed postwar conditions in foreign countries, are to the effect that many of our American tax dollars have been flagrantly dissipated, and poured down "rat holes" with little or no actual aid or relief to the stricken peoples on the lower-income levels who are in dire need of immediate help to prevent starvation. Our foreign-aid program has been shamefully administered and much of the money provided for this program has gone to corrupt politicians, designing civilians and military officials, and others who want to profit from the largess of America without themselves making any contribution by their own self-help to the welfare of their fellow citizens. Whatever we do in the way of relief and aid for the war-stricken nations should be to help them to help themselves, and must be hedged about by administrative controls that will make certain that every dollar expended will bring a full dollar's worth of value in relief and rehabilitation to the needy recipients of the gifts from our own people. In giving aid, we must not undermine our own financial structure.

Under the Marshall plan we are now embarking on another program of worldwide spending which, according to the planners, will involve an outlay of $17,000,000,000 at least in a 4-year period. I do not approve a 4-year program, but 1 year only. This stupendous sum is more than the assessed value of the 11 Western States of the United States. Our children and our children's children will be paying on this debt as long as they live. It will be added to an already huge national debt of $257,000,000,000. If we were assured that the administration would clean house, particularly in the State Department and the Department of Commerce, and would place a conscientious, public-spirited, and efficient American in charge of the expenditures under the administration of this program, we could vote for the plan with more confidence. Judging from past experiences in the spending of the huge sums to which I have called attention, there is little encouragement given that the funds will be conscientiously and honestly expended.

While we are considering this enormous burden to be placed on the American taxpayer, we must not overlook the fact that in the critical world situation now existing and with the threat of war again hanging over our Nation, we must keep our own house in order and maintain our military defenses to full 100-percent strength in the air, on the land, and on the sea. This involves large expenditures and should be one of the first calls upon our resources. We should be strong militarily, not for war, but for peace and the defense of our own country in the event of any emergency. We should not allow our own country to be weakened and its financial resources dissipated, without first providing full, 100-percent national defense.

Mr. Chairman, while I am forced by circumstances to vote for this bill since no other program is offered, I am doing so with the distinct understanding that we are committing ourselves only to 1 year and that at the expiration thereof, or sooner if circumstances warrant, a complete reexamination of the whole problem will be made and a new determination as to what further action, if any, should be taken by the United States to solve these international problems. I am voting for it in the belief we will have a new administration in the White House in January 1949. I am firmly of the belief that we cannot hope for honest, effective, and efficient administration of this program until there is a complete change in the administration from the top levels to the bottom, so that there may be a thorough housecleaning in all departments, resulting in the plugging of the leaks which have resulted in profligate spending of American relief funds by irresponsible persons in high places and low.

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill reluctantly only as a last resort.

WHY NOT A MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE AGED OF AMERICA?

Mr. Chairman, when we had under consideration the tax bill, I posed the question "Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America?" I repeat here some of my remarks I made then. There seems to be no valid reason, while we are planning to spend $17,000,000,000 more overseas for the relief and rehabilitation of citizens of foreign countries, we should not also at the same time make adequate provision for our own old folks here in America who are in want and without the necessities to keep body and soul together. I refer to the inexcusable failure of the Congress to make adequate provision for the aged of America. I again pose the question, "Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America?" While we are considering the Marshall plan for Europe, is it not time to adopt some plan for the old folks of this Nation? The proposal of the administration is to spend some $17,000,000,000 in aid to European countries under the Marshall plan, with an expenditure of $6,205,000,000 for the first year. This is in addition to the twenty-four billions that have already been expended for European aid since the war ended. I call attention to the fact that some of this huge expenditure will be made available for the needy of the European countries, including the aged. Is it not a decent thing to do, while we are expending such huge sums for foreign aid, to have a Marshall plan for our own old folks in America and give them some help in their distress? You can fulfill this obligation to our old folks by signing petition No. 7 and bring on the floor for consideration H. R. 16 which will give them enough aid to sustain them in their old age.

The Congress, for years, has been considering legislation for its elderly citizens. Throughout my legislative service here, covering almost 10 years, I have urged that the Congress adopt a Federal old-age program which will do justice to the old folks of America.

On the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 16, which is a bill providing benefits to the aged and the totally disabled. This bill does not provide any fixed monthly annuity for the recipients, but it does provide for a tax and the total amount raised thereby will be prorated monthly among those entitled to take under the bill. The experts of the Congress on fiscal affairs should determine the tax necessary so that the bill, when enacted, may provide an adequate annuity to maintain these old folks in decency and health. It would lie within the province of the Congress to change the tax from time to time as conditions warranted. This bill has been gathering dust in the pigeonholes of the Ways and Means Committee. Before we adjourned at the special session, I urged that every Member of the House interested in the welfare of our old folks sign a discharge petition which I placed on the Clerk's desk. The Christmas season was then approaching and it seemed appropriate as an evidence of good will and sincere interest in the welfare of these old folks that we sign this petition and bring this bill on the floor for consideration. One hundred and sixty-five Members have signed the petition. When 218 Members sign, the bill will come to the floor under an open rule and will be subject to any germane amendment, and the House will be able to work its will and to adopt any amendments it desires in order to make the bill acceptable to the majority of our Members. The exact terminology and provisions of this bill are not the important consideration, but it is important to enact some legislation making adequate provision for our old folks, with an assurance that they will have an ample monthly income during their old age to permit them to secure the necessary medical care, food, clothing, and shelter to protect them from want, hunger, and cold.

The existing social-security law for the aged is an ineffective gesture. Under it, as shown by the reports from the Social Security Agency, the payments the aged are receiving for old-age assistance through the States of the Union, average from $16.92 a month in the lowest State to $64.93 in the highest, as shown for the month of November 1947, with a national average of $36.91. Truly, such allowances to cover food, clothing, medical care, and shelter represent a starvation program. As was recently pointed out by the Administrator, in some areas "contributions by the State and Federal Government are not enough to enable people to maintain an adequate diet, and they are literally suffering slow starvation."

The United States Public Health Service recently reported the results of a long-range survey which shows that about 35 persons per thousand have some chronic illness or major physical disability. A gradual increase takes place to a rate of about 100 cases per thousand at 45. From this point on the curve goes up very rapidly. There are nearly 250 chronically ill per thousand at 60. In the next 10 years the rate goes up to 400 per thousand. At 80 more than half of the group needs the regular care of a physician and at 90 the rate is more than 900 per thousand.

The critical problem facing our old folks in their endeavor to maintain a bare existence is tragically intensified by the high cost of food and other necessities of life in this inflationary period in which we find ourselves. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has recently announced that the cost of food bought by the average American family increased 25 percent in 1947 over 1946. Dorothy Bovee, Red Cross nutritionist, reports that the cost of a minimum adequate diet for a family of two in the Washington area at this time is at least $11.60 weekly.

We all know old-age annuitants, with their meager income, could not be able to buy this diet, but would be limited to the essential staples only, eliminating the fresh fruit, canned goods, and fancy items. For them it would be a luxury diet.

In contrast to the foregoing minimum fare which old-age annuitants are unable to buy with their limited allotments, is the menu of a dinner recently given in the Statler Hotel here in Washington to 100 guests by Mr. Charles Luckman who headed the President's meatless-eggless days' program. Here is the menu: Shrimp cocktail, fried oysters, crabs, shrimp and lobster gumbo, curried chicken, roast turkey, baked ham, roast beef, string beans au gratin, fried apple rings, pickled walnuts, celery, olives, rye rolls, assorted finger rolls, ice cream, and coffee. Mr. Luckman's job was to conserve food for hungry Americans.

Mr. Chairman, how can an old person, who must maintain himself on old-age assistance according to the plan provided in the present social-security setup, meet his expenses, not only for food but for all other necessities, on an average monthly payment of $36.91? Is there any valid reason why this Eightieth Congress should not give the right-of-way and green light to legislation for old-age assistance while we are opening the Treasury doors wide for European relief?

We have been concerned in the Congress about the rising cost of living, the inflation spiral, and the added burden placed upon the millions of our workers and the low-income groups who must pay these increased prices for food, clothing, and shelter. Cognizant of these difficulties, the Congress has increased substantially the income of some groups of our citizens, but it has given the old people no consideration. Their meager monthly average of $36.91 remains the same, while the simple fare they must provide to keep body and soul together has risen in price by leaps and bounds. Many annuitants receive much less than the average of $36.91. The miserable pittance they were receiving was wholly insufficient to care for their modest needs even before the advent of high living costs.

According to statistics I received some time before the war with respect to the annuitants under the insurance provision of the Social Security Act, 252,000 past 65 years of age received an average of $23 a month; 74,000 wives of these pensioners 65 or over received an average of $12,25 a month; widows over 65, totaling 25,000, received only $20.16 a month; 28,000 parents received $13 a month; widows under 65, of whom there were 55,000, received $19.50 a month, and 159,000 children under 18 received $12.21. Of all persons 60 years of age or over, four-fifths received less than a minimum for decency and health. Before our entry into the war, it was estimated that of the persons 60 years of age and over in the United States, 54.9 percent were supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies or were dependent on children, relatives, or friends for their subsistence and care. A considerable proportion of the remainder received part or all of their support from various pension systems—Federal, State, and municipal, industrial or private.

At the beginning of the year 1946, nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under the social-security program, and nearly two in five of all persons employed were neither

fully nor currently insured. At best the social-security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provisions, and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social security laws now in existence and would, for the first time, set up in our country an old-age-security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens.

On December 31, 1947, there had been paid into the social security fund approximately $10,524,681,961.55, and $1,772,431,249.69 paid out to beneficiaries; the balance was spent by the Government for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress are engaged in a great adventure in human welfare. We are charged with the responsibility of planning and building for 140,000,000 Americans a social, economic, and cultural structure which will assure their welfare. If we omit from our plans the care and protection of the millions of aged citizens who are in want, we will build in vain. We will build a tower of Babel. We must not reject the guiding hand of Providence in our plans; we need spiritual understanding as well as political wisdom. As Benjamin Franklin said to the Constitutional Convention when the great charter of our liberties was drafted:

> We have been assured sir, in the sacred writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

Daniel Webster, one of our eminent predecessors, said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We should not be unmindful of the fact that these senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries, and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They only ask simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed.

Let us prove to the whole world that these aged American citizens are entitled to, and shall have vouchsafed to them by their country, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us prove that humanity is still on the march here in America by enacting an old-age annuity plan that will provide for our old people an annuity sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

I most sincerely urge you, my colleagues, to join us in the petition to bring the old-age security legislation on the floor of this House at an early date, so that it may be enacted into law before this Congress ends, thereby putting America on record as willing to provide reasonable old-age security for our own elderly citizens while we are spending billions overseas for similar purposes. When you have voted for the Marshall plan sign petition No. 7 and bring H. R. 16 on the floor for passage and give our own old folks their Marshall plan to permit them to keep body and soul together.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time I had be allotted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is pending, offered by my gracious friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], would reduce the direct appropriations to be authorized by this bill by $1,300,000,000. Stated in another way, my friend from Illinois wants to reduce the bill by one-third. He has in mind then that this becomes not a Marshall plan but a partial plan. Now, if we are going to carry the gospel abroad, let us not carry a thimbleful. Let us not accept the program up to 66 percent and then call it quits. If we are going to do the job, then let us do it right. I said long ago before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, "Let us do it now and let us do it right, and if it is going to be done militantly and aggressively, then let us make sure that there are ample funds for that purpose." Now, I have heard it said this morning that this will lead to bankruptcy. Well, I have made a few statements of my own on that subject over the years, but I say to you in all candor, if it is $1,300,000,000 that stands between salvation and bankruptcy of the United States, that $1,300,000,000 will probably not save us, with the debt we have and the national income we have at the present time.

I listened to my friend from North Carolina this morning as he sought to make it appear that this was a measure to prevent war and that it would fail in that objective. It is a hope that we can prevent war. It takes two parties to prevent war. If the Soviet Union and the United States could reach some kind of accord, you may be sure that war would be prevented, but in the absence of that kind of formal accord anything can happen in this world today, and this represents the hope—the prayerful hope—that war may be averted.

Now, is it not strange that men will come into the well of this House and talk about billions for aircraft in preparation for the next war and yet resolutely take a stand against this proposal which might spare the world another bloody struggle. I am willing to spend, if necessary, a lot more than this in order to discourage and avoid a repetition of those dark shadows that we have come through since 1941. Let us not be so niggardly. It is said that this will not prevent communism. Perhaps it will not prevent it in Russia, but as I sought to say yesterday, first we have got to bring some hope to people where there is a chance and where the spark of freedom is still alive, and, secondly, seek to retrieve freedom where it has already been liquidated by this very evil force. Let us not be niggardly. Let us go the full way and travel a second mile and give them the money they need for a decent job. To you on my side let me say to you that we have our responsibility, because we are in charge of this body at the present time. If the program fails because we were too niggardly, it will be our failure.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. 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 forty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read for the information of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VURSELL: On page 82, line 11, strike out "$4,300,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VURSELL) there were—ayes 61, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 82, line 6, strike out "1952" and insert "1949"; and in line 15, strike out the sentence after the period and substitute therefor the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed as placing either a legal or a moral obligation upon any succeeding Congress to continue the present aid program beyond the 12 months herein provided for."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of talk on

the floor of the House, and I believe a great deal of discussion throughout the country on the question as to how long this program should run. The Members have observed that throughout the bill the date 1952 is used. We ought to be honest with the people of this country and I am giving this body an opportunity to vote for a 1-year program. You can do it by supporting this amendment on line 6 by striking out 1952 and inserting 1949. That will make it a 1-year program. In my opinion the committee itself ought not to object to that amendment. I call your attention to the language in the bill on that same page starting at line 15:

The authorization in this title is limited to the period of 12 months in order that subsequent Congresses may pass on any subsequent authorization.

In view of the language contained in the bill, this amendment ought to be adopted unanimously. If you believe that this should be a 4-year program, of course you will not vote for the amendment. Likewise in my amendment I changed the last sentence to read as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as placing either a legal or a moral obligation upon any succeeding Congress to continue the present aid program beyond the 12-month period herein provided for.

I believe that language is stronger and leaves no doubt as to what we are doing here today. We are up against a buzzsaw. Do you want a 4-year program or do you want a 1-year program? I take it that if this program is a success and if it is doing the job that we think it should do we will be in session a year from now and there will be no doubt about it at that time that the Congress will appropriate funds for an additional period if it is necessary. It seems to me that is just common horse sense.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think his amendment will clear up the confusion that exists in the minds of the people of the countries who are the recipients of this aid?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt about it. The gentleman is right. I feel there would be a very favorable reaction if we adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This amendment will make the bill what it is supposed to be. It says that this is a 1-year bill, and it will make it a 1-year bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That would seem to be the case to me.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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 Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this amendment.

I think it is about time we found out where we are going, because, wherever it is, we are sure traveling at a very fast rate.

Some time ago I asked members of the committee to tell me the amount of tractors that these people wanted, the amount that had been requested by the different nations. I got my information in conversations down at the Department of Commerce. Greece wants 1,000. France wants 1,100 or more. I find the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio did not have a hundred altogether. So that is one reason why I think we could cut down considerably on this amount. They are only to supply them when a demonstration shows they can be put to effective use. If that is so, I know that a lot of this can be cut down.

Then, of course, last fall, during the interim-aid discussion, we asked how about these war plants; plants for reparations. Two members of this present committee told me that had been stopped. That was last fall. Well, gentlemen, right here I have the figures, and I will show them to any of you. Here is a whole list of plants where this year they are asking now for bids. The last date is March 3. The gentleman from Illinois said, "Let us not be niggardly." I do not want to be niggardly, but I do not want to waste money. I want them to come in here and justify the amount they are asking.

Some few years ago I was just a kid and I was in the Navy. I was in England, and the lord mayor gave us a dinner in Guild Hall. The man in charge was Commander Simms; afterward, during the First World War, he was Admiral Simms. I will never forget what he said. "Oh," he said, "whenever England is attacked, she can depend upon every ship, every man, and every drop of blood of the American people." It seems to me they are surely coming back all the time trying to get that last drop of blood.

I imagine some of you saw last night's paper.

Britain finds action to include Spain very awkward. High British sources express surprise at the vote of the American House of Representatives to invite Franco Spain into the foreign-aid program.

I do not have any objection to that paragraph.

British Foreign Office refused official comment, but one authority termed the American move "very awkward."

I do not have any objection to that, but I do object to the last paragraph, which says:

Whitehall sources take the position that it was up to the 16 Marshall plan nations to invite whatever other countries were to participate.

In other words, you have got your orders. They will tell you who you can give the money to and how much and where you are going to give it. It is about time we started legislating for America.

I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I do not care that the former Speaker of this House says, if you vote against this you are voting against the arming of the country. No, we are not. You bring in a bill for a hundred billion dollars for the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and I will vote for it, but I am not going to vote for any more of this stuff down a rat hole. You have got the ERP now, all right. Wait for a week or so and you will get SAP—that is South American Program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, as one Member of the House, that this is a most important amendment to the bill. It is necessary to read this bill in several parts of the bill at once to understand its intent.

In colloquies yesterday and the day before, representatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs repeatedly said that this was a bill limiting aid to Europe and other countries to 1 year; that under no circumstances were we committed beyond a year. The bill does not confirm that statement. The bill denies that statement. The bill states on page 82 that such funds under this bill shall be available "as are hereafter authorized and appropriated to the President from time to time through June 30, 1952"; and on page 97 of the language it again states: "After June 30, 1952"—which is 4 years.

It is true that a very weak attempt is made on page 82 to say that this title is limited to a period of 12 months, but by a strict interpretation that applies only to the authorization of $4,300,000,000; and, finally, on page 97, instead of saying that this is continued year after year only if positive action is taken, it states that only positive action will stop it. In other words, the bill is exactly the reverse of the committee's statement. So I am very glad indeed that a member of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has offered this amendment. I have at the desk four amendments which would attempt to clarify the bill, to say what the committee says it says, that is all. Consequently if this is adopted and an amendment were adopted on page 98 changing the figure "1952" to "1949" then the bill would be clear and unequivocal; and the leaders of the socialistic movements in the countries of Europe would not be able to say to their people: "Look at what the United States has said they are going to give us—support for 4 years. Continue to keep me in power and I will continue to get you support, I will get you support for 4 years." We want a clean-cut bill, one which commits the United States for 1 year and 1 year only.

I ask that the amendment be given an overwhelming vote under the circumstances.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that Congress will approve the administration's European recovery plan committing our taxpayers to provide at least $17,000,000,000 to Europe over the next 4 years. Funds authorized in the pending bill are to be added to twenty-four billions already provided for similar purposes since the war ended. Let us all hope that it brings the results for which it was advertised. Its cost will be high in prices, scarcities, and inflation at home. But if it helps secure the peace and stop communism it will be worth every cent.

Some of us, I hope, can be pardoned if we reserve our doubts about this program. Put over with great fanfare and hysteria, unidentified submarines seen off the coast, and all that, it brings to mind UNRRA, Bretton Woods, the Export-Import Bank, United Nations, the International Bank, lend-lease, reciprocal-trade agreements, the Atlantic Charter, and all the other panaceas formerly advanced in so-called great emergencies, and which, though they have cost us dearly, have failed, thus requiring ERP. What will follow ERP? Well, most certainly there will next be similar programs for South America and Asia. They put the needle in the taxpayer just a little bit at a time. Further, the administration has already frankly told you that Congress will have to reimpose economic controls to combat inflationary effects of this stimulus to inflation given by these vast appropriations. Also, that Congress must now back up ERP with guns, planes, peacetime military conscription, and a revival of selective service. Thus goes the peace and freedom for which a war was fought. I was around Congress when they were getting us into World War II. The path we follow now is just the same. First it is money. Then it is guns. Then it is blood. I have supported all legislation presented here designed to establish peace and security for the world by international cooperation. But we are now far beyond that abandoned effort. Today you talk of cold war. Too few here are of the opinion that a strong and prosperous America well defended is the world's greatest guaranty of peace and freedom. I wonder if we do not play the Communist game by bleeding ourselves white and weakening ourselves at home, leading ourselves to boom, bust, and war? I discussed this matter in some detail in an address I made and which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 29. I do not wish to be repetitious here.

That all good Americans favor adequate national defense cannot be denied. Congress is going to provide it. A long series of failures in foreign policy have put us in a position where we have little choice. Who is responsible for these failures? That is too long a story for this brief opportunity of discussion. However, not the least of those responsible is the American State Department. Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes and Marshall have the greatest records of failure of any secretaries of State in our history. Marshall's failures have been as great as his monumental successes as chief of staff, where at least his failures are hidden by military secrecy and censorship. One of his greatest troubles seems to be a lapse of memory, frequently suffered. For instance, he cannot remember where he was the night of Pearl Harbor. He has admitted that while he attended the Tehran and Yalta Conferences to advise our ailing President, and was at Potsdam to advise Truman who inherited the secret commitments from the former President, he didn't know what those commitments were. The other night, at a dinner attended by 48 Members of Congress, he admitted that he didn't know the Truman-Marshall European recovery plan included $797,000,000 for Ireland, a country neutral in the war and not damaged by it. Of course, one thing is not generally understood. Marshall, with his great military reputation, is only the front man for the real kings in the State Department. It is these boys behind the scenes who stay and stay while secretaries come and go. They write the program. Sometimes the secretaries read them and sometimes they apparently do not. The ERP plan includes money not only for Ireland, the threat of communism there is hard to imagine, but for other countries which were neutral in the war. For instance, $38,000,000 to Iceland, where we spent millions on airports they now won't let us use. Portugal, $150,000,000, a country run by a Fascist dictator. $700,000,000 to Sweden and Switzerland which sold to both sides in the war and got rich. In those countries the dollar is at a discount in exchange. It is true, however, that most of the money, $5,348,000,000 will go to Great Britain, which has spent the gift we gave here in 1945, of $4,400,000,000 to subsidize her experiment in Socialism, reduce taxes and increase old-age pensions and social benefits.

But, to get back to the powers behind the throne in the State Department. Here we have an extraordinary situation. While we are fighting a cold war with Soviet communism, the State Department approves trade treaties with her satellites, and in 1947 alone approved shipment from this country to Russia and the 10 countries in the Soviet bloc $431,483,000 worth of United States goods, including war supplies. We have given Russia and her friends not only hundreds of millions of dollars since the war, but over eleven billion during the war. Our inconsistent policy toward communism abroad, our coddling of it at home, can only be explained by the large number of Communist sympathizers in the State Department. Congress has, time and again, demanded that they be fired. Only the President can fire them. They are his appointees. The Supreme Court has ruled Congress cannot single them out and cut off their salaries. All we can do is expose them. It should now be apparent that they are so firmly entrenched they will not be fired by the present administration.

Who are some of these gentry? On March 11, Senator WILSON, of Iowa, put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of several hundred people furnished by the Department itself as having had a hand in development of ERP, either as regular Government employees or as consultants. Not all of these people are Reds. Some are just incompetent political hacks and society boys. Our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has performed a service by identifying some of them. He called our attention to Herbert W. Parisius, a Government employee, appointed to his post by Henry Wallace and still there, spending much of his time soliciting subscriptions to "commie" publications from other Government workers. Then there is Arthur E. Goldsmith, who testified to a House committee that he was a member of two Communist-front groups, denounced by the Attorney General. Kenneth Meiklejohn, head of the Socialist Party of the District of Columbia; Ralph Hetzel, cited three times by the House Committee on Un-American Activities; David Lasser, who headed the Communist Workers Alliance and is listed 13 times in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities; Thomas Blaisdell, admitted member of two organizations cited as subversive by the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities; Felis S. Cohen, leader in the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy and a former instructor at the Socialist-Communist New School for Social Research. And last but not least, Lewis L. Lorwin, who, when kicked out of the University of Montana in 1919, went by the name of Louis Levitski Levine. Russian born, Levine-Lorwin has been a consistent left-winger, friend of Henry Wallace, delegate to Socialist conventions, and visitor to Russia at expense of Moscow. These are the kind of people who have administered foreign relief programs for us in the past and who as long as the New Deal is in power will continue to do it. Why waste the money? We had better spend it on plenty of powder and keep it dry. That is language the Communists can understand. Handouts such as here proposed will fatten up their intended prey but not save them any better than it did poor Czechoslovakia.

Yes, I want to help the poor and suffering, not only abroad but in my own country. I am for getting the Government of the United States out of the red and the Reds out of our Government. This bill for an international WPA is not helpful to that end. I have heard no one in Congress argue that it is. The argument seems to be that a vote for this bill is a vote against communism. Well, my record on that is clear so I do not have to cast a political vote on this measure. I was pointing out the dangers of communism when some of those who speak most loudly against it today were appeasing it. I also am proud of the distinction of having been singled out by the official Soviet Government Communist newspaper, Izvestia, in Moscow, November 28, 1947, for abuse which indicates the name of MARION T. BENNETT is high on the Kremlin's purge list, comes the revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There is considerable sentiment in this country for a measure which will provide relief and assistance to Europe for a

period of 1 year, and 1 year only. It is very obvious in reading the bill now before us that this is a 4-year program. If you will read the debate on this bill as contained in the RECORD of last Monday, March 29, and particularly the colloquy which took place on the floor of the House between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM], and the distinguished minority whip the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I am sure there will be no doubt in your mind as to the period covered by this legislation. It is proposed to establish a 4-year program. Frankly, I am surprised that the committee would recommend such a long-term project, in view of the world situation today. The bill contains the date of June 30, 1952, in several sections, although the general impression seems to exist that this is a 1-year program. This amendment is necessary to clearly and definitely fix the period for 1 year only. There are those who would support a 1-year program who are not in favor of a longer commitment at this time. I personally feel that it would be a serious mistake to become involved in a 4-year plan.

The world situation is critical. There is a great deal of hysteria in our own country; I do not know how much of this war scare is justified. The administration has been following a secret foreign policy and the American people have not been given the facts. Congress is an independent branch of the Government. We have the authority, the jurisdiction, and the responsibility to implement our foreign policy. We should act absolutely free and independent of the executive. We must exercise our own discretion and judgment as to what is for the best interests of the United States. No one can predict what the world picture will be a year from now. In my opinion, we should limit this program to 1 year. Then there will be no doubt as to our legal or moral commitments. Otherwise, we may find ourselves under moral obligation to continue a program that we would like to abandon. I cannot understand why there should be any objection to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been argued that this is a bill for peace, and we are buying peace with American dollars. I am reminded that this same argument was made for the lend-lease bill back in 1941. That bill was presented as a measure that would keep us out of war, but had the opposite effect. Since the war we have tried numerous schemes to establish a just and lasting peace. All have failed, so we should exercise caution in setting up another world organization.

The most important task is to keep our own economy strong. Let us be careful to do nothing which would impair the strength and stability of our country. This is our first obligation. No one can predict what is ahead, and certainly we should not commit ourselves for 4 years.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think this thing could be given a much more fair-minded analysis a year from now and that we can be absolved of any possibility of breach of faith if we make it a 1-year program?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Absolutely; and I do not see how that statement can be disputed, even by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Surely no Member of this House will deny the fact that a year from now the present confused situation in world affairs will either have cleared, or will have become so grave that a program like this would be absolutely futile. I submit we are taking a dangerous step if we commit ourselves to the 4-year program contained in this bill.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is a very able lawyer. He was a distinguished judge in Colorado. Does he think there is any legal or constitutional authority for one Congress to bind another Congress?

Mr. CHENOWETH. No; I do not.

Mr. SHORT. Does he think it is legal for us to vote for a 4-year plan, pledging a Congress that has not yet been elected?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. We have no such authority. I submit that the amendment offered by the able gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, should be adopted. At best, this proposal is nothing more than a calculated risk, which should not be assumed for more than 1 year.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the Committee that I was very much engaged in the effort to draft this part of the bill. I was overruled because I wanted a much stronger statement than is now contained in here of our realization that the European recovery was a 4-year program. What the bill contains now is a statement that we envisage this program; we understand this program to be a 4-year program. There is certainly no future commitment expressed in our recognition of the facts about the program.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would help the members of the committee if I read a few lines of the report of the 16 nations in the European recovery program as follows:

> The effects of the war, which are so clearly illustrated by the lack of balance in the world's trading pattern, cannot be cured in a few months. Nevertheless the participating countries are confident that in 4 years considerable and decisive progress can be made to overcome them. This recovery program can break the back of the problem.

We can do no less if we want the 16 European nations to have any hope for the future. May I ask whether we want a recovery program to help the peoples of the 16 European nations to get off their backs, or just another relief program?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman. May I say to the membership of the House that the destruction wrought in Europe was not wrought in a day. The bombers and the howitzers and the long-range rifles were at it a long time. In proportion that the destruction was not wrought in a day it will not be repaired in a day or a year.

The net effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, of course, is to make this essentially a relief program instead of giving it the continuity that is necessary for a rehabilitation program, to undo the damage which was wrought. When all is said and done there must be well-being in Europe if we are going to do something effective in the field of combatting the onrush of communism. And well-being comes from productivity. Their own economic systems have to be wound up and started all over again. Obviously it cannot be done in a year. I shall never delude anybody about that. On yesterday, when I stood in the well of this House, I envisioned a program that might go even further than 1952. But, the corpse is on the back of Europe, and unless the corpse is removed, unless economic machinery is set in motion once more, how long will these supplications for relief come to this country? So, it is essential not only that there be continuity, but that there be ample time to spell out a rehabilitation program because that is the vitals of the bill before us at the present time. Relief comes first but rehabilitation is the core of this effort, and finally by this and other devices the stemming of the march of Red fascism.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Are we not in a rather awkard position if this program should result in the disastrous failures that many of its predecessors have, and are we not then in the situation of having a moral commitment for 4 years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is at least this about it. There is technically peace in the world that we did not have, for instance, at the time UNRRA was set up. It would go on further under rather turbulent and difficult circumstances, and I hope that this will succeed and succeed abundantly. But, this is a worthwhile chance. Let us not destroy the effectiveness of the program by interfering with its continuity where the stabilization of currency is involved and the machinery for the whole interdependent economic mechanism. We have been in Germany for 3 years and we have not stabilized the currency over there yet. It is not because we have not wanted to, and it is not that Britain has not wanted to or France, but the difficulties in obtaining cooperation have been almost insurmountable, and it may take a while longer. Similarly in other countries, to establish a stabilized currency and reestablish a sound economy may take infinitely longer than

a year. So there must be continuity to the program if it is to be effective.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. The Members of this House are greatly saddened by the physical affliction from which the gentleman from Illinois is suffering. We are confident he will have rapid and complete recovery. But would the gentleman, or any of us, like to have a physician who would say to him, "I will treat you for 6 weeks or 6 months, but if you are not cured at the end of that period, then I will not do anything more for you at all"? Similarly a program of recovery like this of necessity progresses slowly. To make sure that we do not waste the money we put in, we must lay out a long-term plan that gives greatest chance of success. We must give the recipient countries the expectation that to the extent they make progress under this program, to the extent they work together cooperatively, the United States also expects to play its part. We make no commitments beyond 1 year. We specifically limit the promise to 1 year. But we seek to give them the maximum incentive to do their utmost as the way to justify us in authorizing and appropriating more each year for a 4-year period. It is to save money, to put it to the most effective use in bringing healing to the sick, sore spots in Europe that we have written the language so as to give hope but without commitment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will certainly not prevail.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in opposition to this disastrous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin would turn this bill into just another provision for an interval of relief.

Aid for 1 year will not be long enough to assure recovery and is not even long enough to justify the term "program."

The amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin, in other words, takes the European recovery program and strips it of program and recovery and leaves us only with the word European.

Another year of relief is not worth $5,300,000,000. If Europe can be rehabilitated, however, the investment our taxpayers are making in this bill will be returned manyfold in productive and sound world trade.

It is the essence of a program that it involves a schedule of work looking toward the accomplishment of a predefined end. There is a moral commitment in this bill—to do our part for the next 4 years if the European nations in CEEC do theirs. Curtailment of this moral undertaking to 1 year means that there simply will not be a program. Remember, we can stop our aid at any time. Congress must authorize money for this program every year. If sound, economic rehabilitation is being achieved as a result of mutual cooperation between the countries of Europe and ourselves, we will want to continue our aid. It is sound business to do so. We are committed to this program only if it is a success. We are not committed to a failure.

The objective of the European recovery program as originally envisaged was to be the recovery of Europe. If we cut this to 1 year we have tied ourselves down so that we cannot adequately plan or act to insure the supposed objective—the recovery of Europe. We simply have one more phase in the hodgepodge of relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I beg the Members to read what is already in the committee bill in lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 82:

> Nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries.

My esteemed colleague from Wisconsin, however, has in his amendment provided that this bill shall constitute neither a legal nor a moral obligation. I question very much whether the Congress has any right to attempt to legislate moral obligations or absence of moral obligations on the people of the United States or Members of Congress. We are going far afield when we attempt to legislate morals for ourselves or our citizens.

The gentleman's amendment also cuts the whole period of the thing to 1 year.

I want to speak to my Republican colleagues. Brethren, this is it. For years we have thundered against the piecemeal, stopgap foreign policy of the New Deal. We have demanded a long-range, world-wide policy, and we have got it, here, now formally set down, carefully framed and limited, and largely written by Republicans; and what happens? We find Republicans on this floor who want to go back to the New Deal emergency stopgap year-to-year relief plan.

Of course, I had expected a certain amount of opposition to our policy statement. We are suffering from congressional foot and mouth trouble here, Members who drag their feet and foam at the mouth day after day against anything we are trying to do here, while we try to get ahead with this gigantic and pressing task. They are willing to line up with the New Deal or with Wallace or anyone to oppose what we are trying to do now.

But I am concerned that others, men of good sense and good will whose friendship I value so highly, such as the author of this amendment, hesitate and shudder because they realize this fact: Any long-range policy involves our saying now what we intend to do in the future, whether or not we reserve the right to change our minds later. We want other nations to hold out indefinitely against powerful and terrifying external and internal forces. In order to hold out indefinitely, they must know now definitely what our plans are if they do hold out and do as we suggest.

In the strategy of waging peace, and that is what we are trying to do, a poor plan is better than no plan at all; but this is a good plan. We may find mistakes in it. They will be corrected in the future if we adopt a policy of having a plan. Let us not go back to organized planlessness. Let us not go back to the policy we have criticized for years. Remember, we are deciding on a policy now whichever way we may vote. We will vote either for a definite, written plan and policy, or for a policy of annual emergencies, the policy we have followed so disastrously in recent years.

The committee plan shows that first, we tell the world that we reserve the right to future Congresses to authorize and appropriate each year; second, the world knows we may make other changes in the plan each year as we review the working of the plan in public hearings on authorizations; third, we reserve the right to terminate the plan at any time for any country for failure to comply with our requirements; fourth, we state plainly that at all times continuity of assistance depends upon continuity of cooperation, but, fifth, we state now that our present intention is to leave the plan on the books, subject to amendments, for 4 years, while they work out their 4-year plan which they have said will remove them from any further dependence on us.

Mr. Chairman, we are not used to taking a long look ahead all over the world. We had better start. We made a start in the first 40 pages of this bill. Let us not spoil it now. Let us vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 63, noes 91.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VORYS and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 117, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, did the vote just cast include a proposed amendment to lines 15, 16, and 17, or was that offered as a separate amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They were both considered as one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from California that the amendment just voted upon did include language substituted for that in lines 15 to 17, inclusive.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 82, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, and substitute for them "or countries. No authorization in this bill shall be construed to imply any commitment, legal or moral, to advance further aid after June 30, 1949. Although the bill recites later dates, it is the sense of this Congress that such aid will be extended only if the recipient countries are doing all they can to aid themselves, and if such further aid is justified by the then economic and financial condition in the United States."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, the amendment is substantially the amendment that has just been passed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment submitted goes much further and suggests other conditions, is stated differently, and involves substantially different propositions than the amendment heretofore voted upon.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. The Committee of the Whole, having limited debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, does that limitation apply to this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. This is not an amendment to the amendment which has been disposed of; it is an independent amendment.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, as all Members of the House realize who heard the amendment read, this does not make any material change in the bill submitted by the committee. It strikes out the last sentence on lines 15, 16, and 17, on page 82, and inserts what the committee says this sentence intends to say. It does so, however, in simple, understandable language, which I can understand, which you could understand, Mr. Chairman, which anybody in any European nation could understand: That although this bill does contain, in several times the date 1952, which the committee has just decided to leave in, that it is the sense of this Congress that such aid will be extended beyond 1949 only to recipient countries who are doing all they can to aid themselves, and if further aid is justified, not by what now is, but by what may then be, the economic and financial condition of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I simply call the attention of this committee, to the fact that by the last vote, this teller vote just taken, we committed the United States irrevocably for 4 years. We permitted the leaders of Socialist groups in Europe to say that the United States was going to support their governments for 4 years. You know exactly what would happen in this country under similar conditions; and so I am trying to say here, as I hope to say again on page 97, something that could be understood by anybody who reads the bill, that it is the sense of this Congress that aid will not be extended under any circumstances beyond 1 year unless certain conditions have been complied with in Europe. That being the case I see no reason why anybody could object to that, if the statements previously made have been true, that this is only a bill for 1 year.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman explain who is going to determine whether the conditions have been fulfilled or not?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Just the same as before. I am not changing that part of the bill. Whoever was going to determine it before, the Administrator or the Congress, would have to determine it under my amendment, if adopted.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Will the gentleman from California please advise us who is to be the judge?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That question was just asked by the gentleman from Florida, and my answer is that I am not trying to change that at all, that whoever would make the determination under the language of the bill would also make the determination under the language of my amendment, only I am making it a little easier for our people to understand, and very much more clear to the Socialistic leaders in Europe.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me, if I understand the gentleman's amendment that he is delegating to this Economic Administrator, whoever he may be, the power which should be retained in the hands of Congress as to whether or not this program is to run one, two, three, or four years.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Only if the committee so delegated it. If the committee delegated it, I did.

Mr. MUNDT. Under our version the Economic Administrator has nothing to say whatsoever as to how long the program runs. That decision is kept entirely in the hands of Congress where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is displaying the confusion which I have previously pointed out which exists in the committee version between pages 82 and 97. I have been arguing just what the gentleman from South Dakota now says, but I was voted down. Now I am giving the committee a chance to say in understandable language what the committee says it means.

When we come to page 97 I will have another amendment. This is a helpful amendment, which I think ought to be adopted.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in two respects this amendment merely brings up points that have already been disposed of. It makes the time June 30, 1949. It also puts in these words: "That nothing shall be construed to imply any moral obligation."

I seriously question whether this Congress has the right to legislate the morals of its Members or the people of the United States as to moral obligations. Then comes this strange language, which will be something new under the sun if we have that sort of language in any bill. Let me read it:

Although the bill recites later dates, it is the sense of this Congress that such aid will be extended only if the recipient countries are doing all they can to aid themselves, and if such further aid is justified by the then economic and financial condition in the United States.

That thought is already written in precise and forceful language in the bill. Let me read from page 49, lines 7 to 14:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that continuity of assistance provided by the United States should, at all times, be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program.

Let me read also from page 82:

Nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries.

Let me read further:

The authorization in this title is limited to the period of 12 months in order that subsequent Congresses may pass on any subsequent authorization.

It is thus made crystal clear we are reviewing this year by year, that we are not legally committed to authorize or appropriate a thin dime to any country. But we certainly do not want to attempt to write into law an express prohibition of a moral obligation that a United States citizen or a Member of Congress might feel compelled to follow.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. We also make it crystal clear that the continued authorizations and appropriations must be made by Congress. The gentleman from California, not intentionally but by the language he uses, delegates that authority to the Economic Administrator. Certainly I do not want to take such a step toward one-man government in this body today.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that two of the points in here have already been debated and passed upon and the third point is provided for more appropriately and effectively in the bill, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment states: "Such aid will be extended." The gentleman from California is trying to put words in the mouth of the committee. The committee said no such thing. In

his zeal to interpret words of the committee the gentleman is saying what the committee would not say in promising to extend aid. For that reason alone the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is extremely fair in bringing this up because the gentleman proposed a somewhat similar phrase to the committee. He did it, having the purpose in mind that the bill should provide that "aid shall be extended." The committee struck that down and the House has agreed with the committee's position. The gentleman is very fair in pointing that out. We should not do by mistake what we refused to do deliberately. One thing we will have, if this amendment is adopted and anybody can understand this language at all, is a statement in here that "aid will be extended."

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I want to say that at first blush I thought the gentleman's amendment was the proper thing to do and I was thinking probably I would support it. But the gentleman has explained it and has stated that the language is quite sufficient in the bill as it is, therefore I am against the amendment.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has very clearly called to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the main objections to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. There are other objections which have been referred to but certainly we would not want to take the chance of placing in the Economic Administrator such broad powers as this amendment undoubtedly would give him. It seems to me that the Committee has very carefully considered this question. The language in paragraph (c) page 82 of the bill is very clear and specific. The one thing that it does do, which I think is very important, is that when the next fiscal year comes around, if it is necessary to extend the provisions of this bill through the medium of additional appropriations, that authorization has to be obtained, and that means it will come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In that way a regular standing committee of the House will have original jurisdiction, whereas if that language that the Committee has carefully worked out is not in the bill, only the Committee on Appropriations of the House would have original jurisdiction. I think on such a tremendous undertaking of this kind, all of us want to have the powers of our country used effectively, whether one is for the bill or against it. Nobody's patriotism in this body can be impugned. We may have an honest disagreement as to judgment, but whatever bill goes through, all of us want to see the results of the bill used effectively in order to bring about peace and to meet the challenge that atheistic communism is giving to the rest of the world, and in the first instance to those countries who are a part of the western civilization.

It seems to me that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has considered this particular question well. The one important thing that addresses itself to me, looking into the future, into the next fiscal year, is that when additional appropriations are sought, that first there has to be an authorization. That means that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, will retain original jurisdiction over the hearings, the consideration, and the reporting of necessary legislation to the House.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. That was done deliberately, because under the provisions of the bill the Foreign Affairs Committee would hold public hearings and the country as a whole would have an opportunity to view the efficacy of this program the next time authorization is up for consideration. On the other hand, our Appropriations Committee has the habit of holding its deliberations in secret sessions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assumed that, and therefore the language of the committee, I think, is best. It goes to the question of administration. I want to stress to the executive branch of the Government that, when this bill is enacted into law, it be administered right. Congress intends that it be administered in a dynamic manner; that there is to be no appeasement in carrying out the purposes of this bill. As a matter of fact, if I had my way about it, I would have as few career men in connection with the administration of this law as possible; to bring in fresh minds; to bring in men who realize what the purpose of the bill is, men not tied up with diplomatic relationships that they have been associated with for years. That is why I think the language of the committee bill is all-important. It is an additional check on the administration and by the Committee on Foreign Affairs that considers authorization legislation.

For those reasons, I think the recommendations of the committee ought to be approved and adhered to, and the amendment offered by our good friend from California it would be very unwise to adopt.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL UNDERTAKINGS

SEC. 115. (a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is authorized to conclude, with individual participating countries or any number of such countries or with an organization representing any such countries, agreements in furtherance of the purposes of this title. The Secretary of State, before an Administrator or Deputy Administrator shall have qualified and taken office, is authorized to negotiate and conclude such temporary agreements in implementation of subsection (b) of this section as he may deem necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That when an Administrator or Deputy Administrator shall have qualified and taken office, the Secretary of State shall conclude the basic agreements required by subsection (b) of this section only after consultation with the Administrator or Deputy Administrator, as the case may be.

(b) The provision of assistance under this title results from the multilateral pledges of the participating countries to use all their efforts to accomplish a joint-recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation as embodied in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, and is contingent upon continuous effort of the participating countries to accomplish a joint-recovery program through multilateral undertakings and the establishment of a continuing organization for this purpose. In addition to continued mutual cooperation of the participating countries in such a program, each such country shall conclude an agreement with the United States in order for such country to be eligible to receive assistance under this title. Such agreement shall provide for the adherence of such country to the purposes of this title and shall, where applicable, make appropriate provision, among others, for—

(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in order to enable the participating country to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance; and submitting for the approval of the Administrator, upon his request and whenever he deems it in furtherance of the purposes of this title, specific projects proposed by such country to be undertaken in substantial part with assistance furnished under this title, which projects, whenever practicable, shall include projects for increased production of coal, steel, transportation facilities, and food;

(2) taking financial and monetary measures necessary to stabilize its currency, establish or maintain a valid rate of exchange, to balance its governmental budget as soon as practicable, and generally to restore or maintain confidence in its monetary system;

(3) cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries;

(4) making efficient and practical use, within the framework of a joint program for European recovery, of the resources of such participating country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, which use shall include, to the extent practicable, taking measures to locate and control, in furtherance of such program, assets, and earnings therefrom, which belong to the citizens of such country and which are situated within the United States, its Territories and possessions;

(5) facilitating the transfer to the United States by sale, exchange, barter, or otherwise for stock-piling purposes, for such period of time as may be agreed to and upon reasonable terms and in reasonable quantities, of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources, and which may be available in such participating country after due regard for reasonable requirements for domestic use and commercial export of such country;

(6) placing in a special account a deposit in the currency of such country, in commensurate amounts and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, when any commodity or service is made available through any means authorized under this title, and is furnished to the participating country on a grant basis. Such special account, together with the unexpended portions of any deposits which may have been made by such country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.), shall be held or used within such country for such purposes as may be agreed to between such country and the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and the Public Advisory Board provided for in section 107 (a) for purposes of internal monetary and financial stabilization, for the stimulation of productive activity and the exploration for and development of new sources of wealth, or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with the purposes of this title, including local currency administrative expenditures of the United States incident to operations under this title, and under agreement that any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1952, shall be disposed of within such country for such purposes as may, subject to approval by act or joint resolution of the Congress, be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States;

(7) publishing in such country and transmitting to the United States, not less frequently than every calendar quarter after the date of the agreement, full statements of operations under the agreement, including a report of the use of funds, commodities, and services received under this title;

(8) furnishing promptly, upon request of the United States, any relevant information which would be of assistance to the United States in determining the nature and scope of operations and the use of assistance provided under this title;

(9) recognizing the principle of equity in respect to the drain upon the natural resources of the United States and of the recipient countries, and (a) providing for a future schedule of availabilities to the United States for future purchase and delivery of a fair share of strategic materials at world-market prices so as to protect the access of United States industry to an equitable share of such materials either in percentages of production or in absolute quantities from the territories and possessions of the participating countries, and (b) agreeing to negotiate suitable protection for the right of access for United States enterprise in the development of such materials on terms of treatment equivalent to those afforded to the nationals of the country concerned, and (c) providing an agreed schedule of increased production of such materials where practicable in the territories or possessions of such participating countries and for delivery of an agreed percentage of such increased production in repayment on a long-term basis of grants or loans made by the Administrator to such countries.

(10) submitting for the decision of the International Court of Justice or of any arbitral tribunal mutually agreed upon any case espoused by the United States Government involving compensation of a national of the United States for governmental measures affecting his property rights, including contracts with or concessions from such country.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator, during the 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, may perform with respect to any participating country any of the functions authorized under this title which he may determine to be essential in furtherance of the purposes of this title, if (1) such country has signified its adherence to the purposes of this title and its intention to conclude an agreement pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and (2) he finds that such country is complying with the applicable provisions of subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator may, through June 30, 1948, provide for the transfer of food, medical supplies, fibers, fuel, petroleum and petroleum products, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed to any country of Europe which participated in the Committee of European Economic Cooperation and which undertook pledges to the other participants therein, when the Administrator determines that the transfer of any such supplies to any such country is essential in order to make it possible to carry out the purposes of this title by alleviating conditions of hunger and cold and by preventing serious economic retrogression.

(d) The Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to insure that each participating country makes efficient use of the resources of such country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, by observing and reviewing such use through an effective follow-up system approved by the joint organization.

(e) The Administrator shall encourage arrangements among the participating countries looking toward the largest practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the participating countries in furtherance of the accomplishment of the purposes of this title. Such utilization of manpower shall include integration into the various recovery programs of the participating countries of a fair share of displaced persons who are the responsibility of the International Refugee Organization, under reasonable terms to be established in cooperation with that organization, in number and under conditions negotiated by the Administrator with the respective participating countries. The Administrator will request the Secretary of State to seek to obtain the agreement of those countries concerned that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three western zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery program.

(f) It is the understanding of the Congress that, in accordance with agreements now in effect, prisoners of war remaining in participating countries shall, if they so freely elect, be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 67, line 21, for the purpose of offering a quite technical amendment which has been redrafted and is now agreeable to all parties.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 67, line 21, after "when issued" insert the following: "shall constitute obligations of the United States and moneys due or to become due under the contracts to which they relate shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and."

Page 67, line 25, following "countries" insert "or by other persons or organizations."

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday a certain amendment was offered and was defeated. I understand now that this amendment is being offered in lieu of the one that was defeated yesterday.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The language has been corrected, and it is now what the General Accounting Office and the other agencies want, is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This amendment having the support of the administration and of the committee, I want to approve the amendment if I may.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 87, line 2, insert after "country" the following: "other than alien residents of the United States who either have made declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States or have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this is something of an anticlimactic amendment in view of the wider importance of the two amendments that we have just considered and acted upon, but nothing could be of greater importance to the people involved. No amendment could be more important to the few hundreds or few thousands of individuals whose very livelihood and whose stake in life and existence in the United States may depend almost entirely upon the acceptance of this amendment.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is quite clear what the gentleman has in mind concerning these people insofar as the first part of his amendment is concerned.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, except for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. I am trying to clarify the gentleman's amendment to see if the Committee can accept it.

Mr. COUDERT. I appreciate that, but of course the gentleman will realize the time is very short.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry, but of course it will take a few words for me to do that. I think we understand what the gentleman has in mind when he says he would make this exemption available for foreigners in this country who have qualified or have started the process of taking out citizenship papers. But you have another conjunctive clause there which is not clear to the Committee. What do you mean by residents who are legally in this country but who are not in process of attaining citizenship?

Mr. COUDERT. I mean those foreigners who, taking legal and proper advantage of our immigration laws, have come here under a quota with a legal

visa entitling them to permanent residence and who are entitled to make application for citizenship.

Mr. MUNDT. But they have not yet started the process, is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. May I say to the gentleman that as I understand the immigration law, it is not necessary for a legally admitted alien to file a declaration of intention on the date of his arrival. He need not file for 3 years, and 2 years thereafter he can apply for his final papers.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman's amendment is then establishing an escape clause and a cyclone cellar for foreigners who do not think enough of this country to even apply for citizenship, and I shall oppose that part of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, there are involved in this amendment thousands upon thousands of foreigners who are in this country legally, who have come here permanently to stay and who have cut all their ties with the country of their origin. They may be married to American citizens. They may have businesses in the United States and yet their earnings or their assets could be confiscated under this bill. They may have property in the United States which would be confiscated under this bill. These people pay precisely the same taxes that you and I pay and every other American pays to provide the money for relief programs and other things.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does your amendment exclude those who are here temporarily? For instance, like teachers in the Army?

Mr. COUDERT. It does. This does not protect any alien who is not here under a permanent quota visa, so as to be legally entitled to permanent residence in the United States.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was disquieted by the same thing in the committee, but I do not believe administratively it will work out as seriously as the gentleman believes. I think the gentleman should consider very seriously the suggestion made that he eliminate the residence factor and rely upon the citizenship factor, as the committee in that case is likely to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is this an immigration amendment? Is this to bring these people in, or what is it?

Mr. COUDERT. These are people who are presently living in the United States, who are entitled to become citizens, whose property would be confiscated by the United States or their home country, under the operation of this law.

Mr. BROOKS. How is it germane to a foreign-aid bill?

Mr. COUDERT. Because there is a provision here that the property of aliens in the United States shall be used for the purposes of this program, which means it shall be taken away from them by confiscation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And they are all quota immigrants?

Mr. COUDERT. They are all quota immigrants, so far as this amendment is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is the important thing. They are under the quota, so that they are entitled to stay here.

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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

Mr. TABER. Well, I hope the gentleman will not try to do that. I think this amendment should be explained.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for the duration of this debate. I more or less find myself in the position of Rabbi Ben Ezra, that poem written by Browning, and I am sure the body politic who has heard this discussion or who has read it in the papers is in that same condition.

I desire to quote to you this stanza from this poem:

> Now, who shall arbitrate?
> Ten men love what I hate,
> Shun what I follow,
> Slight what I receive;
> Ten, who in ears and eyes
> Match mine: we all surmise,
> They this thing, and I that:
> Whom shall my soul believe?

It is a tragedy that we cannot have unity and harmony at this time, in this critical period in the history of this country and of the world. If there ever was a time when we needed harmony and unity and cooperation it is now. Yet the leaders of this Nation in the lawmaking body of this Nation cannot agree on a program dealing with the situation as we find it now.

It is my thought this plan is in the general welfare and the general national interest of this country. I say that because of the fact that we have as proponents of this measure the leaders from the military, the leaders from the State, the economic leaders, and the political leaders, and the labor leaders; and practically every one who went before the Foreign Relations Committee favored this bill.

If we do not pass it, what is going to be the condition of this country? I think that it means nearer to war. Just consider the action of Russia. She has taken Czechoslovakia, she is in the process of taking Finland, and I see in the paper this morning she is dealing with the Netherlands. The only thing that is holding her back, I believe, is her belief that America is going to get behind Western Europe, economically at least. When I was over in Europe this summer, the talk among the people in Germany was that the Russians were sending out propaganda and saying to the German people: "You might as well come on and be with us. You watch the Americans. Just give them a little time. They will desert you. They will build you up to a certain point, but if it costs them anything in dollars and cents they will desert you. They may send boys over here to sacrifice their lives, but they are more interested in the shekels than they are in the manhood of their country."

And I say to the Membership of this House that if this sum of $5,300,000,000 could be substituted in lieu of the men we would have to send over there in case of war, and we are going to have to send them unless we can get the cooperation of the nations that have gotten together and say: "We are going to cooperate with you. We need financial aid, we need economic assistance. If you will give us that, we will go down the line for you, and we will kill communism and we will help you build up democracy, and liberty, and the freedom that you Americans love."

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

Mr. Chairman, I have not had time since this amendment was offered to make a detailed and thorough study of this language and the amendment, but what I am afraid of is this: When I was across the water last year I found this situation existing in Greece, and France, and other places, that enormous numbers of the rich in those places had gotten their assets out of their own country and were not using those assets for the rehabilitation of those countries. I would hate to see any effort that might properly and legitimately be made by this country to crack that situation or give them a chance to really be pressured into helping rehabilitate their own countries out of which they really made their own money. I should like to ask the committee what effect this amendment might have along those lines?

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. I expect to follow the gentleman on the floor to discuss that in detail. This would open one additional cyclone cellar into which foreign capital might go in hiding to attempt to escape taxes at home and abroad. They could come over here and continue to escape from taxation. That is why I opposed the amendment and suggested to the author of it that it might be revised so as to protect certain individuals by limiting its exemption to those who have expressed the intention of becoming American citizens and who have actually made application for citizenship in this country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is adopted I hope it will be so modified that it will not create a situation such as I am fearful will result from the situation that I found while I was over there last year. As we get into it I hope that action may be taken that will correct it, if the amendment is adopted.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that regardless of this amendment, I have an amendment at the desk to this same section which tightens it up along the lines that the gentleman has mentioned by including among the controls which are to be exercised over the assets of these foreign nationals in this country the establishment of conditions for guaranteeing that those assets be held by the United States as security against governmental credits by this country.

Mr. TABER. I have found the situation in several places where their rehabilitation could be promoted very decidedly if the folks who really were citizens of the country were making a contribution in investments in those countries' merchant marine and trading operations that you would naturally expect them to make. I hope nothing will be done which will prevent an effort to make those people pay something to carry their own burden.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very technical phase of the bill with which our committee struggled day after day and hour after hour. We are not sure now we have a satisfactory answer. On the other hand, I am quite positive that the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York is not a satisfactory answer because we discussed that in committee. He is trying to do one thing with which I have considerable sympathy. He is trying to find some way to protect those foreigners who have come to this country under the quota system legitimately, intending eventually to become American citizens, from having their resources in any way recaptured or utilized by the government which they have left. If it is his desire to do that, then he has gone too far by saying that anybody who is in this country legally can have that opportunity. When you go that second step, of course, you provide a great haven over here for rich Greeks, Chinese, Italians, Germans, British, or anybody else to come here with their swag and hide it from our tax collector and from their own as well. I shall resist such efforts.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. Will the committee accept the amendment if I confine this to those who have within a reasonable time filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen?

Mr. MUNDT. As far as I am concerned, I would be willing to accept it if the gentleman restricted it to those who have already made application for citizenship. By saying "a reasonable time" that would merely create another Cherokee strip and would in effect provide an incentive so that it would be cheaper to become an American citizen than to remain a Greek, a Frenchman, or an English lord. I want to help the fellow who is over here legitimately, who in good faith came over here and who has declared his intention to become an American citizen.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman accept 3 months to give those who have bona fide intentions to become citizens but heretofore have neglected to make application?

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that you should include in your amendment only those who have made a declaration of intention to become a citizen, those only who have actually applied for citizenship in the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The difficulty is, if I may suggest it, that up until very recently immigrants coming from certain countries could not even file their first papers under regulations. That has just recently been lifted. During the war they could not apply.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My recommendation is that you put in a specific date when they must apply, and that should be now and not in the future. Put in some date like March 31 or June 30 or April 1, some date like that.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the gentleman that he should address his question to the gentleman from New York, because personally I am inclined to be against the whole idea. I feel that the fellow who has been a Greek or an Italian all his life owes a little something to his kinfolk back there or to his country, even though it has been demolished by war. I am not willing to agree to make it possible for him to come over here with his wealth, but I have agreed to compromise to say to those who have declared their application for American citizenship, we will make this concession. That is as far as I want to go and I am a bit reluctant to go even as far as that. I do, however, see merit in giving special consideration to these cases.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I would just like to say that I join with the gentleman in agreeing to this amendment if the gentleman will change it as requested.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent to alter the amendment by limiting it to alien residents who have made their declaration of intention to become citizens, and I offer the amendment as so amended.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: Page 87, line 2, insert after the word "country" the following: "other than alien residents of the United States who either have made declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States."

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

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

Mr. BLOOM. In talking about declarations, that means nothing in this country. An immigrant can come here, and the next day, if he came in legally, he is a declarant, but he is not a citizen. So, I do not think that this means anything at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 86, line 25, delete the word "control" and substitute the word "identify."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this is an agreed committee amendment to make it clear that we do not insist on other countries controlling the assets of their citizens, but that they identify them so that they may proceed along the principles set forth in other parts of this section.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. I have an amendment to this section which I desire to offer as a substitute for the committee amendment. Is it proper to offer it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman has an amendment, he may offer it as a substitute when the gentleman from Ohio has concluded.

If the amendment of the gentleman from New York is a substitute for the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio has offered, it should be offered before the first amendment is disposed of.

Mr. KEATING. My purpose in offering it as a substitute for the committee amendment is that my amendment tends to strengthen rather than weaken section 4. My analysis of what the gentleman from Ohio seeks to do in changing the word "control" to "identify" is that that is rather to weaken it. Therefore, it seems to me it is appropriate to offer this amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I of course cannot discuss the gentleman's amendment until I know what it is, but may I state to the Committee of the Whole that our committee has worried and fretted over this section and we are all somewhat dissatisfied with it, as to whether it should be a strengthened or weakened, and how much, but one thing that we could agree upon was that we did not want to authorize control. We thought that identification of the assets in this country was a sound principle. Therefore, all I am in a position to do now is to urge the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment as a substitute for the Vorys amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING as a substitute for the Vorys amendment: On page 87, line 4, strike out the semicolon, insert a comma, and add the following: "including but not limited to the establishment of satisfactory conditions for guaranteeing that identifiable assets of nationals of such country located in the United States, its Territories and possessions, may be held by the United States as security against any governmental credits from the United States to such country."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that the amendment as read obviously is not a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, which is on page 86. The gentleman's amendment is on page 87. The gentleman may offer his amendment later as an independent amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 87, line 6, after "stock-piling", insert "or other."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that scrap iron, which is a strategic material, does not necessarily have to be stock piled when it is brought back to this country under agreements with other nations. It will be needed for use immediately in our own economy. By merely putting in the words "or other" we make it clear that scrap iron is considered a strategic material and that it does not necessarily have to be stockpiled when returned to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 89, line 10, after the comma, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "by" and on line 11, after the word "of", insert the word "minimum." On line 19 after the word "enterprise", insert the following words "as defined in paragraph (iii) of subparagraph (3) of section 111 (b)."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, these are amendments to perfect the language in the provision for acquisition of strategic materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 86, line 25, after the word "control", insert "and put into active use."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly glad to offer this amendment, because this is one of those times which are becoming increasingly rare, I regret to say, when I am in complete agreement with the Department of State which looks with favor upon my amendment.

If you will look on page 86 of the bill, you will note the handicraft that we have worked upon this important part of the bill. I call your attention to subsection 4 as it now reads. We have been talking about these hidden assets in this country, and the great hoards of money which it is alleged certain French people and certain Spaniards and certain Greeks and Chinese have in America. We changed the language, you will recall, on the bottom of page 86. It no longer says that we shall take measures to locate and control these assets in furtherance of the program. I share with the members of the Committee the feeling we should not set an example in this democratic country of controlling the assets of private citizens. So we backed up, and as usual, we backed away too far. Look at what we have done. We took out the word "control" and put in the word "identify." So now with all the majesty of this great power of Congress, we insist that the foreign governments locate and identify the assets. But that is all. They do not have to use them. They do not have to tax them. Nothing needs to be done about them, but simply to locate them and identify them.

We have taken away entirely the sum and substance of what the Senate wrote in in its legitimate desire to make sure that the hidden wealth of foreigners in this country be utilized in furtherance of this program to avoid the very thing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], was talking about a few minutes ago. So with the approval of the Department of State and with my own full support and at my own suggestion, I have offered the amendment which would make this language read as follows at the bottom of the page: "To the extent practicable taking measures to locate, control, and put into active use" the earnings from the assets of these nationals. Therefore, these assets which are now hidden away under this legislation, if they are identified as I propose by this amendment, will be put to use helping to finance the recovery of the country to which such national might belong.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman was reading section 4. That section starts out with the words "making efficient and practical use within the framework of the program." Therefore the language of the gentleman's amendment is unnecessary because the words "making efficient and practical use" are already in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. May I point out that those words refer to commodities, services, and facilities provided under the title and that the use which I have now injected into the bill at this point refers specifically to money, resources, and wealth which is located and identified.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If a man has money and has a stake in an industrial corporation, would that be using the money in accordance with your amendment? Would that be such a use as you would contemplate when you use the word "use"?

Mr. MUNDT. That would depend entirely upon the law of the land to which that citizen belongs. If they have a law which taxes incomes, he would have to pay his pro rata share as a taxpayer to France, for example, to help finance the recovery of France. In other words, this compels in brief the nationals of other countries who are living in the United States to share with the citizens of the United States the cost of bringing about the recovery of their own country. It is as simple and as logical and as persuasive as that.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I share entirely the viewpoint of the gentleman and the objective that I am sure he has in mind. I shall support the gentleman's amendment as I hope he will support mine when I seek to add at the end, a statement of exactly what we mean by this, namely, that if conditions can be established, they shall pledge those assets to this country as security for the obligations which this country incurs under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] as to the meaning of this language in lines 20 and 21:

Within the framework of the joint program for European recovery.

Suppose the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, what can the United States do with respect to these resources, unless it has the cooperation of the country of which the person involved is a citizen?

Mr. MUNDT. Nothing, of course. But may I advise the gentleman, we will have complete cooperation of the country involved, because no supplies, no commodities, no finances from the United States flow to any country under this legislation until an actual contract is written and signed. In that contract we can spell out precisely the type of conditions we desire to follow in utilizing these foreign assets.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman in a position to go so far as to emphatically state to this body that in this agreement which is to be effected between the United States and the affected country, that that country will agree to reach out and take over the dollar resources of their citizens in this country, under that language?

Mr. MUNDT. Many of the countries are very eager to utilize these assets of their nationals, but they need some assistance from us to help locate and identify them before liberating them so that they can have access to them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do you mean to say the international situation has disintegrated to the point where England, for instance, cannot locate assets in this country which belong to British subjects?

Mr. MUNDT. Some she can; some she cannot—many foreign nationals have become very adroit at concealing the assets they hold in the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They rely upon this Congress, then, to do the dirty work?

Mr. MUNDT. Great Britain is not one of the biggest offenders in this category.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not absolve them from all blame.

Mr. MUNDT. Neither would I, they offend but not as much as nationals from some of the rest of these participating countries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But you take the position that this language, "within the framework of the joint program for European recovery" is sufficiently broad to put us in a position to substantially force those other countries to join with us first in locating these hidden assets, and second, in putting them to use?

Mr. MUNDT. It is not a question of our authority. Certainly the authority is spelled out definitely in the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why would it be a matter of discussion and debate when the people of this country are being called upon to finance a program of this kind, and leave the citizens of other countries, who are to be the recipients of this aid, to pass us by, leaving the burden on the people of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. Which is precisely why I offered my amendment. The gentleman should be in support of my amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman causes me to doubt the efficacy of his amendment when he says these other things will be done if it is proper to do so.

Mr. MUNDT. That is why I put the amendment in, to make it possible for them to be done in a proper manner.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But your words of reservation make me doubt the efficacy of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be again read.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have opposed this amendment under a misapprehension. I was told that the word "control" had been stricken out. I find that in the amendment just read the word "control" is left in and that the section itself is further tightened by the use of the word "identify."

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The word "control" was knocked out by an amendment and another substituted for it by action of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How long ago was that accomplished?

Mr. MUNDT. About 5 minutes ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not happen to be on the floor at that time; I was called out.

Mr. MUNDT. It was adopted by the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I rose because of the elimination of the word "control." The gentleman from South Dakota will recall that in the Committee the use of the word "control" was discussed and that the committee by a majority vote decided to retain the word "control," because it would give us some means of being able to get hold of the assets held in this country by foreign nationals, so that those assets could be used in rehabilitating the countries from which the nationals came.

The gentleman will further recall that we had information in the committee that European nationals had in this country between two and three billions of dollars in money, that the Greeks themselves had some hundreds of millions of dollars, and that the Chinese likewise had similar amounts.

It is my belief, my very strong belief, that we should do everything we possibly could to make these foreign nationals who have these assets hidden away here bring them out into the open and use them for the rehabilitation of their own countries. I do not think all the money should come from the people of this country when the nationals of other countries have funds at their disposal.

Mr. MUNDT. That is precisely what my amendment proposes. That is why I was shocked when the Chair said the gentleman from Montana rose in opposition to my amendment, because I am sure it carries out precisely the intention expressed by him in the committee and that I knew he held. It requires them to put this money to use in behalf of their countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota that I appreciate his statement. I believe, however, that the word "identify" is not strong enough. I would prefer to retain the words "control and identify."

Mr. MUNDT. I also voted against the word "identify." The committee overruled us. That is why I am trying to put the other language in the bill to strengthen it more than the words "locate and identify" now define its scope.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has just informed us that information was submitted to the Committee that there was $3,000,000,000 in one case and several hundred millions in other cases. Where did that information come from, if these countries cannot find out what their nationals have in the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was not definite information, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, but it was estimates which were placed before our committee when this matter was under discussion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. By whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Offhand, I cannot recall exactly, but I believe it was furnished us by officials of the Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; but by responsible officials certainly of this Government—the Federal Reserve, and the Treasury. They know and these governments know who has the assets here. They do not use them, however, but come here and ask the people of America to foot the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Secretary of the Treasury said they were trying to find means by which they could pry loose all these assets for use in some such program such as this.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Those powers, if the gentleman will refer to page 77 of the hearings, were the National Advisory Council whose head is the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the Administrator of which is to go on the Advisory Council.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because it strikes basically at the roots of private property in this country. Suppose you lived in a foreign country and had a bank account in which you had placed your life's savings. Now, suppose you are a nonresident of that country, you are a United States citizen. If you went to the bank after you had paid your taxes, and asked to withdraw your money and were told that you would not be allowed to because your government had taken it over and blocked it, that would be the totalitarian method used by totalitarian states. Those methods have been used by certain European countries.

If you use totalitarian methods by calling the resources of such participating countries in the United States the equivalent of the private property of its citizens, which this section does, you are then using just the same methods. You are then saying that you are a citizen of a country and your assets, your private property, are the assets of that country. Then if the country so wishes, you are saying in effect: "We will not proceed by the ordinary methods of taxation, but we will encourage by this section that outside country to take over the assets of their citizens which are private property for purposes that they could not be taken over in this country.

Under our Constitution private citizens are protected in their property rights without discrimination, and they should be protected whether aliens or citizens. Why in the name of heaven is the United States Government going to say to foreign governments: "Come in here and take over the private assets of your citizens by your own methods."

We should be able to let the participating countries identify and help them identify those assets, but we should not have the word "control" in the provision and allow foreign governments to come

into the United States and control the assets of anybody.

We want the rights of private property in this country, no matter who the private property belongs to, to be inviolate and under due process of United States laws. If you permit any minority to have its property taken by outside governments without due process of law in this country, the action must be done by the law of that country, not our country, and it is wrong. The outside country by the nature of things must come in and expropriate here in this country.

Believe you me, I am a Republican, and proud of it, and I hope neither my party nor the Democratic Party in this Congress will permit outside countries and governments to come in here under any pretext and expropriate a private citizen's property, whether he is a resident, an American citizen, or a foreign-born citizen living here.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the last speaker said in part, but I think some of the foreigners are coming here with assets and sequestering them from taxation so far as their own country is concerned and also perhaps sequestering some property that should be taxable here. What I would like to know from the gentleman from South Dakota is this: What does he mean by putting the assets into use?

I want to give you a concrete case that came under my observation in 1944. I made a visit to the Westchester Country Club in New York during the war. To my surprise, in a big apartment, owned by that club, I learned that most of the people living there were foreigners. They were paying as high as $1,000 a month for apartments, and, judging by the luxurious manner in which they lived, they must have had vast assets in banks. They had run away from their own country when the invading armies ran over them. Now, I do not want to mention the country or the particular racial strain. But if that money had been placed in American stocks or bonds would the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] consider those assets as being put to use?

Mr. MUNDT. Obviously not, because it says "put them to use in furtherance of this program." Since the gentleman has asked the question may I say that it certainly does not mean confiscation. The strong argument put up by the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not apply to this legislation at all. It says "put into active use," not confiscate or commandeer.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I ask another question?

Mr. MUNDT. This puts into use the assets of those people.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If we furnish that information to the foreign country and it had an income tax law, of course they would be allowed to levy a tax on that property or income. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. With that explanation, I think the amendment is a good one. In other words, you want to take that property, that income, or those assets and subject it to the same obligation that our own people have to accept or that the individual in his own country would have to accept.

Mr. MUNDT. I could not have said it better. That is exactly right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And there would be no confiscation?

Mr. MUNDT. No confiscation whatsoever.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The foreigner is subject to the ordinary government tax and other obligations?

Mr. MUNDT. The reason I did not feel satisfied with the word "control" is that I wanted some other word in there, because I was afraid that control might denote confiscation. That is why I proposed to use this language which says "identify and put into active use." That is the same as if they had their assets in Paris or Athens or somewhere else.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In other words, the gentleman wants them to share the burden with us.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, and the payment of taxes, too.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Supposing Mr. A, a citizen of Paris, has $100,000 in currency in a lockbox in the National City Bank of New York, known to the officials of this country and known to the officials of the Government of France. What are you going to do with that $100,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I would like to know. Will the gentleman listen to this, please? The gentleman from Michigan posed this question which I would like to have answered. Assuming that a Parisian over here had $100,000 in a bank in New York, in currency, which might be subject to tax, say, in New York, or subject to some tax over in France, and we find that out and turn the information over to appropriate French or American officials, what would happen, in the gentleman's opinion, under that situation?

Mr. MUNDT. He being a citizen of a foreign country would have to pay the tax that any foreigner would pay his own government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Suppose he refuses. What do we do to implement that obligation to his own country? Would we open the lockbox and take the amount of the tax out?

Mr. MUNDT. It would go through a regular procedure. It could be worked out in various ways. It would not be confiscation or taking it away. We agree to cooperate with these foreign nations and help them to tax their nationals who have fled to this country with vast amounts of wealth in order to dodge their local tax responsibility. We agree to aid foreign governments "to put into active use" the assets their nationals have in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. You recognize his right to the $100,000 and just permit the taking of the amount that he owes to his own country for taxes, or to our country, if this created an obligation to our Government.

Mr. MUNDT. He would pay exactly the same amount as if he kept his money at home in his own country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And that would be under contract between France and this country.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to make inquiry concerning one of the important aspects of this program, and that is farm machinery. I am particularly interested in this, because we have been holding hearings in the Agriculture Committee for several months on the long-range agricultural program—that includes farm machinery. When our committee was out West holding hearings last week, several witnesses, farmers and big ranchers, spoke to the committee asking about farm machinery. They talked about their wire-bound machinery and wondered whether they were going to get new machinery this year so that they could speed up their farm operations.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, how much farm machinery is going to be shipped under this ERP program. I understand there is quite a bit of it that is going to be shipped; can we afford to do that?

Mr. STEFAN. According to the testimony before the Deficiency Committee by the Export Control Division of the Department of Commerce, the first-year operation of ERP will require one-fourth of all the production of farm machinery for exportable purposes. If I was a farmer today, I would start saving up my baling wire and save every piece of machinery in existence on the farm. This information comes directly from the Export Control Division of the Department of Commerce, and the testimony will be in the hearings that are available today on the first deficiency bill, which will follow this bill. If the gentleman from Indiana wants the official information from the Export Control Division of the Department of Commerce, I will read you briefly:

> Farm machinery: Requirements for farm machinery at home are currently in excess of the industry's ability to supply. Shortage of materials and components such as sheet steel, power transmission chain, bearings, wheels, radiators, and Diesel engines are causing considerable loss in production. Domestic shortages will be intensified by demands for farm machinery under the European recovery program. In its first year of operation the European recovery program will demand nearly one-fourth of our production annually. Demand for Diesel-powered crawler tractors will be especially heavy, and it is greater than the industry can meet unless production can be greatly increased or the supply of United States farmers drastically curtailed.

They also state in their official justification that unless the producer in Amer-

ica can produce more farm machinery or unless the American farmer voluntarily decides not to use any more machinery, he will just not have enough to produce the food he is expected to produce during the next year.

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

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

Mr. BREHM. That statement being true, why have the Farm Bureau and the Grange in the congressional district which I represent requested me to support this program?

Mr. GILLIE. I am sure I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

This morning you heard the gentleman [Mr. O'HARA] make reference about tractors that his people in Minnesota wanted to get. He has been trying for 6 months to get a tractor. If we are going to have the same trouble getting machinery we had during the war our farmers are in for a lot of trouble before we can produce enough for our people at home and for the people abroad.

Mr. BREHM. Evidently the farm interests believe the American know-how can solve that problem and produce enough machinery for the American farmer as well as provide for the farmers abroad to help themselves. I think if that were not true the farm organizations in my district would not be in favor of this program.

Mr. GILLIE. We have the know-how, but we do not have the steel to manufacture the implements. This ERP assignment for farm implements will be another severe problem on our farm economy.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 87, line 4, strike out the semicolon, insert a comma, and add the following: "including but not limited to the establishment of satisfactory conditions for guaranteeing that identifiable assets of nationals of such country located in the United States, its Territories and possessions, may be held by the United States as security against any governmental credits from the United States to such country."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, we have been struggling with this section 4, and I do appreciate the fact that it is a troublesome problem. I am happy over the extent to which the committee has gone toward adopting the viewpoint I expressed in the hearings. The Committee of the Whole has further tightened up this section. But it seems to me that we ought to do what at least many of us I am sure have in mind, and that is provide that these assets of foreign nationals which have been brought to this country, as referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in many cases in order to escape taxation or other subjection to control in their own countries, shall be pledged to this country in partial security for our advances.

The amendment I now suggest merely provides that satisfactory conditions shall be established for guaranteeing that these assets may be held as security, in order that they may be the first source of income to which each participating country will look before it and we ask our own hard-pressed taxpayers to dig down in their pockets and suffer deductions from their take-home pay to help in meeting the crisis facing that country. The fact that it is also a world crisis, impinging directly upon the lives, liberties, and destinies of every man, woman, and child in America, in no wise lessens our obligation to ensure that every reasonable and legitimate step be taken to minimize the burden on our own people.

On page 77 is set forth a table prepared by the National Advisory Council headed by the Secretary of the Treasury showing the assets in this country of the nationals of those countries who participate in this program. They are $4,930,000,000. It is true that some $900,000,000 of that money is already up for a loan, but that loan is about $150,000,000.

My point is that if satisfactory conditions may be established—and perhaps to that extent my amendment does not go far enough, but it was so worded in the hope that it might have some support by at least some of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee—then the assets of, let us say, French nationals in this country shall be pledged to the French loan or assets of British nationals to the British loan. Certainly, it is possible to work out a plan whereby this can be done in some fair and legal manner.

It seems to me that by simply saying, as we have now, that we will locate and identify and put into active use these assets, we have not been sufficiently definite in designating the steps which we should take.

At least, I feel we should pass upon this question and determine here and now whether we are going to insist that the Frenchmen who have taken their assets out of France and brought them here shall bear the primary weight in meeting their nation's obligations in order to restore and rehabilitate the Republic of France or whether our own people shall have that primary responsibility. If it is the sense of this Committee that our own people should bear it, then let us say so. But we ought to solve this problem now and say one way or the other what our intention is.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. How can we differentiate between a Frenchman who has been living in this country for 10 years and who has not become a citizen who may have accumulated $10,000 and has it in the bank and a Frenchman who has recently come here and who has $10,000 which he puts in the bank? Are you going to take it from one and not from the other?

Mr. KEATING. I believe I would answer the gentleman in this way, that anyone who has been in this country and enjoyed the priceless benefits of life here and has taken no steps to become a citizen, certainly has an obligation to some country. If he has not seen fit to accept the responsibilities along with the inestimable privileges of United States citizenship, then he assuredly has an obligation to France or whatever the country of his origin may be.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman on that point.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard the gentleman from New York read his amendment, in the heat of debate, I thought I could go along with his line of reasoning, but upon studying it, and I have it now in my hand, I find myself compelled to oppose the amendment. I want to read it to you and then explain why in my opinion it goes further than we, as a free enterprise country, can afford to go legislatively, even with the temptation which he places before us to capture for ourselves some of the wealth of foreigners. He says:

Including, but not limited to, the establishment of satisfactory conditions for guaranteeing that identifiable assets of nationals of such country located in the United States, its Territories and possessions, may be held by the United States as security against any governmental credits from the United States to such country.

In other words, it seems to me there are at least two things wrong with the amendment. First, it utterly confuses private wealth and public wealth. It holds that any foreigner who brings to this country his money, his jewels, his diamonds, his furs, anything of value that he brings to this country, are not his, but once he gets here we are going to hold them until the country of which he is a national repays us the money which it owes. I think that is an unfortunate confusion of private and public wealth. It would make each foreign national in this country individually responsible and liable for his country's entire debt to the United States.

The other difficulty is the one brought out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. This would make it impossible for any foreigner coming here on a business trip to bring with him any assets with which to buy South Dakota wheat or Detroit automobiles or radios or silks or shoes or anything that he may legitimately want to buy as the purchasing agent for himself or his company. If he brought any wealth along we would be compelled, under the terms of this legislation, to freeze on to it and hold it until we were sure those countries which owe us will pay those debts, which may run for 10 years. So, for 10 years any foreigner coming to this country would be unable to purchase goods from us. It would dry up completely our legitimate commercial export trade with all of these participating countries.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand it, there is no limitation on the amount of time that these investments have been in this country.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Everyone knows that part of the wealth of Europe helped build the transcontinental railroad lines of this country, and our telegraph lines, and they had faith in the industry of America and made those investments. This amendment would allow you to seize those private investments that are still in the hands of foreigners.

Mr. MUNDT. It would require it; yes.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota. Would it not also apply to the residence of a foreign family that might have been here for 20 years and may have earned the money here and put it into real estate?

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me it is very broad language, which might apply to that situation as well.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate all the eloquence that has been shown in favor of these foreign nationals who have brought their assets here, but I call the attention of the gentleman and the Committee to the wording which says: "The establishment of satisfactory conditions."

Now, that is one of the matters for the Administrator to handle, and if we can get the kind of Administrator that we want and expect, or at least that we hope for, he is not going to do any of the things that the gentleman from South Dakota has referred to, nor is he compelled to do so under the wording of this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry I cannot yield any further. It is true it says, "The establishment of satisfactory conditions," but read on. Satisfactory conditions for what? Satisfactory conditions "for guaranteeing the identifiable assets of such nationals located in the United States." In other words, we give the Administrator a mandate to establish conditions as satisfactory as possible for guaranteeing that these assets shall be frozen. It does not apply only to those assets that have been hoarded here for years. It applies equally to a foreign purchasing agent who may be here only on a 2 weeks' buying trip. An agent cannot come here and buy our goods. You freeze trade. Under my amendment, I provide that you put into active use the assets, but I do not go so far as to say that you could confiscate them or freeze them for 10 or 15 or 20 years, so that they could never be used by the foreign national again.

I think we should defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 18, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 87, line 2, after the word "country", insert a parenthesis and add: "Under suitable rules and regulations to protect such citizens as have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence and have in the judgment of the Administrator a bona fide intention to become citizens of the United States and not to conceal their assets from the Government of the country of which they are citizens."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes, three to be allotted to the gentleman from New York and three to the committee.

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

The was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the committee has heard this question debated in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I had no intention of submitting an amendment on the same general question, but in view of the fact that there is grave disquiet that this word "citizens" in section 115 (b) (4) of the bill, will catch in a net, which it was never intended, the small-business man in this country as a permanent resident, who is very anxious to live and make his living here—as so many millions of our people have—I felt constrained to offer this amendment. We certainly do not want to disturb that kind of foreign citizen resident here, and my amendment is designed to avoid the pitfalls which were pointed out in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York a short time ago, that an alien could easily declare his intention to be a citizen without any real purpose of finally becoming one. My amendment leaves it to the Administrator to determine whether the particular citizen of a foreign country really intends to become a citizen, and is not concealing his assets from his own government, of which technically he still remains a citizen. It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that those individuals who come to the United States as quota immigrants with every intention of remaining in the United States and becoming citizens, technically still remain citizens of the country of their nationality—one of the 16 European countries covered by this bill—until they are naturalized.

If the committee adopts this amendment it will take care of the cases there is no intention of reaching, and get rid of the fear that a net has just been spread to draw in the assets of a lot of people the committee never had any thought of disturbing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 3 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this problem very fully in the Coudert amendment. However, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is infinitely worse than the Coudert amendment. This new amendment leaves the door wide open. Mr. JAVITS simply strikes down language that we have just adopted to put into active use the assets and the earnings of these nationals. To whom does his amendment apply? It applies to any national of any country which national has the remotest, subconscious intention some day of becoming an American citizen. All he has to do is to convince the Economic Administrator that in the dim recesses of his mind he has that intention. Now, if you want to have a loophole in this thing large enough to drive a six-team South Dakota load of hay through, vote for it. Otherwise, vote it down. I suggesct that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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 86, line 19, strike out the semicolon after the word "country" in line 19, and insert a comma, and add the following: "and in removing progressively the obstacles to the free movement of persons within Europe among the participating countries."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am here seeking to include in subsection (3), page 86, in addition to lowering the trade barriers also the lowering of barriers so far as the passage of people from one participating country to another is concerned. In volume 1 of the CEEC reports there are set forth the seven objectives of the participating countries. These objectives were formulated by the countries themselves. One of these objectives is the lowering of trade barriers, another is making sounder financial assistance, and objective 6 reads as follows "to remove progressively obstacles to the free movement of persons within Europe."

In other words, I am simply incorporating in the bill the very language which these countries themselves state as an objective. If we fail to put that in, in my humble opinion, we will be failing in a very important ultimate objective.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. May I say to the gentleman that the committee has gone over this amendment, feels it is in proper form and inserted at the proper place. It does carry out one of the objectives of these countries which they themselves set. I therefore hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. It would be a great mistake to fail to include this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the most important ultimate objective of ERP is the political integration of the people of Europe.

The bill as it now stands contains the objective of lowering trade barriers for articles of commerce, but we have as yet failed to require the removal of obstacles to the free passage of peoples.

Do you not agree that the lack of obstacles to the free passage of people among the States of the United States is perhaps the greatest factor in effecting a mutual understanding of the people of all the separate States with one another? The fact that a citizen of Wisconsin can readily travel to the State of California, or vice versa, is the greatest reason why the citizens of these two States would never be brought to the point of war upon one another. If the people of France could readily travel into Germany, and the German people could readily travel into France, would that not be a great means of mutual understanding between two countries that have been involved in conflict for ages?

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it will be the greatest step forward to the realization of political unity in Europe. It may be too optimistic to hope for a United States of Europe immediately. But this amendment will help to pave the way in the not distant future.

Unless the aid that the American people are asked to give now at great sacrifice can produce great constructive reforms such as this amendment provides we are then missing a historic opportunity. Now is the time to secure these fundamental improvements in Europe. When was there a better time? When did people more earnestly desire the conditions of peace? When was there a greater necessity for mutual understanding and knowledge of one another by the people of Europe?

In addition to this amendment I would also like to state that I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT] which will be offered later this afternoon. The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota will assist in the increase of private aid to the stricken countries of Europe, including Germany. It is in the same spirit of increasing understanding among peoples—a major factor in maintaining enduring peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 92, lines 9 to 12, inclusive, strike out subparagraph (f) and insert:

"(f) The Administrator shall request the Secretary of State to obtain an agreement from any participating country which is still holding prisoners of war that said prisoners of war shall be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949, unless they shall freely elect otherwise, provided such agreement has not heretofore been obtained."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, 2 minutes for the gentleman from Illinois and 3 minutes for the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, again I desire to express my appreciation of the extent to which the committee has gone in incorporating some provision in this bill relating to the released prisoners of war who are being held by some of our erstwhile allies. As the committee knows, on both humanitarian and economic grounds, I have been advocating this principle for months. However, the attention of the committee is called to the wording of subsection (f), as it stands now, reading:

It is the understanding of the Congress that, in accordance with agreements now in effect, prisoners of war remaining in participating countries shall, if they so freely elect, be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949.

What if our understanding is incorrect? There is nothing in the bill to indicate what happens then. Of course, nothing would happen.

The purpose of my amendment is to provide in so many words just as we have done with regard to other commitments which the participating governments must enter into, namely, that they must agree such prisoners of war will be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949, unless they have already entered into such an agreement.

I have some difficulty in understanding the unwillingness on the part of those handling this measure to accept this language.

Western Germany is included in this program. We all know that the notorious Morgenthau plan is now out the window, and that western Europe will never be completely rehabilitated until the economy of Germany is reestablished, always under proper safeguards of course, to insure that its war potential is in no way encouraged.

We also know that any man is going to do more effective work to contribute his bit toward the over-all rehabilitation of western Europe if he is working in his own country than he is if he is wearing the dungarees of a prisoner of war in some other former enemy country. Self-help, not serf help will save Europe. I am told that there are some seven-hundred-thousand-odd prisoners of war still held by the European countries participating in this program.

In order for all of these countries to get back on their feet, which is what we are seeking here, one of the important factors is to make the best possible use of the existing manpower which we can devise. It strikes me that will not be accomplished unless those individuals, those nationals who want to go to work and who must go to work if this program is to succeed, are working in their own native land.

Now, there is one other difference between this provision and the committee wording. If the Members will note, under the bill as worded, it says that these prisoners of war shall be repatriated if they so freely elect. In other words they must all make an election in order to be repatriated. Now, I do understand that there are a few who do not wish to be repatriated, and in that event, they should probably not be forced to return to their own country, if the country where they now are still wants them.

But, this amendment, as worded, provides that they shall be repatriated unless they shall freely elect otherwise. In other words, the burden should be upon the Government which holds them to see that they are repatriated, unless they do not wish to be, instead of putting the burden on each prisoner affirmatively to make the election to be repatriated.

I should like to express my appreciation for the great help I have received from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] in my efforts to get this amendment perfected.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, a year ago this month I stood on the floor of this House and called attention to the fact that there were hundreds of thousands of prisoners being held as slave laborers in England and France. I informed you that I had carried on correspondence with the Department of State and with the War Department and promises were made to repatriate these prisoners. They promised that by October 1 they would be repatriated. Now, Belgium and Luxemburg kept their promises. France, however, made an arrangement whereby the prisoners could work for a year or 2 years in that country at a stipulated wage, and they would be released immediately from bondage. So many of the prisoners immediately asked for that privilege that France began to cut down the number so that at the present time they still have hundreds of thousands of prisoners in France who are doing slave labor. The labor leaders of the United States, particularly Matthew Woll, have been complaining about the fact that goods are being shipped over to this country and that we are being undersold because of the slave labor, so

that we have that condition, in addition to the fact that it is inhumane and it certainly is un-American. The only real change that is being made here by the amendment is that, where they, the prisoners, have to elect to be repatriated, they are going to be repatriated unless they elect to do otherwise.

I earnestly ask your support for this very fine amendment. If it is not adopted, you will find that on next January 1 that such inhumanity is still being carried on throughout certain nations of Europe, particularly England and France. We now have the opportunity to effectively end such savagery. Should the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs choose to oppose it, then they have the sin on their heads.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman proposes to have done in the future something that has been done already. We already have the agreement, which General Clay says should be maintained, to have orderly repatriation of these prisoners. Part of the pressure for that action came from the Congress. But we have got it, and we do not need to write it in in any better form than it is here. Certainly if these prisoners want to stay in the countries where they have made their homes we do not want to force them to go back home.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The agreements already in force provide that all prisoners of war are to be repatriated by the end of this year. Great Britain and France are the only nations in the ERP who have prisoners of war.

General Clay testified before our committee that because of shortages of transportation and other facilities in Germany they cannot accept war prisoners at an appreciably faster rate of repatriation than they are now receiving them. For instance, France is repatriating war prisoners at a rate of 25,000 a month.

The amendment repudiates agreements to which we are a party. It will accomplish nothing. At the best it can only speed up the return of war prisoners by 2 or 3 months, and the result would be more expensive for the American taxpayer, because added confusion in Germany means added costs for the American taxpayer. Remember we are carrying the burden of the administration in Germany. At the worst, it will force the Schuman government in France to agree to a condition under the ERP agreements which will be highly distasteful to the French people.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from New York was a leader in this fight in which we all joined, to secure repatriation of prisoners and the end of slave labor, but he has won his fight and has got his provision in the bill. The agreements are being implemented. We, therefore, do not need to adopt this amendment, which looks forward to something which has already been accomplished.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, many Members have asked me about the prospects and intentions with respect to concluding the consideration of the pending measure. Quite some time ago we announced that we hoped to be able to conclude it this evening. I feel quite sure that we can do that, and I am inclined to believe we should remain in session this evening until the measure is concluded. Not only is this matter important in itself, it is important to have its consideration concluded in accordance with the timetable we have set up. Moreover, we have other important matters that should be disposed of this week, and I am very hopeful that we dispose of them as soon as possible. In order that we may expedite our deliberations as much as possible, I make this statement at this time to solicit the cooperation of the Members. There is no desire or intention to shut off unduly or unreasonably any debate in respect to any matter that is properly presented for consideration. I wish solely to advise the Members of the situation to the end that we all may cooperate in accomplishing what, I am sure, would represent the desire of all the Members for concluding consideration of this measure this evening.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 92, line 3, strike out "to seek."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my amendment aims to correct an abuse which exists in connection with the dismantling of industrial plants in Germany. The people are aroused and insist that this Congress write into this law a provision which will permit a fair measure of recovery for the occupied zone in Germany.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a circular issued by the Department of Commerce, under date of March 11, 1948, which is entitled "Reparations News." I shall also offer a table which indicates that some of the items which are now for sale are also being exported from this country to the bizonal area.

This particular circular describes what is available in reparations in one of the big Krupp plants in Essen. It offers these plants, presumably, for distribution in any of 20 countries, including Russia and Poland, and three other countries, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, which are also behind the so-called iron curtain. I say "Russia and Poland" because, although the State Department promised it would suggest the stopping of shipments from the British zone of Germany to Russia, the answer to their suggestion has never been reported. And the continued shipment of plants to Russia from the British zone still goes on. At least as far as this body goes, it has never been denied.

But that is not the most interesting part of this official circular. It lists the serial number of the plant, which is 1009, and then it describes the various shops in the plant which are available for reparations.

1009/11. Shop 48: Forging plant—production of railway axles and similar products of tool steel bars.

1009/13. Shop 74: Spring shop—spiral and leaf springs.

1009/13. Shop 76: Fire brick mill—refractories.

1009/16. Shop 54: Gear shop—gear production.

1009/20. Shop 34: Private railway shop—production and repair of rolling stock for private and colliery railways.

1009/25. Shop 22: Car repair shop and apparatus shop No. 3, repairs to vehicles and machinery.

Now, that is a sample of the railway manufacturing equipment which is being torn down in Germany and scattered all over the world.

The second document is the State Department's estimate of what it intends to ship to western Germany under the Marshall plan.

One item is $60,000,000 worth of freight cars.

Now, lest it seem too absurd to be true that this economic folly would be seriously proposed for the approval of this Congress, I submit the actual document. It is table 17 in the State Department's Illustrative Composition of Imports of Commodities and Services.

In addition to offering it here for the RECORD, I will also refer those who want double confirmation of this incredible stupidity to volume I of the Senate testimony on the European recovery program, where it is printed on page 128.

I could go on and cite the whole gallery of economic fallacies involved in our program or lack of program for Germany. But this is enough. It is, as the State Department would say, "illustrative." Here, in the same city of Washington, we have one department of Government giving our conquered plants in Germany away to any and all comers and another department asking for $60,000,000 to replace their output for a few months.

It is imperative that we stop dismantling in Germany at once. The State Department should obey the intent of the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1948.

REPARATIONS NEWS

I. GERMAN PLANTS DECLARED AVAILABLE FOR REPARATION

The official inventories, listing and describing the general-purpose equipment adaptable for peacetime production in the following two war and industrial plants declared available for reparation from Germany, have been received by the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce:

Serial No.: 1009.

Plant name: Gusstahl Fabrik Fr. Krupp A. G.

Location: Essen.

Description: Parts plant, for production of armaments and steel products, comprising the following units:

1009/6. Shop 56 (b): Machine shop No. 9. Only general engineering machinery stored but not yet erected is included in this unit.

1009/11. Shop 47: Open hearth plant No. 3 and electric steel plant north—production of Siemens Martin and Electric Steel.

Shop 48: Forging plant—production of railway axles and similar products of tool steel bars.

Shop 49 (a): Forging plant—production of light forgings.

Shop 49 (b): Forging plant—production of medium forgings.

1009/12. Shop 77: Armour plate mill—production of armour and bullet-proof plate.

Shop 77 (a): Armour plate mill—production of armour and bullet-proof plate.

Shop 78: Pressing and drawing plant—production of bombs and pressure bottles for submarines.

1009/13. Shop 70: Testing shop—testing of forgings.

Shop 73: Civil Engineering Department—civil engineering work.

Shop 74: Spring shop—spiral and leaf springs.

Shop 75: Research Department—research.

Shop 76: Fire brick mill—refractories.

1009/14. Shop 79: Agricultural machine shop—production of agricultural machinery.

Shop 81: Fuse shop—detonators.

Shop 82: Foundries 5 to 7—castings.

Shop 83: Printing office—printing.

1009/15. Shop 32: Heat treatment shop—heat treatment of war material.

1009/16. Shop 53: Machine shop No. 6—iron structures for dredgers.

Shop 54: Gear shop—gear production.

Shop 55: Screw plant and machine shop No. 15—instruments and gun parts.

1009/17. Shop 57: Drop forging plant—production of light and medium die-hammered forgings.

1009/18. Shop 41: Machine shop No. 2—Forkard chuck, surgical instruments, and aircraft fittings.

Shop 44: Welding shop—welding.

Shop 46: Machine shop No. 11—electric repairs.

1009/19. Shop 72: Crankshaft shop—crankshafts for high speed, aero, and water-craft engines.

1009/20. Shop 34: Private railway shop—production and repair of rolling stock for private and colliery railways.

1009/23. Shop 24: Union workshops—storeroom for machine parts.

1009/25. Shop 22: Car repair shop and apparatus shop No. 3—repairs to vehicles and machinery.

1009/28. Sheet pressing plant No. 5—pressed steel components.

1009/30. Machine shop—general light engineering work.

1009/31. Iron store—various stores.

1009/32. Border plant for supply of steam to works.

Serial No. 1074, B/S/413.

Plant name: Atlas Werke A. G.

Location: Elmshorn.

Description: Plant for production of sound detection apparatus.

The inventories for these plants are available for public examination in the office of the Chief Reparations Officer, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D. C.

Expressions of interest invited

This announcement does not constitute an offer of sale. These plants have been declared available for reparation but have not yet been allocated by the Allied Control Authority. American business firms and citizens are invited to express any interest which they may have in the purchase of these plants in the event that they might be allocated to this Government. Such expressions of interest should be forwarded to the Chief Reparations Officer, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D. C., and must be received by April 9, 1948.

For further information concerning expressions of interest, disposal procedure, or inspection of plants, refer to previous reparations news circulars or communicate with Chief Reparations Officer, OIT, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

TABLE 17.—*Western Germany—Bizone—Illustrative composition of imports of commodities and services from Western Hemisphere and possible sources and distribution of financing, Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, at July 1, 1947, prices*

[In millions of dollars]

Import	Total imports	Possible sources and distribution of financing		
		Bizonal dollar earnings	Sources other than new United States funds	New United States funds
Bread grains	284.6			284.6
Coarse grains	54.1			54.1
Fats and oils	24.5			24.5
Oil cake				
Sugar	27.5			27.5
Meat	6.2			6.2
Dairy products	9.9			9.9
Eggs				
Dried fruit	5.5			5.5
Rice				
Coffee	2.2			2.2
Other foods	23.9			23.9
Subtotal	438.4			438.4
Tobacco	16.1			16.1
Cotton	66.5			66.5
Nitrogen	12.0			12.0
Phosphates	1.1			1.1
Potash				
Agricultural machinery	8.4			8.4
Coal				
Mining machinery	28.0			28.0
Petroleum products	22.5			22.5
Timber				
Iron and steel:				
Finished				
Crude and semi-finished				
Pig iron				
Scrap iron				
Iron ore				
Trucks	9.4			9.4
Freight cars	60.0			60.0
Steel equipment				
Timber equipment	.3			.3
Electrical equipment	5.0			5.0
Other imports [1]	212.4	99.6		112.8
Total commodity imports	880.1	99.6		780.5
Net freight	134.0			134.0
Other dollar payments				
Total [2]	1,014.1	99.6		914.5

[1] Includes copper, lead, and zinc, $18,000,000; hides and skins, $9,000,000; seeds, $22,000,000.

[2] In addition to its dollar requirements for imports from the Western Hemisphere, bizonal Germany will have an uncovered dollar deficit of $200,000,000 with nonparticipating countries outside the Western Hemisphere. This deficit is made up of the following items: Wool, $71,000,000; hemp, $6,500,000; lead, $10,000,000; coarse grains, $28,500,000; cotton, $16,600,000; other raw materials, $26,600,000; freight, $26,800,000.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Actually were not the agreements for reparations between the countries made at Potsdam and therefore are we not now committed under the agreements that have already been made at Potsdam and if that is the case, how does your amendment change the amounts already in the committee's bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It seems to me that we take a rather defensive position in that connection. Those agreements at Potsdam have been broken a dozen times. We are not bound to recognize them at this time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to support the gentleman's amendment, which is identical with one which I have at the Clerk's desk, except that mine, in addition to striking out the words "to seek" in line 3, also inserts the words "in the opinion of the Administrator" after the word "will" in line 7. I commend to the Senate-House conferees consideration of the inclusion of these additional words for the purpose of clarification, but will not press my amendment. My information is that we have been pursuing a policy of dismantling plants in western Germany at the very time we have been shipping to western Germany the same products as those made in those very plants.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KEATING. Such a policy seems to me inexcusable. All that the gentleman is seeking to do is to make it very clear that the Secretary of State is to obtain these agreements and not just to seek to make agreements.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is exactly right.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am in no position to resist the gentleman's amendment. I commend him for calling the attention of the House to this situation. As I say, so far as I am concerned, I am not in a position to oppose the amendment since I am in favor of it. I yield to any member of the committee who wishes to oppose it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a mistake if the words "to seek" were deleted from this subsection. I am in substantial agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], as to the advisability of revising the agreements made with respect to reparations and dismantling. I have so advocated in numerous speeches. We gave a great deal of attention to this whole question in committee. This language was worked out by the gentleman from Connecticut and some of the committee's assistants. The fact is that dismantling is being carried on at the moment under agreements made in August 1946 in Paris. I believe that we should seek to obtain a revision of those agreements in order to bring them in line with the major intentions of ERP. We can even tell these nations that we feel that since we are extending this aid to them, the whole question of German reparations and dismantling should be revised in the light of these new circumstances. It seems to me that that is the most that we can do. To

do any more than that would be regarded as a breach of faith with respect to these agreements. To do any less than that would be entirely unrealistic. I cannot see what more is accomplished by taking out the words "to seek," except to embarrass the Secretary of State and the participating countries which are members of the Interallied Reparations Agency. All the Secretary of State can do is to seek to obtain revision of agreements already made. He should, in my opinion, seek to obtain those revisions.

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose the amendment, and I support what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has just said. I go even further, to say that I object to the bill as it is now written in this respect. We say, "The Administrator will request the Secretary of State to seek to obtain the agreement of those countries concerned that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three western zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery program."

Evidence before our committee and the Senate committee showed that the dismantling of German nonwar plants is consistent with the European recovery program. Those plants cannot be put into operation in Germany within the next 3 or 4 years because of shortage of materials, transport, and manpower and other factors. On the other hand as rapidly as this industrial capacity is being transferred to claimant countries it is being put into immediate production, thus aiding the rehabilitation of these countries. Never forget that these countries which are claimant for German reparations are today devastated because of the war which Germany forced upon the world.

The expenditure of the billions authorized by this bill is necessary as the direct result of the actions of Germany whose habit it has been to overrun Europe every generation. We may easily forget that all-important fact, since we have escaped direct injury in two world wars. But the victims of Germany in Europe cannot forget so easily. They are the beneficiary parties to the Paris reparations agreement. We cannot overthrow that agreement by a unilateral act. It ill becomes us to attempt to try to do so.

One more point. So much of the discussion on this floor links reparations to the Morgenthau plan. The reparations program is unrelated to the Morgenthau plan. It seems to be forgotten that reparations out of German capital plants were undertaken only as an alternative to the plan as attempted after World War I of collecting reparations out of current production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] 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. JAVITS) there were—ayes 69, noes 53.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mrs. DOUGLAS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to refer to a series of questions I asked the acting chairman yesterday afternoon with reference to the construction of subsection (b) of section 112 which we have passed, of course, but which has to do particularly with the uses of petroleum and petroleum products in the 16 countries.

At that time I also called attention to the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the fuel investigation dated February 27, 1948, House Report No. 1438, which indicated a tremendously large increase in the prospective demand for gas, Diesel and fuel oils in these countries, and set forth certain specific examples of conversions.

The acting chairman was good enough to suggest that I place those questions in the RECORD and indicated that he would be glad to give the answers at the proper time today. He has indicated to me that he would be glad to have me repeat the request at this time.

I now yield to the acting chairman of the committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I will say frankly that I am not very well satisfied with the information we have been able to obtain and am inclined myself to concur in the criticisms which were contained in the Herter report on petroleum and in the report from the gentleman's committee dated February 27, 1948.

As the gentleman knows, the amount for petroleum in the ERP figures is $651,000,000 for the next 15 months, and I assume a similar amount will come the next year. As the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shows more brilliantly than I can point out, we produce and consume about two-thirds of the world's petroleum.

It is to our interest not only to have Europe consume petroleum from the Near East but to save our own supplies and to secure some from the Near East also.

There are two specific protections in the measure in addition to the one the gentleman has mentioned, which may give the administrator not only discretion but strong advice to protect the economy of this country, which would protect domestic consumers.

As to the delicate balance between when it is wise to furnish machinery over there to increase their production and what we might best use here, I have puzzled over a way to draft a provision to take care of that, but have been unable to do so. I feel that with the provisions in the bill it is a matter that we must leave to the discretion of the administrator. He is enjoined, however, by law to protect the economy of the United States.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the difficulty of the problem. I want to reemphasize my own deep conviction that the key to the success of this plan lies in our own productivity, and unless we are willing to assure the American people and American industry that they can expect the full extent of their needs will be met, we cannot hope to succeed. With this bill now keyed to the report of the Herter committee and the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which we have both referred, I think the best possible safeguards have been taken and that our domestic consumers, and our domestic industry, can feel a great degree of assurance that they are going to be protected in large measure as to their vital requirements of petroleum and petroleum products.

Mr. VORYS. It is my hope that the Administrator, when he is appointed, will read this colloquy and be reminded of the sections of the law, and the various reports to which we have referred.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. I have every confidence that the Administrator will accept that advice and will be guided by the constructive suggestions contained in those two reports in making decisions as to the matter we have discussed.

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

Mr. Chairman, the matter of fuel oil and steel pipe was brought up yesterday afternoon just before the committee rose by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. All of us on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have been very deeply disturbed about the fuel oil situation. In the city of Detroit last winter our plants were closed down for a period of over 3 weeks because of the shortage of fuel oil and natural gas. Our people were cold. They shuddered with cold. Today you are making them shudder with fear, so that they shall continue to shudder from cold next winter.

I want to have some assurance from the committee now that this fuel shortage is not going to happen again this winter. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that we do not want some pretty words spoken here or a general sort of a statement to preserve our oil and gasoline supplies for our own people. The language should be mighty strong to give full assurance to our people that they will not go through the fuel shortage they went through last winter.

The gentleman has stated that he hopes this act will be expedited dynamically. That is the whole trouble. I am sure that this program will be expedited dynamically. They expedite these things so dynamically because of the profits that are involved in the goods that are shipped to Europe that they just take everything away from our own people, and then we have these shortages. That is why we have shortages of steel. I have plants closing down in Detroit because they cannot get 18- and 20-gage steel to make cabinets and to make deep freezers. I just got a letter from one of our big manufacturers last week saying that he cut down his deep-freeze production to one-half because he cannot get 20-gage steel, and he is asking

me to find some for him. Well, I cannot find any. I am sure you have the same experience.

Now, if language is not put in this act right now to guarantee to our own people that these shortages will not occur, then watch out what those people are going to do to you in November, because they are not going to be bothered with your explanation of how you voted for this plan in order to save the world, because they will say, "How about us back home." Another thing, what assurance have they that we are not going to take away their gasoline this summer. It was brought out before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that we will have a shortage of gasoline this summer and this fall. Now, if they are going to raid the gasoline market and take our gasoline away, as they certainly will do, you will be held responsible. Of all of the gasoline going to Europe, 75 percent is going to come from United States resources. What situation are we going to face domestically here? Are we going to have gasoline rationing before November? As far as I am concerned, I warn you gentlemen that this bill should not go through unless there is positive protection given to our people that domestically we will not face a gasoline or fuel-oil shortage this fall. Do not go home and say, "We did not know about it," or "I did not anticipate this." but make sure that we will protect our people and that they will not suffer these shortages.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 95, line 13, after the period, add the following: "Whenever the Administrator finds that any country receiving aid under this act transacts any business or has any relations with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, or any other Russian satellites, they shall forthwith be denied all further such aid."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. That part of the bill has not yet been read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation has been greatly improved over what the State Department and the administration proposed originally. The amount has been reduced from the tremendous amount of something over twenty-five billion. The bill has been changed so that the State Department has been practically eliminated from the active control of the administration of the functions to be performed under this legislation.

Likewise, the bill as it now stands provides for a one-man administration with advisory assistants. In other words this bill as it now stands contains several recommendations made by the Herter committee. In fact the important provisions of this bill are largely based on recommendations made by the Herter committee. I am naturally favorable toward the recommendations coming from the Herter committee because I am a member of that committee and I know the diligence with which the committee worked and I know its fidelity to the best interests of the country.

I shall support this legislation because I feel that it will be a relief measure and more than that it should be able to assist these foreign countries to help themselves. It will strengthen the weak governments and will stabilize the currencies of these several countries whose financial structures are so weak that it is impossible for them to engage in trade and commerce with other countries.

If we are to have any trouble with any foreign country from a military standpoint it may be to our advantage if we are engaged in activities that will further our military advantages. For instance, Greece now has an army of 125,000 men who have been provided with all their clothing and shoes and with their arms and ammunition by money furnished to Greece under the loan made by the United States to Greece less than 2 years ago. Why not keep this army on a fighting basis rather than permit them to disband and then send our own men to do military duty in Greece to hold back the bandits that harass the inhabitants of Greece.

If we are to have trouble with the Communist countries we had better have as many countries on our side as we can have.

I am moved to support this measure because I think it will be for the best interest of our country.

I voted to amend this measure by reducing the total amount provided herein by more than a billion dollars. I am sorry this amendment failed. I have also voted today to reduce the time during which this law shall operate from 4 years to 1 year. I felt that we could try this plan for a year and then if it proved satisfactory we can extend it further. I am sorry that this amendment failed.

I feel that since we have taken this matter out from the control of the State Department and have placed its administration under a single administrative head with proper assistants, and since we reduced the time and the amount to be spent that this bill that we are about to vote on is a bill that the people will quite generally approve. At any rate the Congress will have the whole matter under its control and we can amend it as future events may suggest.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of title I be considered as read and open for amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

SEC. 116. The President shall take appropriate steps to encourage all countries in the Western Hemisphere to make available to participating countries such assistance as they may be able to furnish.

OTHER DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 117. (a) The Administrator, in furtherance of the purposes of section 115 (b) (5), and in agreement with a participating country, shall, whenever practicable, promote, by means of funds made available for the purposes of this title, and increase in the production in such participating country of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the resources within the United States.

(b) The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries.

(c) In order to further the efficient use of United States voluntary contributions for relief in participating countries receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants or any of the zones of occupation of Germany for which assistance is provided under this title and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones, funds made available for the purposes of this title may be used, in the discretion of the Administrator, and under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to pay port charges in the United States and ocean freight charges from a United States port to a designated foreign port of entry (1) of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid for operations in Europe; or (2) of relief packages conforming to such specified size, weight, and contents, as the Administrator may prescribe originating in the United States and consigned to an individual residing in a participating country receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants or any of the zones of occupation of Germany for which assistance is provided under this title and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones. The Administrator may make an agreement with such country for the use of a portion of the deposit of local currency placed in a special account pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 115 of this title, for the purpose of defraying the transportation cost of such supplies and relief packages from the port of entry of such country to the designated shipping point of consignee.

(d) The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery to participating countries of commodities or products which go into the production of commodities or products for delivery to any country which has announced its intention to attempt to prevent the success of the European recovery program, which commodities or products would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 118. The Administrator, in determining the form and measure of assistance provided under this title to any participating country, shall take into account the extent to which such country is complying with its undertakings embodied in its pledges to other participating countries and in its agreement concluded with the United States under section 115. The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that (1) such country is not adhering to its agreement concluded under section 115, or is diverting from he purposes of this title assistance provided hereunder, and that in the circumstances remedial action other than termination will not more effectively promote the purposes of this title or (2) because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States. Termination of assistance to any country under this section shall include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under the aid program for such country and not yet delivered.

EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT AND ACCOUNTING LAWS

SEC. 119. When the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this title, the functions authorized under this title may be performed without regard to such provisions of law regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 120. Service of an individual as a member of the Public Advisory Board (other than the Administrator) created by section 107 (a), as a member of an advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 107 (b), as an expert or consultant under section 104 (e), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 121. (a) The President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies, or other international organizations, in carrying out the purposes of this title, and may make payments, by advancements or reimbursements, for such purpose, out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, as may be necessary therefor, to the extent that special compensation is usually required for such services and facilities. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to delegate to or otherwise confer upon any international or foreign organization or agency any of his authority to decide the method of furnishing assistance under this title to any participating country or the amount thereof.

(b) The President shall cause to be transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations copies of reports to Congress on the operations conducted under this title.

(c) Any agreements concluded between the United States and participating countries, or groups of such countries, in implementation of the purposes of this title, shall be registered with the United Nations if such registration is required by the Charter of the United Nations.

TERMINATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 122. (a) After June 30, 1952, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, which declares that the powers conferred on the Administrator by or pursuant to subsection (a) of section 111 of this title are no longer necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, whichever shall first occur, none of the functions authorized under such provisions may be exercised; except that during the 12 months following such date commodities and services with respect to which the Administrator had, prior to such date, authorized procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a participating country, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this title may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer, and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this title.

(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority of the Administrator under this title may be transferred to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, and personnel of the Administration may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 123. The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every calendar quarter through June 30, 1952, and once every year thereafter until all operations under this title have been completed, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this title, including the text of bilateral and multilateral agreements entered into in carrying out the provisions of this title. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 124. If any provision of this act or application of such provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are nine amendments at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title I and all amendments thereto close in 54 minutes, with 3 minutes allotted to the proponent of each amendment and 3 minutes for the committee.

Mr. GOFF. I object, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes, but I take this time in order to ask a question. There appears in the section that we are just finishing up now a provision dealing with the local currencies which are deposited as a counterpart for the grants-in-aid that are made to these various nations. I have always felt, and the Select Committee has always felt, that the constructive use of these local currencies could, perhaps, be one of the most important functions performed in the entire bill looking toward the recovery of the various nations.

I want to compliment the committee on the very good wording with which they have handled this matter; very much better than in the bill as it came from the other body. But, I do want to ask the chairman of the committee this one question: In view of the fact that the final disposition of these currencies as provided for in this section must come by concurrent action of the two branches of the Congress, does not the chairman of the committee assume that the United States Government either has title to those currencies or joint title to those currencies, in order that the Congress may have a say in the final disposition thereof?

Mr. VORYS. Answering the gentleman's question specifically, may I say somewhat with regret that the provision as drafted does not vest legal title to these funds and control of their use solely in the United States, but does provide for the establishment of a special account in each country subject to joint control of its disposition.

May I say without telling tales after school that I as one of the members of the Herter committee felt exactly as the gentleman did as to the use of these currencies. Language was proposed which would carry out more fully that viewpoint, but that language was not adopted. However, there was compromise language adopted which I feel is an improvement on the Senate language but which does not provide clearly that title is in the United States. As a technical legal matter, I would say it does leave title in the other country subject to joint control and veto by the United States.

Mr. HERTER. Nevertheless, the gentleman would agree that there is an implied joint title, or else the Congress cannot assist in making the final disposition.

Mr. VORYS. I agree to that.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the proceedings any longer, but I feel that I ought to say a word or two in regard to the select committee. When this bill has been disposed of, the purpose for which the select committee was appointed will have been accomplished. I think it is only right before we finish our consideration of this bill to pay a word of tribute to the hard work, the diligence, and to my mind the very able and effective way in which the members of that committee contributed in their reports to the knowledge of the Members of the House of the over-all subject we have been discussing. A very large number of the recommendations, not in legislative form but in general form, that were made by that committee are contained in this bill. In view of the fact that that was a committee selected for one purpose only, and is now shortly going out of existence, I wanted to utilize this occasion to express my appreciation as the acting chairman of that committee overseas of the very fine service the members of that committee, in my opinion, rendered to the House as a whole.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEVITT:

Page 93, line 14, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

Page 93, line 14, strike out the comma after "used", and strike out "in the discretion of" and substitute therefor "by."

Page 93, line 15, strike out the first "and."

Page 94, line 4, after the period add "Where practicable" and strike out "may" and substitute therefor "is authorized and directed to."

Page 94, line 11, after the period add the following: "The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, shall make agreements where practicable with the participating countries for the free entry of such supplies and relief packages. The execution of such agreements by the participating countries shall be a condition precedent to the receipt of assistance under this title."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT] that I understand from members of the committee who have studied his amendment that there is no objection to it.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended for two purposes. First, to make it mandatory for the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to provide ocean-free transportation and to defray port charges on relief supplies furnished by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies and on individual relief packages from the United States to Europe, and to make mandatory the execution of agreements between the Administrator and the recipient countries by the terms of which moneys in the so-called revolving fund shall be used to pay the transportation charges for such supplies and relief packages from the point of arrival in Europe to the place of residence of the addressee. The objective is accomplished by substituting the word "shall" for the word "may" and the expression "is authorized and directed" for the word "may" in the pertinent places.

The second objective of the amendment is to require the Secretary of State and the Administrator to make agreements with the participating countries for the free entry of such supplies and packages, and to make the execution of such agreements a condition precedent to the receipt of relief by the participating countries.

In support of the first purpose, it is urged that the principle of encouraging the giving of individual relief through private relief agencies and through the sending of gift packages is a sound and meritorious one and will contribute much to international good will. At the same time it will lighten the relief burden of the Government of the United States by shifting a part thereof to the shoulders of the people of this country. This carries out my concept of the humane obligation of the peoples of the United States to help their brethren in need in the devastated countries of the world.

Many Members of the Congress have introduced bills to provide proposals such as this. If the principle is a sound one, the Congress should not leave it to the discretion of the Administrator as to whether or not the principle should be made effective. Under the terms of the bill as drafted, the Administrator is vested with discretion. Hence the use of the word "may." I believe the Congress should express itself as being unequivocally in favor of the injection of this principle into the relief bill.

The second purpose sought to be served, that of making it mandatory to make the entry-free agreements, is prompted by the action of many of the 16 ERP countries in recently raising their barriers against the free entry of articles normally shipped by private relief organizations and usually contained in gift packages. It is appalling to note the extremely high import duties imposed even on the necessaries of life, such as food, clothing, and medicines. By way of example, it should be pointed out that Great Britain imposes a 20-percent ad valorem tax plus a 33-percent purchase tax on all used cotton, wool, linen, and articles of clothing. Even used silk and rayon is taxed the sum of 20 percent. One carton of cigarettes is taxed at the rate of $6.50 a carton. Ordinary kitchen soaps are taxed from 15 to 25 percent. Why should the recipients of relief packages be obliged to pay such onerous taxes as a condition to receiving them from their American benefactor?

In the Benelux countries many recent changes in their laws and regulations will have the effect of making it prohibitive for people in need in those countries to receive gift packages because of the huge taxes that must be paid. On January 1 of this year the Benelux tariff act went into effect. An import tax of 6 percent is charged on the landed-cost value of the packages sent, increased by the amount of the import taxes. The import taxes vary with the articles contained in the packages. The governments of these countries are generous enough to waive the import tax in the case of a gift package of the value of $1.90 or less.

A tremendous number of relief packages are being sent to Sweden and Norway, but still those two Scandinavian countries do not have any specific law or decree permitting the free import of gift packages. In the case of Norway, the only duty-free articles are "natural curios, globes, planetariums, books, and picture books not printed in Norwegian." What good would these items be to persons in need in Norway? Rayon stockings are taxed $1.08. Roasted coffee is taxed 9 cents a pound. Printed cotton fabrics are taxed 15 percent. Wool stockings, scarves, and sweaters are taxed 30 percent. In addition to these taxes, excise taxes and surtaxes are applied in many cases. Approximately, the same is true in Sweden. It should be remembered that thousands of pounds of parcel post gift packages are sent into these countries every month. For instance, in October of 1947, 4,826,684 pounds of parcel post were dispatched to civilians in Great Britain. During the same period Norway received 336,302 pounds and Swedish citizens received 255,055 pounds from generous benefactors in the United States.

It is suggested that some of the European countries have recently raised their import duties and taxes for the selfish purpose of protecting their own markets. One of the very purposes of the ERP bill is to tear down the tariff barriers between countries; we have urged the formation of customs unions between the European countries. For us to acquiesce in this conduct to the detriment of our own citizens who are generous enough to send relief packages and supplies would be inconsistent and in derogation of the principles of the whole international relief effort.

For the United States to provide some $6,000,000,000 of relief to these European countries and then at the same time to permit the governments of these countries to charge such burdensome taxes on the sending of essentials to life in gift packages to those countries, is an anomalous situation. I propose by this amendment to require that the recipient countries, as a condition precedent to the receipt of relief, execute agreements with the Secretary of State providing for the free entry for such supplies and gift packages of such size, weight, and contents as the Administrator shall prescribe. Mind you, this is not a provision for a blanket entry of goods into these countries, but rather the granting of an authority to the Administrator to execute agreements for the free entry of necessaries and essentials of life so that the pauperized recipients will not be burdened with the payment of taxes on their gift parcels.

I urge that the amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. In order to clarify this, you are by your amendment on line 14 saying that the funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be used by the Administrator under rules and regulations prescribed by him to pay for port charges and ocean freight transportation on these packages that will be sent abroad.

Mr. DEVITT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FULTON. Those of us on the committee who have studied the gentleman's amendment agree with it. But I would like to ask if you would add a definition of what those port charges are in the United States by inserting on page 93, line 16, after the words "United States" "including handling costs from the post office at the port terminal to ship's side."

Mr. DEVITT. I have no objection. I will agree to the definition of port charges.

Mr. FULTON. The committee, then, has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my able colleague for having introduced this amendment which I know will go far toward helping those who are seeking to assist their friends and relatives overseas. I had a similar amendment at the Clerk's desk which I am very happy to withdraw in order to lend my support wholeheartedly to the effective effort which my good friend from Minnesota is making by his amendment toward achieving an objective for which he has labored with such zeal.

Mr. DEVITT. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

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

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. REES. This same subject matter has been before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I hope the amendment that has been offered will take care of that particular problem. I, too, had an amendment at the Clerk's desk, but in view of the fact that this amendment has been agreed to by the committee, I shall withdraw mine in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I thank the gentleman. I should probably say to the gentleman

from Kansas that in addition to the ocean-freight transportation, this amendment also provides that as a condition precedent to receiving relief, these foreign countries shall agree with the Administrator and the Secretary of State to waive all charges and import fees which are usually charged.

Mr. REES. Will this permit individuals as well as groups to send these packages?

Mr. DEVITT. That is correct.

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

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. This means that there will be two classes of citizens in the United States, those who will send free packages to their relatives in Germany and those of our citizens who will not be able to send gift packages postage free to their relatives in Warsaw, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, is that right?

Mr. DEVITT. That is a situation over which I have no control, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Do you think that is good American legislation, making class distinctions among your constituents and saying to the needy recipients or rather to the constituents who would send these packages to these needy recipients, "You can send gift packages," and then to another group of your constituency saying, "You cannot send packages"?

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I understand the gentleman's question. I am sure it would not be germane to this subject if I were to include in this bill provisions for countries which are not included under the Marshall plan. These provisions are limited only to the 16 countries coming under that plan. As the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has advised there is in his committee a bill which would cover the other countries. This bill only covers the 16 European countries.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Those benefits should be extended alike and equally to all destitute people. There should be no question of class distinction.

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

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The committee has prepared an amendment to take care of just such a situation. It will be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] so that under it CARE packages can be sent to all countries and so we do help them. So the gentleman's comments are not quite accurate. There is no distinction between any classes of citizens who might send relief under the CARE amendment which is to be submitted by the committee.

Mr. DEVITT. May I say I read the gentleman's amendment, and I wonder if it only pertains to the participating countries.

Mr. FULTON. Not the CARE packages. They can be sent any place, even outside of the participating countries.

Mr. Chairman, in view of my previous remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's amendment may be amended to include inserting a comma and the words "including handling costs from the post office at the port terminal to ship's side."

With that amendment, the committee has no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman's statement to be a unanimous-consent request to modify the amendment?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct.

Mr. DEVITT. I agree to the modification, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 93, line 16, after the words "United States", insert a comma and the words "including handling costs from the post office at the port terminal to ship's side."

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. GATHINGS. 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.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it was my distinct privilege last fall during the recess of Congress to go to Europe in company with five of my distinguished colleagues on the Agriculture Committee. We were privileged to travel widely and, in the course of our committee work, we talked to many, many people and made countless first-hand observations.

On the basis of what I saw, heard and felt, I returned home believing that this country was under a great misapprehension as to actual conditions in Europe. A blanket of sentiment, which was inspired either by propaganda or by the simple generous impulses of the people of this Nation, has descended on this country and we were weeping national tears for the plight of the "starving Europeans."

On the basis of my observations on the continent of Europe, I could not follow this sentiment. Europe, as I saw it, was not starving, or naked, or cold—not to any degree which could rationalize the mass hysteria of tears which was being stimulated. It is true, conditions in the occupied zones were still far from happy and in some instances they could be classified as critical.

Given a good crop year, a mild winter and other conditions of agriculture normalcy, the countries of Europe, I felt, could repossess themselves of their national vitality and struggle to their feet, without any coddling from our own country.

I reported these conditions as I saw them to the people of my district. I took the case directly to them and gave them the situation as I saw it realistically. I told them that I was opposed to any costly relief program and thought that it was not needed and that the interests of this country could best be served by rigorous attention by the Government to shortages which have been hampering our farm production for many months.

I told the people of my district frankly that I did not believe that this country could buy the friendship of other nations. I still believe that and I shall oppose any attempt on the part of this Nation to woo with dollars the affections of a foreign nation. Dollars will not purchase friendship.

At the time of its inception, the plan proposed by the distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall, had the color and odor of a financial romance. We were proposing to buy the affections of distressed—but recovering—Europe with an outlay of dollars never before dreamed of in peacetime. We were told that $18,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000, over a period of approximately 5 years would be the price of sealing this friendship.

Every observation which I made in Europe has turned out to be accurate. Europe's food, health, and food problems—to quote the most recent press dispatches—are in better over-all shape than at any time since hostilities. And that is before one penny of permanent Marshall-plan funds are expended. This condition, of course, has been aided by a mild winter, but there is no denial of the fact that conditions generally improving in a gratifying manner.

Since my return from that trip, however, a great and terrible force has begun to spread over the continent of Europe, crushing nation after helpless nation and thrusting into despair others that, so far, have been spared the iron hand of the aggressor.

I now feel that this country can no longer take the risk of a slow, if normal, recovery of the remaining free nations of Europe. The process of recovery must be speeded up so that it can keep pace with, or, under better circumstances, surpass the rapidly spreading menace of Red Russia.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is incumbent upon this Nation, in the name of salvation, to assist the free nations of Europe to combat the Soviet disease. It must be recognized, in the light of the swiftly moving events now going on in Europe, that such is the only course of enlightened self-interest.

We have observed with what deadly accuracy, and ease, the Soviet aggressor swallowed up the free nation of Czechoslovakia in recent weeks. Already its bloodless conquests of Poland, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, and Rumania have become almost forgotten incidents. Now we see the Russian bear poised to move into little Finland when the moment suits its purposes. We are fearful of the situation in Communist-ridden Italy.

Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, already heavily under trade pacts with the Soviet Union, may yet find that you can no more do business with Stalin than you you could do business with Hitler. Little Austria teeter-totters to keep its head up against the communistic flood. Part of it is already lost.

Yes; the events of the past months and the dreadful promise of even more of these terrible events makes decisive action by this country imperative. The Marshall plan, I have sincerely concluded, is our one major hope of salva-

tion for what is left of free Europe and for our own country.

There are two reasons which prompt my support of this plan. First, I believe it has now become necessary to stem the tide of communism in Europe. Second, I believe that the economic welfare of the farmer of this country is dependent on the export market which we hope can be kept alive by constructive economic assistance to the nations that would share the bounty of the Marshall plan.

Farmers of this country have already been hit by the scarcity of dollars abroad. This cannot continue. To him, the farmer, the loss of his European markets for cotton, tobacco, wheat, flour, corn, hogs, and fruit would be a catastrophe. To lose the market still to be had in Europe would greatly depress prices for those major commodities.

Under normal conditions, Europe is responsible for half of the world's trade. Out of that percentage, directly and indirectly, the farmers of the United States prosper. Thirty-five to forty percent of the goods we sold abroad in 1938—the last normal year—went to the 16 countries that will share in the Marshall plan.

The National Cotton Council recently pointed out that—

> The people of the Cotton States have an interest in this program that is * * * direct and immediate. We are now producing exportable surpluses of both cotton and cotton goods. If the countries of Europe and Asia are not put on their feet so they can continue to take these products, surpluses again will start quickly piling up to plague our industry.

I believe that this plan, properly administered, has the possibility of spelling the difference between peace and democracy and war and communism in Europe. If it is carried out as it should be, it holds the promise of bringing about a world stability without which our own country stands first to lose its own economic prosperity and, second, our peace.

If we couple this program with a strong air force, a system of universal training to give us a strong reserve of manpower, and if we once and for all serve notice on the Soviet Union that her aggression must cease, then, I believe, in years to come it will be called the creator of peace and prosperity—at least in our time.

I should like to repeat the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG, whose efforts have made the writing of a sane and sensible bill possible. Senator VANDENBERG has declared of this measure:

> It is a plan for peace and stability and freedom. As such it involves the clear self-interest of the United States. It can be the turning point in history for 100 years to come. If it fails, we have done our final best. If it succeeds, our children and our children's children will call us blessed.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GOFF: On page 99, between lines 1 and 2, insert the following:
>
> "JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE
>
> "SEC. 124. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. In each instance, not more than four members shall be members of the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly, shall appoint a chairman and a vice chairman from among the members of the committee.
>
> "(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of such programs. Upon request, the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries; and it shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Administrator, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this act.
>
> "(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such time and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditure as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.
>
> "(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and, clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.
>
> "(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman."
>
> On page 99, line 4, strike out the number "124" and insert the number "125."

Mr. VORYS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I think this is the same text as is set forth in a similar section in the Senate bill, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this place.

Mr. GOFF. That is true. These are the identical words found on page 45 of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, the entire Senate bill was stricken out. You will notice at the bottom of page 44 of the printed bill, section 23 of the Senate bill provides for reports to Congress and that section 24 provides for a special joint congressional committee.

Before I proceed further let me state that I am in favor of the bill that has already been read, and I expect to vote for it. I feel there is a good chance we can insure the formation of a military and an economic front in western Europe against communism. I want to congratulate the members of our Foreign Affairs Committee on the excellent job they have done under very difficult circumstances. I do not agree with everything in the bill, but I expect to vote for it. You will note that the House committee left out the Senate provision for a special joint committee while adopting the other provisions of the Senate bill at the end of title I.

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

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman's amendment in effect sets up a watchdog committee, does it not?

Mr. GOFF. That is right; this is the watchdog committee referred to in the Senate bill, and I think that all of us here see the value of the excellent services rendered by the Herter committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated this afternoon that his committee was in effect discharged. I think the House, on a matter as important as this, could well keep some substantial special group in addition to our regular committee looking over the shoulder of this new executive agency that we are setting up.

It seems to me that this House has profited by the work of this committee outside of the regular Foreign Affairs Committee and that the doubts in the minds of many in voting for this measure are due to the fact that many of us are worried about the administration.

This is the identical provision found in the Senate bill. Although I hesitate to do so, I would suggest that the Speaker might well appoint the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] on this committee, and might select the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who has some doubts about the communistic tendencies of those who might serve under the Administrator. I feel that this House has profited from the general dissemination of knowledge that this House has received from the select committee that has studied our foreign-aid program and could well adopt the Senate proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, under the Reorganization Act under which we are now operating, it is provided that each committee of this House which is a constitutionally recognized agent of the House shall follow up its legislation and shall see that it is properly administered. I object with all my strength to the appointment of a watchdog committee to take from the various committees of this House their constitutional functions and their rights.

This legislation when it is passed will be followed up by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as our foreign program has been; and that is the only observation that is required.

We do not need a watchdog committee composed of folks from the other end of the Capitol as well as here. We are responsible people. Let me read the provision of the Reorganization Act under which we are operating:

Legislative oversight by standing committees (sec. 136 of Reorganization Act):

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agency in the general executive branch of the Government.

We are operating under the Reorganization Act, and to appoint a watchdog committee is uncalled for. I do not like the name to start with. It is a reflection upon our integrity and our intelligence. I am strongly opposed to the adoption of this amendment and I hope it will be defeated. I would like to call attention to the fact that in all legislation I have endeavored to protect the dignity and constitutional functions of the Appropriations Committee, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and of the entire House of Representatives, I, therefore, hope that the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the able argument of our distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] is very convincing. Let me read one part of this amendment. How generous it is on the part of the Special Joint Committee on Economic Cooperation:

Upon request, the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress.

Mark you how generous they are. Look at what it does to every standing committee. It puts this special committee over and above every standing committee of the House. That includes not only the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations, but it might include the Committee on Ways and Means, it might include other committees.

In other words, this is a supercommittee over every other standing committee of this body that might have anything to do with the administration or consideration of this law. It seems to me that is very, very far reaching.

We have provided in this bill that each year there shall be appropriations. There would have to be an authorization in order that the Foreign Affairs Committee in addition to the Appropriations Committee retain original jurisdiction as a matter of right, not as a matter of sufferance. Under the legislative reorganization bill all that is to be done is for the Committee on House Administration upon request of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to appropriate money for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to continue a check, and I think that should be done, operating as a full committee or through subcommittees. So this divests the Committee on Foreign Affairs of its rightful jurisdiction.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that this special committee would have no power to bring in legislation and all of the work would have to be done twice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. JUDD. Then it would be turned over to the standing committee to deal with the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. It seems to me there are some people here whose feelings are too easily hurt. Certainly there was no intention on my part to reflect upon the committee. It does seem to me that in a matter as important as this the House is entitled to advice when there are agricultural matters and when there are so many other phases to this great recovery program. We are entitled to this information and the committee should welcome the advice and service of this special committee provided for in the Senate bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree that the gentleman did not intend to offend, but we are considering results. I had not even thought about the Committee on Agriculture being involved, but I find it is. So this committee will have more far-reaching jurisdiction than I thought.

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

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that a vote for this amendment would be as a matter of fact a vote of no confidence in the standing committees of the House? There are certain overlapping duties of committees, but we are meeting that confusion and overlapping. There is the Committee on Full Employment that is taking jurisdiction of matters over which the Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. On this question of thinking we can improve things and venting our feelings and voting our lack of confidence in standing committees by creating new committees, is just like the statement "Officer, call a policeman."

Mr. McCORMACK. I can imagine this supercommittee going to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and saying: "We will aid you." I can imagine JOHN TABER looking them in the eye and saying: "You will not. We will do our work ourselves."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, can you imagine a joint committee of 14? I have served on joint committees more or less for the last 20 years. Frankly, except for the bringing out of certain information of a general character that the Byrd committee brings out, I have never known joint committees to accomplish any effective results. The more committees you have involved in doing a job of this kind, the more opportunity there is for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to feel that it has no responsibility and that it does not pay any attention to its job, and the more you have of other committees butting in, the more you make the Committee on Appropriations feel that it has no responsibility and does not have a job to do.

Let me say to you that when this thing comes to me after this bill is passed, I intend to go into the need of every nation before recommending funds to the House. I intend to go into the capacity of the United States to provide for this program, and I am going to give you an illustration of how that might work. There is no individual today who can tell what we can possibly provide for the countries across the water on a wheat basis. It is probable that the budget will not be up here on this proposition before the middle of April and that we cannot conclude our operations on the budget estimate and have the bill in here much before the 10th of May, no matter how hard we work. Around that time we will be able to learn something about what the wheat crop is going to be, and make an intelligent recommendation as to what this country might be able to provide. Today we cannot. I hope that the membership realizes the importance of that statement and how necessary it is that these things be kept in mind when the final appropriations are provided. It is very important. If we are going to do that, we will have to take the responsibility for it, and whether we do it right or not, is up to us. We cannot do it and have some other committee running around trying to follow it up.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. It would be impossible for any sane man to imagine a better watch dog than JOHN TABER. He would have to be a thoroughbred, and he has not been bred yet anywhere in the world.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. I do not claim any greatness. I do not claim anything except a willingness to try to do the best I know how and work just as hard as I can to protect the people, and the Treasury of the United States, and that I intend to do if this responsibility comes to me as the result of the passage of this bill.

I intend to do what is the job of the Appropriations Committee, and I am sure that the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Members of this House expect us to do it. I hope the thing will not be mussed up by putting in a super-joint committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are six amendments to this title on the Clerk's desk. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this title be limited to 6 minutes on each of those amendments, 3 minutes for the

proponent of the amendment and 3 minutes for the committee. May I say that we have other legislation to complete this evening in addition to this, and we must proceed with the greatest of speed.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I so move.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

Page 97, strike out lines 12 to 24, inclusive, and on page 98 strike out line 1, and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 122 (a) The powers conferred upon the Administrator by or pursuant to (a) of section 111 of this title expire June 30, 1952, and must be renewed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress before June 30, 1949, and annually thereafter, unless the two Houses of Congress, by the passage of a concurrent resolution, declare that the powers conferred upon the Administrator by subsection (a) of section 111 are no longer necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title; except that during the 6 months following such date, commodities and services with respect to which the Administrator had, prior to June 30, 1949, authorized procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a participating country, may be transferred or delivered to such country and funds appropriated under authority of this title may be obligated during such 6-month period for."

Page 98, line 8, strike out "12 months" and insert in lieu thereof "6 months."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am still trying to prevent the very unfortunate situation which would exist 1 year from today unless, in my belief, and I think the belief of other Members here, some change is made in the wording of the bill. There are two parts in this suggested amendment. Let me say, in order to save my time and the time of the committee, that this bill goes from this House into conference, and any changes in the language would unquestionably be supported by this House and by the Senate. What I want to talk about is the intent of the amendment. I am not attempting to reargue the question of whether it should be 1949 or 1952. The House has decided that. I am trying to put into the bill now these two changes so that a year from now, if the situation internationally is not satisfactory, this House will not have to take affirmative action to stop aid, but will just let the bill die out without action. In other words, I am saying in this amendment that in order to continue the aid under this bill beyond June 30, 1949, and up to June 30, 1952, an affirmative resolution of the Congress is necessary. You know very well that if this is not adopted and if a year from now, we should desire to stop aid to any country or to all countries, those countries would simply look at the action today and say "You promised us aid until June 1952, and you are reneging on the firm promise of the United States." I am trying to prevent that. That is the first part of the amendment.

The second part of the amendment is one which I consider of very minor importance. I think it is desirable, but if there is any argument over it, I would simply strike it out of the amendment. The second part of the amendment says that instead of having a year after the expiration of the time under the bill to continue to send things abroad which we had agreed to send abroad or started to send abroad, that 6 months is adequate time. If this bill operates for 1 year and then stops, it seems to me that we could get all of the commodities abroad that we had agreed to send abroad, in the following 6 months instead of a year. Remember, the only time we would want to exercise that provision would be if we were not satisfied with the conditions in those countries.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important amendment in view of the conditions that exist today, and the conditions that may exist a year from today.

We should make the continuance of this aid depend on affirmative action.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but also in admiration for the gentleman's persistence. This is the third time this afternoon that we have passed on this one. It is another 1949 amendment except with some new trimmings and attachments which would cause a will-we, will-we-not state of utter confusion if it should be adopted. If the next Congress wants to repeal this law, they can do so. But let us not try to put in a half-and-half repealer or extender such as is proposed here. We voted on this twice before. I urge that the amendment for the third time be voted down, and I hope for the last time this afternoon.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 47, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 94, line 12, strike out subsection d.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am striking this out is because we wrote this language in earlier in a slightly revised form as you will recall, yesterday, as a substitute for the Colmer amendment, and this will simply clean up the bill so that the same amendment does not appear in different language in different parts of the bill, although it has the same intent. So I ask that this perfecting amendment be adopted.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 94, line 12, add a new section:

"SEC. (d). The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery from the United States to participating countries any materials or money therefor, for the development of petroleum resources unless and until the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator in writing that such delivery is necessary and desirable in the interest of national security."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment grew out of a colloquy on the floor yesterday between myself and the acting chairman of the committee and others who participated in the issue raised as to the utilization of this fund for the development of the petroleum resources in the Middle East particularly. This is a question of steel being made available for development and if we are going to give it to British companies. I have endeavored to get answers to my questions. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has sought to obtain information. I think he has some information, the best he was able to obtain, and I now yield to him for the purpose of giving whatever information he has.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, my information is that the total petroleum equipment askings or requirements from the European countries is $2,120,000,000, of which $1,260,000,000 is to be available from the said countries, and the balance, $860,000,000, is to be supplied from the United States.

No list of this equipment has as yet been received by our officials, and no amount has yet been approved to go for such equipment. I am further informed of the fact, that has been brought out so well in the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, dated February 27, that the United States is now producing and consuming, roughly, two-thirds of the world's total petroleum supply, and that under these conditions the primary problem for the United States is to shift European consumption, as far as possible, from the rapidly draining resources of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, to the Middle East.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the objective and in order to meet that situation with reference to the allotment of the available steel for the development of petroleum resources, this amendment was offered. After discussing it with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] I understand he has no objection to it.

Mr. VORYS. I hope this has come out of the gentleman's time, because I find myself in this position: I myself have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I do not think it is necessary. I understand there may be others on the committee who do object to it, and I would not want, in the confusion, to foreclose them of an opportunity for presenting their views.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that.

Mr. VORYS. But I have no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. The only thing I am trying to do is to clarify the controversy as to availability of goods to develop petroleum resources in order that petroleum, through the regularly established industry procedure, may be developed in order to save the European countries in this recovery program.

I hope the amendment will be accepted.

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

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

We are about to do something in the closing minutes of this debate on the bill, 3 minutes' debate, which I think will seriously jeopardize the success of the entire Marshall plan.

I come from an oil-producing district. I know that we have oiled two world wars with Western Hemisphere oil, and we are running out. We have to go down to 12,000 and 14,000 feet now to get a decent oil production.

This effort in the Marshall plan, this $800,000,000 earmarked for oil-production machinery, is to help Europe produce some of its own oil, and stop draining the Western Hemisphere oil. Now, let us be reasonable and honest. This is an embargo, actually, against all oil machinery.

Mr. HARRIS. This is not an embargo on oil equipment for the development of petroleum resources, this is merely an amendment which says that these funds cannot be spent for equipment to be sent to the British concessions in the Near East for British development at American expense.

Mr. MONRONEY. All right, I will take the gentleman's word that none of these funds can be expended, which means you cannot make an Export-Import Bank loan, you cannot have any money under the Marshall plan.

We are talking about a plan to make up the deficiency of the balance of payment. Yes; the British oil companies are rich in pounds sterling. The Dutch Shell is rich in guilders, but they are all poor in American dollars. They cannot buy this equipment without help under the Marshall plan or under the Export-Import Bank.

The United States is the only country that makes oil-well equipment, drilling equipment. It is sold only for dollars—not pounds, francs, or guilders.

We can either export our own oil over a long sea lane and further reduce our own supply or we can let them have a little of this oil equipment and develop some of their own resources. In Holland they have same small oil wells which could be developed.

These countries need to be able to buy with their own Dutch guilders of French francs or British pounds sterling their own oil and to develop their own indigenous products.

We should make it possible for them to do this and save the drain on our own natural resources, our own dwindling supply of oil. And also to save the drain on their very scarce supply of American dollars.

Let us be reasonable and look at this thing a while longer so that we may know exactly where we are going.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 14, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 94, line 11, after the period insert the following: "The Administrator is authorized in his discretion to reimburse United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies which are registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid for operations in Europe and which deliver relief packages from stock piles abroad, in the amount, or any portion of the amount, of the expense of furnishing the delivery service for such packages to stock piles abroad, and the Administrator may make an agreement with any participating country in which the voluntary relief agencies above described function for the use of a portion of the local currency deposit above described, for the purpose of defraying the cost of furnishing the delivery service for such relief packages from the port of entry in such country to the place of storage therein, and to the designated shipping point of the consignee therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, we have a Subcommittee on Voluntary Relief of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is a member of this subcommittee and who has conferred with CARE and with the State Department officials and is very well prepared, to explain this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is simply to clarify the situation with respect to a magnificent American agency called CARE which efficiently stockpiles packages for the relief of individuals overseas at an economy to those who purchase those packages in this country, and then delivers them out of stock piles overseas.

The committee will notice that by the section which is now sought to be further amended it is already provided that the Administrator will take care of some of the charges of individual shippers who are shipping relief packages abroad, and we have also provided for United States voluntary, nonprofit relief agencies, which make the same kind of shipments.

CARE operates in a unique way in the sense that it does not ship each individual package from the United States but ships the packages in bulk for stock piling; hence it is essential to give them some consideration because they do not fit into the pattern which is laid out in this section of the bill for other voluntary agencies and individuals. The Administrator is to work out with CARE how much of the cost of the delivery service is to be borne from the United States to the place of stock piling, then where the stock piling takes place in such countries as are participating in the ERP, to work out the amount of local currency deposits to be used to cover the cost of the delivery service. It helps CARE to do the same job which we want the other American voluntary agencies and American individuals who are shipping packages today, to do, and tries to work out some basis of accommodation with these other agencies by the terms of the amendment.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Voluntary Aid of the Foreign Affairs Committee I also believe that in this legislation we should take care of that good, efficient agency, CARE. CARE has done a magnificent job and has been able because of its policies, to ship at lower cost than ordinary individuals sending packages over there. Also this amendment will broaden the scope of assistance for shipments abroad as shipments may go to wherever CARE is operating.

Mr. VORYS. With this amendment added to the language in the bill it will facilitate as far as is possible the sending of private packages over there, either individually or through reputable agencies?

Mr. FULTON. Yes. It will give them every help.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If it were not for this amendment CARE would be required to make a revolutionary change in its shipping arrangements. For this reason I am very happy that the amendment has been offered and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is quite right.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I desire to ask what amount CARE has taken care of by way of packages sent to foreign people that will aid them, either in tons or number. Can the gentleman give us that information?

Mr. JAVITS. I am advised by CARE that the business that is being done by it is approximately $30,000,000 a year; and in the 2 years they have been in business they have delivered over 4,000,000 packages. It is doing a magnificent job.

Mr. HAYS. The amount of private contributions to Europe over a period of time has been almost 2 billion dollars, a magnificent record.

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

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

Mr. BUCK. Is this restricted to participating countries or does it also apply to countries behind the iron curtain?

Mr. JAVITS. It covers everywhere that CARE operates, except as to the local currency-deposits provision, where it only applies to participating countries.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 95, line 13, after the period add the following: "Whenever the Administrator finds that any country receiving aid under this act transacts any business, or has any relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria or any of the Russian satellites shall forthwith be denied all further such aid."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the question is whether this Congress means business or whether it does not; whether or not we are going to have a foreign policy that makes sense and is really in the interest of this country. Unless a restriction is placed in the bill limiting the aid provided under it to countries that have severed all relations with Russia and her satellites, much of the goods we supply them will find its way into those areas; or what amounts to the same thing, goods produced in the recipient countries will go there.

There is no question about it. Has not the United States already done enough to strengthen Communist Russia? It was a fatal mistake to provide her with lend-lease without attaching to it those conditions that a sovereign nation demands, and we are paying the price for that folly now. Shall we run the risk of further enhancing the power of Communist Russia? Let the RECORD show that not all Members are blind to this grave danger. My amendment would protect the United States against making the same colossal blunder this body made in providing Russia with lend-lease without attaching thereto conditions vital to our preservation.

I ask: Are we in earnest? Are we opposed to communism, really, or are we not? If we are, let us take a stand on the side of those countries that show a willingness to cut loose from Russia and communism and socialism and refrain from helping any political authority based on collectivism.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONOHUE. Can the gentleman advise the House if Russia at the present time is exacting reparations from any one of the 16 countries which will participate under this program?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is she exacting reparations?

Mr. DONOHUE. Yes; war reparations.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think she is exacting some war reparations.

I believe if every Member of this House would inform the citizens of his district of the cost to them of this $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan it would not pass.

The scheme will cost the taxpayers of my district, the Eighth Ohio, $28,210,798. Mine is a typical district, mixed urban and agricultural. It consists of Crawford, Hancock, Hardin, Marion, Morrow, and Wyandot Counties. The cost of the Marshall plan to each of these counties will be as follows:

Marion County	$6,914,292
Hancock County	6,282,122
Crawford County	5,477,934
Hardin County	4,167,394
Wyandot County	2,959,572
Morrow County	2,409,484

And this is just a starter for another foreign give-away scheme.

When UNRRA was first being considered it called for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. We were told that would rehabilitate the European countries. I told the committee that had the bill under consideration no one should be surprised if the cost to us for rehabilitating Europe would reach 5, 10, or even 20 billion dollars. Already roundly $25,000,000,000 has been provided for that purpose.

So the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan should be considered as just another shot in the arm to be followed by more and bigger United States taxpayer dollar injections as time goes on. If the cost to the Eighth Ohio Congressional District ultimately reaches $40,000,000, or $70,000,000, or $100,000,000, no one should be surprised.

My conscience would not possibly let me vote to fasten this additional tax burden on the backs of the people that I represent, especially when you stop and think the Eighth Ohio Congressional District's share of the $255,000,000,000 national debt amounts to $448,000,000, or $2,450 for every person in my district.

This scheme will not only fail to halt communism in Europe or anywhere else but will definitely have the effect of promoting it abroad and at home as well.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as we near the close of this momentous and dramatic debate, on the European-recovery provisions of this bill, the eyes of free and democratic peoples the world over look longingly to Washington, and await with confidence our decision to take definite action for the American people in the name of peace, stability, and freedom.

There can be no doubt as to the realization by the Congress of the monumental problem ahead, of its responsibility in the world economy, the burdens that will be placed upon our peoples. These and many other phases of the task facing us have been clearly brought forth during the past few days and weeks, during which the world pattern has seen striking changes, new frontiers, and further clashes in ideologies, that have brought us close to the path of a new and terrible conflict.

In my opinion, the paramount need for the European recovery plan is that it be a cooperative effort to deal with the basic causes of tyranny and war, in a Europe which is still submerged in a state of disruption and where wars have smashed the vast and delicate mechanism by which its countries made their living.

While the Kremlin strives to spread its iron curtain and tyrannical tentacles the world over, we seek through the European recovery plan to maintain our own welfare and security by assisting nations to feed themselves and aiding them to reestablish their economic health and thereby save themselves from the yoke of communism.

Sixteen European nations have already taken steps to help themselves, and the record of the western allies, in earnestly attempting to find a secure foundation for such common action, is convincing testimony to their good faith and their sincerity of purpose. The European recovery program is the lift that we feel will help put across the drive to reestablish Europe and pave the way to permanent peace and prosperity.

In the light of the magnitude of the program of European assistance and its cost to the American taxpayers, we must assure Americans that the plan is not being used to aid any governments whose economic theories and practices do not conform to our ideal of free enterprise; we must insist on a continuing check to make certain that nations being helped are meeting their pledges of self-help; that funds are not corruptly or improperly used; and that goods do not flow into the black market. Further, that efficient and businesslike methods of operation are pursued by those governments. I firmly believe that the plan should be administered by an independent agency of the government and composed of top grade businessmen, the best that can be found available for the job.

The United States has already spent billions to fight totalitarianism. The job is still unfinished, and we must decide whether to stop or carry on. In my opinion, the grave decision behind the European recovery plan is whether the United States is prepared to help western Europe attain an economic stability which will enable it to resist Communistic pressure and violence, or whether to leave these nations to division and conquest.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that if we fail to make possible the return of western Europe to self-support, then the free peoples of western Europe will be forced to turn in large part to the east for survival. Do nothing, and you will encourage hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos, upon which communism feeds.

Communism seeks world domination. It knows no boundary lines. It cares not for our principles, ideals, and American way of life. The threat to Europe today may be the threat to America tomorrow, unless we have the vision and foresight to act now. It is in the interest of our own security as we look ahead over a period of years, that this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke was not in the chamber yesterday when we had our long debate on this very issue, and after which action was taken which goes about as far as we can now go to correct what has been a bad situation.

I do not believe anybody is going to accuse me of being pro-Russian. I do not think that my record of service on the House Committee on Un-American Activities would indicate that I have been in favor of communism. Many will recall that just a week ago today I took the floor for more than 30 minutes and exposed the shipments they were loading on a Russian freighter at Jersey City,

N. J., for Russia, which I ardently opposed, because they were war potentials and machine tools. But this amendment offered by the good doctor from Ohio does not deal with war potentials.

Here is what this amendment says. It says that the Administrator will have to deny aid to any of the participating countries which transact any business or have any relations with the Soviet Union. In other words, if some citizen of Paris should by accident write a letter to a citizen of Moscow and, perchance, get a reply, or even without a reply, he would invalidate the whole French community from partaking in the program. It is an effort to do something which we did, I think, in a rather intelligent manner yesterday, Doctor. We passed an amendment here which prohibits the reshipment of any of these supplies from participating countries to Russia if they are of such a nature that we in turn deny them to Russia from here. In addition, we give to the Administrator veto power to carry out the intent of Congress that from this country there shall not go to Russia anything of a war potential. I see no reason to discourage peaceful trade with Russia in supplies which are definitely not adaptable to military uses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman used the word "legerdemain." What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman has violent opposition to the term "legerdemain" I will be happy to withdraw it and just refer to legislation.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLOESER. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I look upon the European recovery program, not as an insurance premium against communism or war in Europe, but as the payment of loss for the grievious errors of our foreign policy management. To this loss we have become morally committed. Regardless of the wording of this bill I accept that commitment for 1 year and here and now state my reservation beyond that period. I accept such commitment for 1 year and with reasonable amount feasible within our economic ability until a change in administration can bring sound thinking and more noble action. If the payment can in a measure prevent further deterioration of our foreign relations in Europe, I hope to find full justification for my vote. All in all it is the bitter cost of incompetency in high places in our Government. But then we have been forewarned for years by the blunders of one President compounded by his successor.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the principal reason, as I see it, why we must advance aid for an economically stable Europe is that it is a prerequisite condition to the maintenance of the civilization in which the American way of life is rooted. This reason is the controlling one and the one which must determine whether or not the United States is to embark on a program of aid of sufficient magnitude to enable the attainment of a real European recovery.

I do not believe any voice here will dispute the truth of Gordon Sewell's statement that:

> Europe is a spiritual conception. In the rich pattern of this culture there are many strands—the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness; the Roman genius for law.

After our hairbreadth rescue of the soul of Europe from the menace of Hitler's deadly attack, we cannot now allow her collective Christian consciousness and personality to disintegrate and in desperation yield to the aggressor from the east.

The economic illness of Europe, and the prolonged inability of the peoples of Europe to see clearly in the future a time when economic health and hope will be restored, have served to intensify a political struggle between those who wish to remain free men living under the rule of law and those who presume that tolerable living conditions can only be regained by ruthless subjection of the individual to the omnipotent state. There is no doubt that the 16 countries which participated in the Paris Conference on European Economic Cooperation want to preserve their heritage of free political institutions and the rule of law. To do so they must recover from the economic and social effects of the war.

The next few years can determine whether the countries of Europe will, in fact, be able to hold to their heritage. Economic collapse, spreading through Europe, may persuade the peoples of these countries to accept the counsel of despair that their basic wants of food and work can be met only by the subjection of their rights under law to totalitarian control. The countries of Europe are not yet in a position to fill for themselves their essential needs for food and fuel and the materials to enable their industries to function adequately. They cannot produce all these needs in Europe. Their exports cannot yet pay for them. They cannot purchase them from their depleted or exhausted capital reserves. A large part of the basic requirements for the western European countries can at this time only be met by United States aid. This presents to us a responsibility and a challenge. Western Europe looks to the United States for the extraordinary yet temporary support needed during these critical years to permit it to regain economic vitality and an environment in which free institutions can persist.

It must be observed that our adoption of this proposed recovery program can do no more than provide the promise of recovery; it cannot assure recovery. The assurance of success rests primarily on the determination of Europe to work out its salvation with such help as we give. There can be no success without whole-hearted effort on the part of the western European peoples themselves.

The program admittedly faces many risks. Those who believe that they stand to gain politically from unrest and chaos in Europe have openly declared their intention to use all means at their disposal to cause the failure of any program of European recovery based on American assistance. Such a design, were it to succeed, would result in the demoralization of a continent. It would postpone and endanger peace. It would destroy the present hope of an ultimate world rule of law under the Charter of the United Nations.

The United States has taken a leading part in the creation and evolution of the United Nations. The goals of the United Nations Charter are, in fact, the goals of United States foreign policy. It is the firm intention of our Government to conduct its foreign policy in accord with the Charter of the United Nations.

In no respect is this more true than in proposing support to a cooperative endeavor for European economic recovery—an endeavor which was open at the start, and remains open, to all European nations prepared to work fully toward the common goal. Meanwhile, the United States has been and is supporting fully the efforts going forward in the United Nations and its related agencies to assist the economic recovery of Europe.

The very structure of the United Nations requires the economic well-being of the countries which participated in drawing up a program for European recovery. These 16 nations number among them two of the five great powers with special responsibilities under the Charter for the maintenance of the peace, and smaller powers which have contributed most vitally over the centuries to the very concept of peace under a universally accepted rule of law.

The stake of the American people in the success of the European recovery program is great. A small fraction of the vast quantities of the resources of the United States which were expended in the conduct of two successive world wars, ventured now in a cooperative endeavor of free and vigorous peoples, offers the high hope of achieving through European recovery that climate of world peace and stability with justice which was not achieved by the material and human sacrifices which brought military victory in those two wars.

While the risks are real, they must be faced with courage and boldness. Without an essential margin of American assistance, western Europe cannot be expected to achieve economic and social recovery, the foundation for the maintenance of the institutions of freemen. The rise of totalitarianism would not be stemmed; it would be fostered by economic want and desperation. If totalitarianism were to sweep Europe, its repercussions throughout the world would operate slowly but inexorably to compel adoption by the United States, in its own defense, of measures inconsistent with American traditions and the opposite of American hopes. With the persistent slow progress of freemen thus brought to a pause, there could in the future be little justice, no stability, hazardous and transient peace, and the ultimate degradation of the subordination of men to state.

Because of the reasons I have just outlined, Mr. Chairman, and with the sin-

cere conviction that this European recovery program is a measure to prevent war and preserve peace, I am going to vote in favor of this legislation.

At the same time I wish to emphasize to my colleagues that while we are proposing to meet the challenge abroad, we must not neglect our duty and responsibility to our own people here at home. Our aid to afflicted Europe will only be effective in accordance with the measure of the good spirit and sacrifice of the American people behind it.

If we can afford to entertain such a large-scale program for European relief, we surely can and must work out the solution for our many domestic problems. The veteran in whose ears the turmoil of war is not yet dimmed, and who is again facing the possibility of recall, is still without a home for himself and his family. What can we ask or expect from them, and the rest of our people, if we do not provide them with adequate housing? What enthusiasm can we look for from the average working man and woman unless we raise their minimum wage to a reasonable cost-of-living level? With what enticement shall we exhort the great army of labor, that performed so magnificently during the recent war, to rally to this cause if we continue to surround them with legislative restrictions inciting difficulty and discord? There is crying need for extending through our social-security system enlargement, such help as will enable our handicapped and aged citizens to face their lives with hope and confidence. The tax measure we recently voted on is in substance only a reminder that our whole tax structure is in desperate need of study and revision to correct existing inequities. The cost on too many of our basic products is exaggerated and unjust.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any more time at this period, but I would have felt remiss in my responsibility if I did not dwell for a moment on the vital needs of our own people in the midst of this debate on the proposal to extend substantial recovery aid to Europe.

I wish to reemphasize with all the energy I can command that unless we devote ourselves, without delay, to a full program of relief from the burdens now resting heavily upon our own citizens, our saving gestures toward Europe shall be made in vain.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at appropriate places in the record of this great debate, provided their insertions do not impinge upon the remarks already made.

The CHAIRMAN. That permission will have to be given in the House.

Mr. VORYS. May I say to the Committee that I shall obtain that permission in the House. The question about extensions of remarks has been asked me a number of times.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the remainder of the bill, titles II, III, and IV, be dispensed with, that these titles be printed in the RECORD, and that they be open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Titles II, III, and IV are as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "International Children's Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948."

SEC. 202. It is the purpose of this title to provide for the special care and feeding of children by authorizing additional moneys for the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations.

SEC. 203. The President is hereby authorized and directed any time after the date of the enactment of this act and before July 1, 1949, to make contributions (a) from sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, and (b) from funds made available pursuant to the proviso in the first paragraph of the first section of the joint resolution of May 31, 1947 (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.), as amended, to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children.

SEC. 204. No contribution shall be made pursuant to this title or such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, which would cause the sum of (a) the aggregate amount contributed pursuant to this title and (b) the aggregate amount contributed by the United States pursuant to such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, to exceed whichever of the following sums is the lesser:

(1) 50 percent of the total resources contributed after May 31, 1947, by all governments for programs carried out under the supervision of such fund; or

(2) $100,000,000.

SEC. 205. No contribution shall be made pursuant to this title or such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, unless, at the time of such contribution, governments other than the United States Government have provided for use in the world program for the special care and feeding of children under the supervision of the fund at least 20 percent of the total resources contributed by governments for such use after May 31, 1947.

SEC. 206. Funds made available pursuant to such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, shall remain available through June 30, 1949.

SEC. 207. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $60,000,000.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Greek-Turkish-Chinese Assistance Act of 1948."

SEC. 302. Paragraph (2) of section 1 of the act entitled "An Act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey" (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) by detailing to the United States Missions to Greece or Turkey or China under this Act, or to the governments of those countries in implementation of the purposes of this act, any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and while so detailed, any such persons shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights and privileges as such, as an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the department or agency from which detailed. Traveling expenses of such personnel to and from the place of detail shall be paid by the Government of the United States. Such personnel, and personnel detailed pursuant to paragraph (3) of this section, may receive such station allowances or additional allowances as the President may prescribe; and payments of such allowances heretofore made are hereby validated. No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Secretary of State under this act until such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: Provided, however, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be temporarily assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of the enactment of the Greek-Turkish-Chinese Assistance Act of 1948. The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;".

SEC. 303. Paragraph (3) of section 1 of the act entitled "An Act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey" (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) by detailing to the United States Missions to Greece or Turkey or China under this act, or to the governments of those countries in implementation of the purposes of this act, a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall, except as otherwise provided herein, be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;".

SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey" (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make additional advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey" (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended by deleting "$400,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$675,000,000" and by inserting after the word "repaid" the following: "without interest."

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act of May 22, 1947 (Public Law 75, 80th Cong.), as amended, in relation to China.

SEC. 305. The act entitled "An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey" (61 Stat. 103), including the title thereof, is amended by inserting before the word "Greece", wherever appearing therein, the following: "China,": *Provided, however,* That this section shall apply neither to the preamble of such act nor to the amendments to such act made by sections 302 and 303 of this title.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "China Aid Act of 1948."

SEC. 402. Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and China, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in China endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. It is the sense of the Congress that the further evolution in China of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the continuing development of a strong and democratic national government as the basis for the establishment of sound economic and political conditions and for stable international economic and political relationships. Mindful

of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to China, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the Republic of China and its people to exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve the internal peace and economic stability in China which are essential for lasting peace and prosperity in the world. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the Republic of China in its efforts to maintain the genuine independence and the administrative integrity of China, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty and free institutions in China through a program of assistance based on self-help and cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to China herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that assistance provided by the United States under this title should at all times be dependent upon cooperation by the Republic of China and its people in furthering the program: *Provided further*, That assistance furnished under this title shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for policies, acts, or undertakings of the Republic of China or for conditions which may prevail in China.

SEC. 403. In addition to the amount authorized by section 11 (a) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.), appropriations in the amount of $420,000,000 are hereby authorized for assistance to China under such act until June 30, 1949, and such act is hereby amended accordingly: *Provided*, That—

(a) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4, section 10, and section 11 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall not apply with respect to China;

(b) the agreement provided for by section 5 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (1) shall, to the extent practicable, make appropriate provision for the matters covered by paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (b) of section 115 of title I; and (2) may contain such other undertakings by China as are necessary to improve commercial relations between China and the United States, consistent with the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That the provision for the disposal of any unencumbered balance of local currency deposits provided for in section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall not be effective with respect to China until September 30, 1949;

(c) the authority to procure or provide for the procurement of commodities for China shall include authority to procure or provide for the procurement of such other commodities and services in addition to those specified in section 3 (a) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and for the furnishing of technical assistance as the President deems necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title;

(d) without regard to the provisions of section 5 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, assistance under such act may be provided for China during the 3 months following the date of enactment of this act when the President determines it to be essential in furtherance of the purposes of this title;

(e) the provisions of sections 104, 105, 107, 110, 111 (c) (1), 112, 113, 117, 119, and 121 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be applicable to the furnishing of assistance for China under the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions are applicable to the furnishing of assistance to participating countries under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948;

(f) when it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. The bank shall deposit into the Treasury of the United States, as miscellaneous receipts, amounts received by the bank in repayment of principal and interest on any such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended;

(g) notwithstanding the appropriation made by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, for foreign aid, the provisions of section 11 (d) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall be applicable for carrying out the provisions of this act;

(h) not less than 5 percent nor more than 10 percent of the funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be used to carry out the purposes of section 404.

SEC. 404. The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is hereby authorized to conclude an agreement with China establishing a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China, to be composed of two citizens of the United States appointed by the President of the United States and three citizens of China appointed by the President of China. Such Commission shall, subject to the direction and control of the Administrator, formulate and carry out a program for reconstruction in rural areas of China, which shall include such research and training activities as may be necessary or appropriate for such reconstruction. *Provided*, That assistance furnished under this section shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for making any further contributions to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 405. There shall be established in China a special mission under the direction of a chief who shall be responsible for assuring the performance within China of operations under this title, and who shall take rank immediately after the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in China. The chief shall be appointed by the Administrator, shall receive his instructions from the Administrator, and shall report to the Administrator on the performance of the duties assigned to him. He shall keep the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in China fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of the operations of the special mission; and the chief of the diplomatic mission in China shall keep the chief of the special mission fully and currently informed on matters relative to the conduct of the duties of the chief of the special mission. The chief of the special mission shall also keep the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the House Appropriations Committee currently informed concerning his activities. The chief of the United States diplomatic mission will be responsible for assuring that the operations of the special mission are consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States in China and to that end whenever the chief of the United States diplomatic mission believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the special mission is inconsistent with such foreign policy objectives, he shall so advise the chief of the special mission. If differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State and the Administrator for decision.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: On page 101, line 3, to page 104, line 5, strike out all of title III.

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

Mr. VORYS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of the amendment striking title III from the measure now before us.

After reviewing the European situation very carefully—both in person and as a result of committee hearings—I have come to the conclusion that the Marshall proposals offer a possible solution to the difficulties of western Europe. I have based my decision, in this respect, on three factors: one, it is a humanitarian measure which will provide relief to peoples who are subsisting on a near or semistarvation basis and are not in a position to help themselves; two, it will provide for the economic rehabilitation of Europe, allow those nations to take their rightful place in the world's economy and give employment, hope, and security to their populations; and three, it is necessary in the interests of our own national security to take this "calculated risk" so that these countries will not, on the basis of insecurity, hunger, and chaos move into the satellite area through pressure and intimidation from minority groups whose real loyalties lay not wtih their respective countries but with the U. S. S. R.

This program, as it applies to western Europe, does not offer an assured success. It is, I repeat, a calculated risk and we stand to appropriate a sum of between fifteen and twenty billion dollars over a 4¼-year period in the hope that it will succeed. The alternative to this proposal is the loss, by default, of all of western Europe and the isolation of our country.

What will this alternative, this isolation, mean to us? It will mean that we shall have to spend much more than contemplated under the Marshall proposal in strengthening our own defenses; it will mean that our natural friends in western Europe will be lost to us, perhaps irretrievably; and it will mean depression at home, the possible rise of a state-controlled economy, and the loss of many of the privileges which we, as Americans, have always felt were rightfully ours.

On the basis of these arguments and because the 16 nations of western Europe have made a real effort to evaluate their needs on a cooperative basis and because I feel this program offers a road to a real peace, I support the proposals of Secre-

tary Marshall and the recommendations of the American committees which have considered and approved this program.

For 7 weeks we held intensive hearings on the program for western Europe. Then, after we had finished with ERP—the European recovery program—we held hurried hearings on military assistance to Greece and Turkey, economic assistance to China, and additional assistance to the occupied countries. On at least three occasions the Democratic minority tried to report out the European recovery program, but on every attempt we were voted down on a straight party basis. It was the contention of the Democrats that we had spent enough time on the European hearings and that, because of the urgent necessity for immediate action, we should report this measure out, get it passed, and then begin considered hearings on Greece, Turkey, China, and the occupied areas. The Republican majority, however, was determined to bring out a package bill, and, after deliberating 5 minutes on the children's fund, 35 minutes on military assistance to Greece and Turkey, and 2 hours and 10 minutes on economic and military assistance to China, the present bill was reported out.

It is my belief that the committee has reported out a bill about which too many of us know too little. It is my belief, also, that title III, dealing with military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and China, should be stricken from this measure and separate hearings held thereon. The Democratic members of the committee were opposed to a package bill and were also against combining military-aid proposals with legislation for European economic assistance.

This measure is a perplexing combination of economic and military assistance to countries scattered all over the world, and I predict that it can, and will, be used as a precedent to extend our aid to countries, such as Iran and others, not now receiving it.

We are now faced with a dilemma, and we will have to decide the relative importance of Europe and the Far East in our diplomacy. We will have to recognize the fact that our resources are limited and that we will have to decide—as we did during the war—where to place our emphasis and greatest effort. Secretary Marshall has faced up to the same decision he encountered during the war, and has stated that in his opinion western Europe is the most important, and, that while economic assistance should be sent to China, military assistance should not. Just as in the war, the Secretary has had to put up with special pleaders for special areas, and just as his judgment was sound then, so do I think it is now. First things must be met first, and China in the present instance is not first.

In my earlier remarks I stated that ERP was a calculated risk with no assurance of success but only a reasonable possibility. Do we want to include the rest of the world and thus make way for the stretching of our lines on an extremely thin basis with the possibility of failure on all fronts rather than our possible success in Europe? Do we have the resources to carry on a world-wide program as contemplated in this measure?

Proponents of the China program have merit on their side when they cite the fact that the Communist leaders of China—Mao-Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, and all the rest, are out and out Marxian Socialists and intend eventually to create a Soviet state. They do not, I believe, have as much merit on their side when they compare China with Greece and say that because we have gone into the latter country we should, for the same reasons, go into China. In Greece we have a small country and a small population; in China we have a country one-third again as large as the United States and a population of 475,000,000. Our policy in Greece is costly and far from successful; our policy in China will, if enacted into law, be far more costly and will have much less chance of success. I do not agree with those who always find fault with our State Department or with Secretary Marshall in their China policy because they are interested in their country's welfare and are doing the best job they can in behalf of the United States. They are fully aware of the possible costs of a China adventure; they have no illusions about what may happen if we embark on this policy; and they know, that once started, the drain on us will be terrific and will have a snowball effect as the years go on. We should be under no illusion that we are supporting a democratic regime and we should realize that many of the Chinese in Kuomintang China will not look upon us as deliverers nor will they welcome our participation in their affairs.

Our study of China should not be on a partisan basis. I should be more than happy to consider a China policy based on the Marshall program which would have a reasonable chance of success and which would give to the Chinese people hope in their national future and security in their daily lives.

In my opinion, too many of those who stand for all-out aid to China are motivated by emotion and not by facts. Too many of these people think the solution to China's problems is a matter of money. Too many of them think the China problem is simple of solution.

The Chinese National Government itself has not come forward with an answer to its problems but has, in effect, adopted a fatalistic point of view. Pei Tsu-yee, a Chinese banker sent to Washington to explain China's needs to the United States Government, stated, "Whatever is given, it will not be enough." Truer words were never spoken.

Recently J. Franklin Ray, Jr., former UNRRA Director for China, compiled some figures for the Foreign Policy Association showing the total American funds spent in China since VJ-day. The total amounted to $2,000,278,000 and was itemized as follows: $844,721,000 for military aid, $907,107,000 for relief, rehabilitation, and trade development, $155,000,000 for fiscal aid, and $30,450,000 for educational and philanthropic aid. These figures must include, in addition, large quantities of surplus properties and a nucleus of 271 small ships for the Chinese Navy.

The Chinese Government is operating under the double handicap of a civil war and a badly shaken, deteriorating economy. These difficulties cannot be overcome by help from the outside alone but must be met and conquered largely by the Chinese themselves. Any American aid should be conditioned by adequate reforms instituted in fact, and not on paper, for the benefit of the Chinese people. This, in turn, will strengthen the Nationalist Government, give the support needed to win the civil war, and thereby bring about the creation of a strong and united China.

Much has been made of the statement that you cannot make the Chinese do anything, and criticism has been leveled at General Marshall because he tried to make the Nationalist Government do certain things. Certainly we should have the right to lay down conditions in China, Greece, and elsewhere if we want to see the greatest good come from our contributions.

Secretary Marshall and every student of China knows that the present Kuomintang government has become conditioned to a constant expectation of continued American aid. This conditioning breaks down the initiative of any government and makes it more dependent than ever on outside assistance for survival. Furthermore, it all too often holds back the reforms in behalf of the people which should be expected of any good government.

Many Americans have recognized the bad psychology of this type of dependence. Nevertheless, and in spite of the record, the Republican Party in this Congress has shown a great inclination to break up any effort which might cause the Kuomintang any anxiety. This inclination extends even to the Republican candidates for the Presidency, all of whom are for aid to China with no questions asked and no obligations expected. Even if conditions were attached to this aid the real political and economic reform will ultimatedy have to come from the Chinese themselves. To date little has been done along these lines.

American businessmen in China are in an unhappy situation. They have to contend with state-controlled or powerful family-controlled businesses, and they have to depend on a commercial treaty which offers them no protection nor guarantees security.

It has been stated that with additional American help the Kuomintang could win the civil war. This, I believe, is open to question. American-trained Chinese divisions have been wasted; political incompetents have been placed in charge of Chinese armies, and good military commanders have been deprived of their divisions. Furthermore, much American material has found its way into the hands of the Communists; and, perhaps in the last analysis, we will find that indirectly we have supplied a large portion of the war material they have used. The questions in my mind are: How much of our munitions and planes supplies to the Kuomintang have been put to good use, and how much more can we afford to waste?

The situation in China is not a pleasant one. We can argue here in this Congress from now until doomsday about the merits and demerits of the Chinese problem but we will have to admit eventually that the solution of China's ills will have to come from the Chinese themselves. When that day comes the United States then can embark on a program of aid and assistance which will have some hope of success. Then, on a mutually cooperative basis, the Governments and the people of both countries will be able to respect and assist each other in the maintenance of peace in the Pacific and throughout the world.

In conclusion, I want to say that the European recovery program is based on the carefully worked out plans of free nations for their own economic revival and is not, as is the case in China, a hit-or-miss proposition with little assurance of success. The time has come to decide whether the policy contemplated in this Congress is to be applied on a world-wide scale with little possibility of victory or if it is to be applied to western Europe where we have a reasonable chance for success. The choice is ours.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted to me earlier in the day, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of a speech made by me before the Academy of Political Science in New York City on November 12, 1947. The title of this speech is "The Chinese Policy of the United States."

THE CHINESE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Misunderstanding of our policy in China arises largely from a failure to understand the nature of American foreign policy itself. Therefore, I think it essential, at the outset, to consider briefly the substance of policy in terms of three components: objective, pattern, and technique. Without a clear comprehension of these distinctions and their respective characteristics, it is difficult to grasp the implications of our China policy or to relate that policy to our activity in other parts of the world.

Let us bear in mind that the objective of American foreign policy is indivisible and constant. Our Government seeeks the same ultimate ends whether its policy is operating in Europe, in South America, in Asia, or in the United Nations. Furthermore, the objective has remained unchanged since the dawn of the Republic. It is, in the words of the late President Roosevelt, "to defend the honor, the freedom, the rights, the interests, and the well-being of the American people." An essential corollary to our objective, however, is that, again in the words of Mr. Roosevelt, "We seek no gain at the expense of others. We threaten no one, nor do we tolerate threats from others."

In contrast with the fixity and the universality of the objective, the pattern of American policy, which finds its most vivid expression in our great state papers, is gradually evolving. It is the broad blueprint for action which represents the accumulated wisdom of countless American minds. It is the product of the interests, the hopes, and even the fears, of our whole people.

The slow evolution of the pattern of policy is everywhere in evidence. In Latin America a hemispheric solidarity emerges from the earlier foundations of the Monroe Doctrine. In Europe we move from a concept of isolation to a deep concern in the political and economic fortunes of that Continent. And in Asia, too, there is the same gradual flux of the pattern in the interest of the objective.

The third component of policy—technique—concerns the instruments we use within the pattern to achieve the objective. It consists of all the measures—diplomatic, political, cultural, and economic—that are employed in meeting the exigencies of international relations. In the last analysis, it includes, too, military measures—whether force, threat of force, or the acquisition of strategic bases. In contrast to the fixed objective and the evolving pattern, the technique of foreign policy must remain flexible, and responsive to changing conditions. Any other course, in a complex and unstable world, would be an invitation to disaster.

With these three distinctions—objective, patterns, and technique—in mind let us examine the historical development of the Chinese policy of the United States. The objective of our policy in China does not differ from the over-all objective of American policy. We are concerned as much with "the honor, the freedom, the rights and interests, and the well-being of the American people" in our relations with China as we are in our relations with Britain, with France, or with Russia.

However, as our interests have broadened and our world responsibilities have increased, the pattern of Chinese policy has undergone a slow evolution. During the early period of our relationships with the Manchu Empire, China was still too remote, too unknown a factor, to loom largely in the thinking of the American people. The initial pattern of government policy reflects largely concern for our shipping interests and the safety of our missionaries. We wanted equal commercial opportunity with European merchants for our traders. When the British opened Chinese ports to their citizens, ours also gained entrance. And when they established extraterritoriality, we did the same. In this early period we avoided annexation of alien territory, resorting primarily to a technique of diplomacy to secure our objective.

By the turn of the century, however, there were indications that equal commercial opportunity was inadequate in the face of mounting imperialistic pressures on China. It was at this point that John Hay circulated his now famous open-door notes among the great powers. And when it became evident that even this step was unlikely to stem the predatory tendencies of other powers, especially Japan and Russia, we expanded the open door to embrace the principle of maintaining the independence and integrity of China. But we soon discovered that diplomacy could operate as a technique for fulfilling this pattern only if there existed a balance of power in the Far East. This balance was upset by the First World War. From that conflict, Japan emerged as a dominant force in eastern Asia.

Nevertheless, at the Washington Conferences of 1922, an attempt was made to maintain the open door and China's independence and territorial integrity through normal diplomatic methods. We sacrificed a part of our military potential in the Pacific, in return for Japan's pledges to forego further expansion. Under the pressure of its military leaders, Japan in 1931 turned from the ways of peace.

For fully another decade, however, we sought to preserve the pattern of the "Open Door" and of China's territorial integrity without resort to military techniques. We wrote notes. We engaged in conversations. We spoke angrily. We spoke softly. But the Japanese military machine rolled onward into Mongolia, North China, the Yangtze Valley, and South China.

By 1940, with Japanese armies straddling the coastline of east Asia from Korea and Manchuria to Indochina—and spearheaded deeply into the body of the continent—and with Europe set aflame by Germany, it had ceased to be a question of maintaining the pattern of our policy. The American people were faced with the inexorable reality of a free America standing alone in a hostile, totalitarian world.

American public opinion began to shift rapidly. So, too, did our technique of policy. To the exhausted diplomatic measures we had taken against Japan, we added economic measures in the form of aid to China and restrictions on trade with Japan. We extended lend-lease to the hard-pressed Chinese and with the Flying Tigers, spread an air cover over their defenseless cities. Finally we reached that point in the tide of history when a reassertion of the pattern of our policy in China and the Far East, coupled with our activities elsewhere in the world, offered the last hope of defending beyond our shores the honor, the freedom, the rights, the interests, and the well-being of the American people.

The complexities of the war involved the United States in the affairs of China to an unprecedented degree. Economic and military problems of the joint struggle against Japan forced our Government to take an increasing concern in the internal problems of China—a course which we would normally have avoided. The United States dealt officially only with the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek to which, theoretically at any rate, the Chinese Communists adhered. Vital considerations connected with the war, however, made it essential for us to try to forestall a rupture in even the theoretical unity of Chinese resistance—a rupture which conceivably could have lengthened the war. There is nothing contestable in this approach. It was essentially the same technique that was employed in France, in Italy, and in Poland. It was predicated on a recognition of the hard reality of the cost of the war in terms of American lives and resources.

While aiding China internally to maintain its unity and to remain in the field against Japan, we were seeking also to build up China's international position in order to prepare the Chinese for a possible expansion of their role in the postwar world. First of all, we recognized China as one of the Big Four of the war against the Axis. In 1943 we abandoned extraterritoriality and wiped out the stigma of Chinese exclusion. At the Cairo Conference, in December 1943 we endorsed the principle of the return of all Chinese territory seized by Japan. Still later we acknowledged China as one of the five great powers in the United Nations. Throughout the war our assistance went exclusively to the central government and we interfered as little as circumstances would permit in internal Chinese affairs. In line with the traditional pattern of American policy, we desired an independent China at the end of hostilities, not an administrative and military appendage of the United States.

But peace found us, notwithstanding our desire to the contrary, deeply enmeshed in Chinese affairs. It was impossible to extricate ourselves immediately with the firing of the last shot. We faced a drastically altered situation in the Far East. The shattering of the Japanese Empire had left a huge vacuum. Into it had rushed new power from Soviet Asia, through Manchuria to Dairen and Port Arthur, and over the border into Korea to the thirty-eighth parallel. On the other hand, American forces occupied Japan, the Ryukyus, and southern Korea. Between these new frontiers of power lay the seething uncertainty of China; a China on the verge of economic collapse and already in the first throes of renewed civil war.

In this chaotic situation, the need for redefining the pattern of our Chinese policy became imperative. It was forthcoming in President Truman's policy statement of December 16, 1945. Linking the Chinese situation to our faith in the future of the United Nations, the President declared that, "it is the firm belief of this Government that a strong, united and democratic China is of the utmost importance to the sucess of this United Nations Organization and for world peace." Let us consider, for a moment, the

implications of this statement. Is it in accord with the fundamental objective of our foreign policy? It is. The defense of the well-being of the American people is inextricably bound up with the question of the maintenance of peace. Peace, in turn, will be influenced profoundly by the international position and the internal conditions of China. Is it a natural extension of the historical pattern of our policy in China? It is. We have come a long way from the "equal commercial opportunity" through the "open door" and the "maintenance of China's independence and territorial integrity," to the present "strong, united, and democratic China." But this logical and inevitable evolution has developed through the interrelation of our expanded interests, our world position, and our power and the great political changes the world has undergone.

The President's December 16 statement contains two factors that warrant careful examination. There is, first of all, the frank acknowledgment of our obligations to the National Government of China. And secondly there is the whole body of measures and methods with which we hope to realize the pattern of our present policy. It was absolutely essential to aid the Central Government in the transportation of its troops to disarm and to evacuate the Japanese, if for no other reason than that we had committed ourselves to do so. We extended this help in spite of strong counterpressures at home and in the face of violent opposition from the Chinese Communists. We extended it even at the cost of American lives. We would have preferred to help an internally unified China. But in the absence of unity we aided the Central Government exclusively—the Government we had dealt with throughout the war; the Government we recognized as the legal authority of the Chinese nation.

Let us now consider the methods and measures through which we hope to see realized the pattern of a strong, united, and democratic China. I must stress that these measures and methods concern the technique of foreign policy and, consequently, there is no virtue per se in their consistency. Rather, within the limits of our moral and ethical concepts, these measures and methods must remain flexible and adaptable, to meet everchanging problems. I emphasize this because those who delight in pointing out the inconsistencies of our foreign policy usually are thinking in terms of its technique.

Paramount among our methods in China is continued recognition of the National Government and cooperation, internationally, with that government. One need not have access to secret State Department documents to recognize that this procedure is still being followed. In the international field, our support of China's National Government has been imposingly steady. We have backed Nanking officially on the reparations issue in Manchuria, and we have sought by diplomatic pressure to assist in the restoration of Chinese administration to Dairen and Port Arthur. Still another evidence of our support for the National Government was given by Secretary Marshall at Moscow in the spring of 1947. He refused to permit the discussion of the China question without the consent of the Chinese. The effectiveness of this measure was attested to by the approving demonstrations which greeted it in Nanking, Peiping, and Shanghai.

Our technique with regard to the internal situation in China is also clearly indicated in President Truman's statement. He has placed primary responsibility for the establishment of peace and unity on the Chinese themselves, and asserted that we will not intervene to influence the course of any civil strife. At the same time he has pointed out that our interest in the peace of the world gives us a concomitant interest in a peaceful China. Therefore, he suggested that the Chinese take certain steps to promote internal stability. Among these were the cessation of hostilities, the convening of a national political conference to solve the problem of internal unity through a modification of the one-party dictatorship, and finally the integrating of all Chinese armed forces into a national army. To help bring about these changes, the President dispatched General Marshall to China. Further, he held out to a unified China the offer of reasonable aid in economic rehabilitation and assistance in the reconstruction of its military organization.

How adequate is this technique? At first, it seemed on the verge of success. A delicate settlement covering all the major problems of unity was put together with infinite care. Bitterness and hatreds and suspicions of 20 or more years' duration were reconciled at least temporarily. Success was never a certainty. That it had ever become a hope was a remarkable tribute to the pertinacity and wisdom of General Marshall. The shattering of that great hope as you will remember, came in the spring of 1946—at the very moment of fruition. General Marshall had returned to America to report to President Truman. Within a week of his departure from China the Communists were accusing the Nationalists of failing to relinquish one-party control of the Government. And the Nationalists were charging the Communists with attempting to set up a puppet regime in Manchuria.

Actually it matters little now who fired the first shot. General Marshall later blamed the extremists of both parties for the failure of mediation. What is significant is that the most determined efforts of one of our ablest officials had been insufficient to halt the recrudescence of strife. In effect, the break-down of peace condemned the Chinese people to an indefinite continuation of the miseries of the previous 8 years. The vision of peace, which had flared so brightly in the spring of 1946, dimmed steadily during the late summer and autumn. Occasional contacts of opposing forces gave way to skirmishes. Skirmishes grew into pitched battles. Chinese again killed Chinese, and in ever-increasing numbers. We had little to show for our efforts except mounting hostility from large sections of the Chinese people. They vented the bitterness of their frustrated hopes on the peacemakers.

Almost a year to the day after his first pronouncement on China policy, President Truman acknowledged the failure of our efforts to quell the civil war. On December 18, 1946, he issued a second statement indicating that while the basic pattern of our policy still remained, some of the instrumentalities with which we sought to operate would have to be held in abeyance. Since the return of General Marshall, and following the rapid withdrawal of American military forces during the early months of this year, there has been no significant change in our methods of dealing with the Chinese situation. The pattern remains the same: a strong, united, and democratic China. We still actively support, internationally, the sovereignty of China and the government of Chiang Kai-shek. But with regard to the internal situation we have, in effect, retired almost completely to the side lines to wait further developments. If there is a clear indication that out of the chaos there is emerging a hope for the development of peace, unity, and democracy, we are pledged to move in actively with any economic or other aid necessary to support that hope. To date, that hope has not emerged. Civil war now rages throughout North China and Manchuria. Other areas are in a state of incipient separatism. The Communists are resorting to their old extremist tactics of brutal terrorism. And the administrative machinery of the national government, as General Wedemeyer has recently pointed out, is bogged down in a mire of unparalleled corruption.

That we regret this situation, that we sympathize with the Chinese people goes without saying. But it is equally true that there is little we can do, as our experience has shown, to alleviate their difficulties. Nevertheless, powerful and capable voices are heard in the United States urging us to project ourselves into the middle of this problem of China. Let us, for a moment, consider the views of those who object to the abayant state of our policy in China. Many Americans have a deep and sincere affection for the Chinese. Among them there are those who point out that it is ignoble of us to forsake our wartime allies in their hour of need. Therefore, they insist, let us do something for China, and let us do it through the living symbol of China's resistance, Chiang Kai-shek.

Let me, first of all, make clear the extent of aid already made available to the National Government. I have alluded to the postwar military and international assistance which we have tendered to President Chiang. Mention should also be made of the American Army and Navy missions still in China to help establish a truly national military organization. Since 1941 total aid in the form of loans and grants is in the neighborhood of $2,500,000,000. In addition, we have transferred extensive quantities of surplus property at a fraction of original cost. We have also turned over 271 naval vessels. This year the United States foreign-relief program probably will allot $30,000,000 in medical supplies and food to China.

Furthermore the United States stands committed to provide additional assistance for noncivil war purposes as the circumstances permit. When there is some assurance that instead of adding to the wreckage of civil war and to the private fortunes of corrupt officials, our aid will assist in the restoration of the well-being of the Chinese people, its flow should increase. Those who are sincerely distressed over the plight of China, need have no fear. The United States Government will do all in its power to lessen the sufferings of the Chinese people, but will resist firmly all ill-considered efforts to have it add to their distress. The great shortcoming of many who insist, vaguely, that we "do something" for China is that they fail to realize the limitations as to what we can do. We can stand beside the Chinese as sympathetic friends. We can help them through our private charities, our Christian missions, our educational and cultural endowments, and through governmental grants or loans to meet their most pressing needs. All these measures we have taken and will continue to take. But we cannot supply the spiritual spark which will release the capacities of the Chinese people and channel them into a reconstruction of their noble civilization. That spark can—and will someday—come only from the heart of China itself.

Before concluding, I should like to discuss briefly another line of thought in opposition to the present relative abeyance of our Chinese policy. I am fully aware that there is a growing advocacy in the United States for action to halt the spread of communism in China. Briefly, it consists of several fundamental assumptions; that we cannot permit any foreign power to dominate China; that it is futile to halt communism in Greece and not to halt it in China; that unless aid, both economic and military, is extended immediately, the Central Government of China will collapse; and finally that such aid will be much cheaper than grandiose Marshall plans for Europe. One of the most disturbing factors in the views of those who insist on positive action is their assumption that the United States Government is unaware that China and Russia have a common border of several thousand miles. I wish to reassure these people.

The Government is not only aware of the existence of this boundary but has been considering it in terms of the ultimate objective of American foreign policy for more than half a century. Let us, then, at least concede a measure of validity to the decisions which grow out of this experience and the day-to-day reports of trained observers in the field.

I shall avoid a detailed discussion of the problems, both military and economic, which would be involved in positive action in China. Suffice to say, despite specious arguments to the contrary, that they would be monumental. As an instance, let me recall the widespread hostility demonstrated just a year ago by the most politically-conscious elements in China—the students—against the continued presence of American troops in China. And those troops were there with the peaceful intent of attempting to maintain the Nationalist-Communist truce. What would be the reaction if they were in China for the express purpose of assisting one section of the Chinese people against another? Those who advocate a return of American forces to Chinese soil in large numbers—and a program of positive action would ultimately involve precisely that—show an abysmal or arrogant indifference to one of the most powerful forces in Chinese life today—nationalism. They would take on for America the same heritage of hatred that the Russians are now busy constructing for themselves in Dairen and Port Arthur.

Finally, let me point out the fallacy of assuming that since we are taking positive steps to aid Greece and western Europe, we must take similar action in China. The pattern of our Chinese policy is concerned with the establishment of a "strong, united, and democratic China." Obviously such a pattern cannot prevail if China is dominated by an outside power. I think it legitimate to assume that our Government is capable of making this simple deduction and therefore may be counted upon to apply measures necessary to support China's sovereignty. But the United States, in selecting the methods for implementing its policy in China, must weigh all the factors in the world situation against the resources it has available. In the pursuit of our objective in Asia we must not permit ourselves to be hastened into any action which would result in a partial fulfillment of our objective elsewhere or even in China itself. We must bear in mind what we desire is a strong, united, and democratic China. Omission of the third adjective could have tragic consequences in terms of the ultimate, over-all objective of American foreign policy.

No one is more aware than I of the inherent threat of communism to the liberties which we hold dear. But we cannot oppose that threat with precipitous action, with impatient sentimentality, or with hysterial fear. We can oppose it successfully only insofar as we act with calm intelligence, with unremitting patience, and with a bold and dignified faith in the institutions which uphold America's greatness.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does that mean that the whole of title III and all amendments thereto will now be limited to only 5 minutes' debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the way the Chair understood it. The Chair understood the request was on this amendment and all amendments thereto, but not necessarily amendments to the title.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 78, noes 35.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for 1 minute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this is the first intimation that I have heard that this is a partisan bill. I do not believe it is so. Of all the countries made beneficiaries of this program, the assistance given China will pay highest dividends. With the exception of the faithful and laborious efforts of certain Members of the House and a few military men, China has had little official assistance in the making out of her case. Her diplomatic representatives must not be very active. Certainly top-flight people have done little or nothing to help. Mr. Chairman, China is our devoted friend. She has been faithful and is most deserving of all the help that we can render. To help her is to help ourselves. While China needs relief, her greatest need is munitions of war. I would like to see the full amount provided for her in the bill made available for arms and ammunition. This ought to be done. Certainly no one fully cognizant of conditions would want to eliminate any part of the amount made available for uses of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have been personally interested in the foreign policy of the United States. When one has a continuing interest over a long period of time, it is possible to observe certain trends, developments, movements and accomplishments. Now and then, throughout these recent years, all of you have read statements saying the United States has no foreign policy. Writers of books, editorial and feature writers, authors of articles in public-opinion magazines have criticized not only the State Department but those responsible for our Government for not having a precise objective foreign policy. We have been told we proceed on a day-to-day basis without any specific objective in view and with very little direction. Our Nation has been criticized for not developing a long-range point of view.

I do not wish to discuss the details of American foreign policy during all of these years I have had the honor of being associated with Congress, but I do want to emphasize a very certain and a very strong observation. It is this. In spite of all of the criticism that has been directed against the United States foreign policy—and in passing I might add that I have been one of those who has contributed some of the criticism—there is one outstanding objective of our country in its relation to the nations of the world. It stands out like the sun on a clear day in summer. It burns in the hearts of men and women throughout this Nation. It is the one thing that every man and woman would willingly lay down their lives to protect. The one great controlling feature of American foreign policy throughout the years has been and is today the protection, the establishment of free life, free living and freedom not only in this country, in the Western Hemisphere, but in every country in the world that has shown any desire to possess this kind of life. Freedom. Freedom. To be free. To make your own decisions—to be free to choose your own government—to be free to worship God—freedom, the cause for which this great Nation was founded, is the over-all long objective and short objective foreign policy of the United States.

During these recent months and particularly these hours of the last few days a very unusual procedure, a very unusual event, has been unfolding before the eyes of the world. This event has been taking place right here—has been taking place here on the floor of the House of this Congress. Here we stand. Here we have witnessed this great Nation of ours considering the best possible method of helping the people of other nations to hold fast to their freedom. Never before in the history of the world has any people been so generous, has any people been so unselfish, has any country been so great. I say to you, my colleagues and fellow Members, this—this is America's finest hour. The example we set today—the principle we establish in human relations—will shine on throughout centuries as one of the noblest deeds in human history.

Although we are motivated by high principle and unselfish objectives we must be constantly mindful of the advantages and disadvantages, the gains to be achieved and the losses to be borne if we proceed with this program. In this case the decision is not difficult for the gains far outweigh the costs. Our acceptance today of this economic European recovery program will create in western Europe a great dam, holding back the westward sweep and flow of the Communist tide. If this dam holds and becomes more solid with time, I confidently believe that the recovery of the free nations of western Europe will begin to flourish and that the dreaded communistic flood will not only fail to advance but will begin to recede over the long road back to the country from whence it came. The forcing back of communism from the free people of western Europe will widen the frontiers of freedom and once again entrench free institutions in these war-swept lands more securely than ever before.

Now, just what does this mean to the United States of America? To once again establish western Europe and, for that matter, the whole of Europe, on an independent, cooperative, operational basis will constitute a decisive factor in the world balance of international relations. Such an achievement is essential for international security and peace, as well as the security of the United States,

for a strong free western Europe will create counterbalances to the powerful Communist army now clouding the sky of freedom. The great shadow of Soviet aggression must be reduced in size.

In my opinion, based upon years of experience, I believe the support of this legislation to assist free nations to again sit in dignity in the councils of world progress and in the deliberations of the United Nations is indeed a positive act toward the guaranty of world peace.

There is much to consider. There is much involved. There is much at stake. If the Communist tide is not held back, if it is allowed to sweep on, then we must face the fact that the United States, Great Britain, and France will be forced out of Germany with the probability that Germany would become a strong Communist nation. If the Communist tide is to be permitted to flow on, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Iran, north Africa will completely fall under its control and domination. Control of the Mediterranean would be lost. Spain, proud France, glorious Belgium and Holland, and heroic Britain will come within the shadow. This is most serious. This is an eventuality which we cannot sanction.

But there is more that we must consider. The western nations of Europe possess colonies and territories in the Caribbean, in Africa, and in the Pacific. The fall of France, Belgium, Holland and Spain, as well as Denmark and the Scandanavian nations into the orbit of the influence of communism means that these far-flung territories, strategically located, would come also within the orbit of Communist domination. As the most powerful free nation in the world, can we permit this to happen? If freedom is to be protected, is it not our responsibility and duty to bring to bear all the forces within our control in order to insure its survival? I need not tell you, my distinguished colleagues, but I do wish to emphasize in this great forum of freedom, that we must not allow this Communist tide to flow over and engulf the free nations of the world.

The whole northwestern part of Africa, reaching to within 1,800 miles of Brazil, flies the tricolor of France. During the war we knew how dangerous German control of this region would be to the Americas and took steps to prevent it. Communist control of this region would project Soviet power into the South Atlantic, flank our communications with Brazil and Argentina, with bases for planes, submarines and the long-range guided missles of the future, and increase immeasurably Communist influence in South America.

Well to the south lies the Belgian Congo, containing some of the richest uranium deposits in the world. This uranium has been available to the United States, and has played an important part in our atomic energy program. If the Belgian Congo fell under Communist control, its uranium could be denied to us and supplied to Russia.

On the east coast of Africa, French Madagascar and Reunion could provide Communist bases on the Indian Ocean. French Somaliland looks out upon the entrance to the Red Sea at the Gulf of Aden.

On the Pacific, French Indochina could be converted into a Soviet pressure center and springboard on the southern border of China. This territory, together with French New Caledonia and the strategically and economically important Dutch East Indies, could interpose potentially hostile territories between Australia and the Philippines. Communist control of the Dutch East Indies could cut us off from their rubber, tin, and oil. Far to the east, in the Southern Pacific, the French Society, Tuamotu and Marquesas Islands could furnish Communist bases and pressure centers opposite the weak and vulnerable west coast of South America.

Within our own hemisphere, French St. Pierre and Miquelon are situated in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. French Martinique and Guadeloupe and Dutch Aruba and Curacao are in the Caribbean. French and Dutch Guiana lie along the northern frontier of Brazil and flank our communications with the east coast of South America.

All these colonies listed would fall rapidly under Communist control and serve the purposes of the Kremlin unless the United States intervened forcefully enough to prevent such an outcome. From a military point of view, we should probably have the power to do so in most of them, since all except parts of French Africa can be reached by sea more effectively than by land.

It seems clear, however, that any adequate intervention would require the threat if not the use of force. It would amount, in practical terms, to denying France, Belgium, and Holland during peace the right to govern their own colonies because we did not like their governments. What to do would be one of the most critical decisions our country has ever faced. If we proceeded to instigate and assist revolts in the colonies against the new governments the threat or use of force would seem necessary to prevent those governments from dispatching troops to the colonies to maintain their rule. Even effective economic pressure on the colonies would require a naval blockade. If we proceeded to land American marines and troops in the colonies of most vital concern clashes in so many parts of the world could easily set off war with the Soviet bloc. In fact, it seems likely that any form of intervention adequate to succeed could lead to war.

If we make the grave mistake of rejecting this legislation today serious consequences would occur. Without our assistance I firmly believe there would be an economic collapse of the nations in western Europe unparalleled in the history of the western world. Naturally, this collapse would cause communism to flow unchecked throughout Europe. France and Italy would be immediately engulfed. The fall of these nations would soon lead not only to the communistic control of the whole of Europe but to Great Britain as well. If the government of one important nation of Euorpe goes communistic, certainly it would influence directly the fate of other governments. Communism thrives on economic collapse. Communism, by intrigue and other devious methods, strives to cause economic collapse. In countries where starvation and want are everywhere prevalent communism has a fertile field of operations. When communism once establishes itself in a nation and takes over the control and use of the machinery of government, possessing not only the police power by fear and terror to maintain its grasp, nothing short of war can break its hold.

If we fail today to support this legislation, the free people of freedom-loving nations in Europe are going to feel that we have turned away from them and let them down. Bitter disillusion will take the place of hope and confidence. The Kremlin would cheer and the torrent of communism would flood the whole of western Europe resulting in grave and serious consequences to the security of the United States. This we cannot allow to happen.

In considering the question before us today from the viewpoint of industrial power and the development of atomic energy, there are certain bold facts which stare us in the face if the great communistic tide flows over all of Europe. It is generally known that in all probability, within 8 to 15 years, many other countries will not only possess significant quantities of atomic bombs, but also the use of atomic power. Without a doubt, Russia today is making the most significant strides toward this accomplishment. If Russia is able to have at its command the control and use of the industrial resources and technical know-how of France, Italy, and Belgium, it might succeed in producing atomic energy of all kinds at a very early date. These nations could also fill in the chinks of Russia's deficiencies in precision industry, skilled labor, and technicians.

As the atomic scientists have tirelessly pointed out, the United States is exceedingly vulnerable to atomic attack. Our industries are heavily concentrated within a relatively small section of the country. One-third of our people live in large cities. The very fact that we have progressed so far in industrialization, makes us more exposed to crippling damage than are more industrially backward nations.

Our institutions, moreover, render us particularly vulnerable to surprise attack. Arbitrary police and security measures, which some nations could carry out overnight, would require debate in Congress. Our freedom to travel without any police control opens the way to atomic sabotage, which could be effected by smuggling in plutonium to insert in bombs secretly assembled in cities or by dropping delayed-action atomic mines from merchant ships into harbors.

Because of this high vulnerability, our best defense against a potential enemy who possessed atomic bombs would be an overwhelming superiority for offensive atomic warfare. This might prevent war by forcing the potential enemy to realize that, however devastating a blow he struck at us, he could not escape defeat as well as still greater destruction. Vital elements of this superiority would be industrial capacity, stockpiles

of bombs, ability to produce bombs, and the means of delivering them—planes today and eventually guided missiles—and dispersion of offensive bases.

It is here that the consequences of Communist control of western Europe would be particularly ominous. With her rapidly growing population, huge resources, and control of French, Italian, Belgian, and eventually German industry, Russia would have a good prospect in the long run of rivaling us, and possibly even of surpassing us, in industrial capacity. This could mean an ability to produce atomic bombs as quickly as we could, progressively diminishing the advantage of our head start. It would mean provision of adequate means for delivering bombs to our cities and industries. In seeking to assess such capabilities, it must be remembered that dictatorships have been able, during peacetime, to put a greater proportion of resources into war preparations than have democracies.

Russia, moreover, could expand tremendously her offensive capabilities through dispersion of bases with control of the French colonies. Her offensive bases would then stretch from the South Atlantic through the North Atlantic and the Arctic far into the Pacific.

We cannot easily close our eyes to the consequences of failing to support this legislation of the hour. We cannot consider this important crisis lightly. We must consider the precise questions involved from the viewpoint of how the present situation affects the future of our country. This free and happy Nation cannot continue free and happy if we allow the great shadow of communism to so grow and increase in size that it begins to form a significant cloud over America and the Western Hemisphere. There is no valid ground for believing that communistic Russia would let America alone except for the few years required to consolidate their grip on western Europe and its colonies. Instead, there is solid ground for believing their basic aim, the zealous objective of Communist leaders, is to eventually create a Communist world with all people held in the bonds and chains of slavery, controlled and managed and dominated by uncontrolled and unresponsible power in Russia.

In conclusion, I should like to point out the grave consequences which would result just as surely as night follows day if we here during this significant hour reject this European recovery legislation. They are as follows:

First. Communist control of France and Italy, subsequently Belgium and Holland, and eventually Germany;

Second. Establishment of Soviet bases in Atlantic, Pacific, and Caribbean areas of vital importance to American security, unless prevented by force;

Third. Partial encirclement of North America and partial isolation of the United States, unless prevented by force;

Fourth. Danger of imminent war if we intervene to prevent these developments;

Fifth. Paralysis of all major organs of the United Nations through increase of Soviet controlled votes;

Sixth. A vast increase in the industrial capacity, manpower, and atomic warfare potential of the Soviet bloc;

Seventh. Creation of a new balance of power with the Soviet bloc likely to grow progressively more unfavorable to the United States;

Eighth. Militarization of American life and curtailment of our freedoms;

Ninth. Pyramiding costs and taxes, certain to lower living standard and likely to stifle free enterprise;

Tenth. The growth of fear and movements away from cities after the Soviet bloc produced atomic bombs;

Eleventh. A constant threat to the security of the United States; and

Twelfth. An eventual atomic war with the Soviet bloc, unless we succeeded in keeping the Soviet leaders convinced that they could not win.

A careful examination of these consequences show very clearly how extremely important it is that we support this legislation. This bill in a very real sense constitutes an insurance of our future peace and security—our future freedom—our future economic and social welfare. It is at the same time an insurance of our cities and of our children, their lives and progress, their play and happiness. It is an insurance of the continuing existence of all that free America means to mankind.

Throughout these many years of my interest in American foreign policy, and long before that, another objective of this Nation has been to oppose oppression and slavery. We fought the Hun in the First World War to stamp out oppression and aggression. We fought the Nazi and the Jap in the Second World War to eliminate slavery in order that freedom and the free way of life might continue. And, if it is necessary, we will fight the Communist in a third world war to protect the freedom that is so necessary and so much a part of life not only in America but elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere and other parts of the world. Today, just as in days past and in many days to come, there sits the great lifelike figure of Abraham Lincoln, at the Potomac end of the Mall. He is facing the Capitol of the United States, where you and I have the privilege and the honor of being today. He looks toward us as if in times of crisis he desired to extend his advice and counsel. On one great occasion President Lincoln said, I quote:

> This Nation cannot exist half slave and half free.

I say to you, my fellow countrymen, that this world cannot exist half slave and half free.

For almost a quarter of a century I have been privileged to be a Member of this House. I have had the honor to represent the congressional district where freedom was born. With nothing but a musket, ramrod, ball and powder, the courageous men of Concord and Lexington fired the shot heard around the world. From every Middlesex village and farm men came with their muskets—not machine guns, not tanks, not air power—just themselves and their muskets and stood on the Common and fought the first battle for freedom. The principle that was established there at that time is going to live in this world forever; is going to live in this world as long as civilization survives. No power on earth, no communism, no nation that believes in oppression, aggression, and slavery can defeat freedom. The strongest men in the world today are free men and free men will hold fast to this precious way of life.

The issue facing this Congress at this hour is really not an issue at all. Whether or not we vote for European relief, or the so-called Marshall plan, is not the issue facing us at this moment. The question we are to decide today is whether or not this great freedom-loving Nation is going to take the first great positive step toward the defeat of communism and slavery. I believe with deep sincerity that no Member of this Congress can afford at this hour not to support the bill before us. We cannot afford to take the chance of leaving free men in other parts of the world to be swallowed up by the ruthless and bloodthirsty monster known as communism. This is a fight of freedom versus slavery. I choose the path of freedom and I urge you with all of the conviction and power at my command to join this distinguished crusade, vital to the lives of millions of friends, in free nations throughout the world and vital to the survival of a free America.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, military aid could be extended on a multilateral basis or a regional basis such as provided for in the Chapultepec agreement, but we find ourselves here resorting to a unilateral method such as we resorted to in the Greek and Turkish aid programs. We are doing the same thing now that Russia has done in Czechoslovakia and that Yugoslavia is doing in northern Greece—we are intervening with military personnel and military matériel. We are doing the thing that we condemn on their part.

We are not going about this thing as we should go about it through the United Nations. There is a way of doing this thing right, but instead of that we are going at it in the old national sovereignty unilateral, balance of power method which has led to countless wars in the past and will lead to countless wars in the future; we are practicing the Soviet-Marxist ethics that "the end justifies the means."

I am supporting the amendment to strike out title III of the European recovery-plan bill. A year ago we had under consideration the Greek-Turkish loan, which included the principle of military aid. By military aid, we mean the furnishing of weapons of war and advisory military personnel. At that time I opposed the military features of the Greek-Turkish loan. My reasons for my opposition was then as it is today, as follows:

First. Unilateral action in providing military aid to any nation is in violation of the United Nation's Charter, in that it ignores and bypasses the multi-

lateral consideration by the signatory nations of disputes between nations.

Second. Unilateral action on our part in extending military aid, weakens the United Nations. It is only through actual performance of duties that it will be possible for the United Nations to strengthen itself to the point of insuring world peace.

Third. In deserting the United Nations, we are turning back again to the discredited methods of trying to produce world peace by the strength of the limited arms and money of a single nation. We do not have the strength in manpower, wealth, or gunpowder to fight or feed the world by ourselves. Whether the world has peace or war, we must act in concert with the majority of nations, or we must lose.

Fourth. We lose our moral and spiritual position in the world when we engage in the practice of unilateral military aid to nations or national groups. This is exactly the practice which we condemn when Russia gives aid to the Communist parties in the satellite nations and when we condemn Yugoslavia for aiding the Communist guerrillas in Greece.

We are faced in this bill with a legislative dilemma. We must accept provisions, unless deleted by amendment, recommittal, or eliminated by conference agreement, which violate deep convictions. The House Foreign Affairs Committee would have presented a fairer bill to the Members if they had separated the economic rehabilitation proposal and the military aid into two separate legislative proposals. Many of us in that instance could have voted our convictions. But we are not given the choice in this bill between aid for peace and aid for war. Of the total aid fund of $6,300,000,000, approximately $425,000,000 has been earmarked for military aid. In other words, fourteen-fifteenths of the appropriation is for peaceful purposes, economic rehabilitation, and humanitarian relief to suffering millions. One-fifteenth is for military aid. From a financial point of view, therefore, the military aid is small in relation to the total fund. We cannot afford to deny the rehabilitation by means of food, medicine, and machinery, which constitutes 93 percent of the fund, because we do not approve of the 7 percent set aside for military materiél.

When we turn to the principles involved, we cannot relegate the importance of the military aid to such a small percentage. We fear the effect of the violation of the principles of the United Nations which calls for multilateral solution of economic and security problems. The most important issue in the world is the strengthening of the United Nations. We cannot appraise the effect of continued unilateral military procedure on the fate of the United Nations. Certainly we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Russia and the United States have both practiced this procedure. The factor of unilateral action must be considered in relation to other factors which are weakening the United Nations. I refer to the use and misuse of the absolute veto—22 times by Russia, twice by France; the lack of an international police force and the failure to establish the proper parliamentary and judicial powers originally envisioned by the framers of the Charter.

The only hope of the people of our Nation and the world for obtaining universal peace is through a functioning United Nations. Every step we take away from multilateral cooperation is a step away from collective security. Every step that weakens the United Nations is a step toward war. Let us strengthen the United Nations and solve our problems through its organizational procedures, in the open light of debate and by the majority decisions of the signatory nations of the world.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it must be recognized that this is no longer the Marshall plan, but the Marshall plan with a lot of other things added; and it must further be said that this debate has degenerated into a comedy.

We have just commenced to consider title 3 of this bill. This title not only involves $275,000,000 more for Greece, but likewise involves the broad and dangerous implications of the Truman doctrine. It is not believable that our discussion of this vitally important question is limited to 10 minutes debate. That is not debate at all; that is a high-handed suppression of the opposition.

The bill about to be passed by the House is not the Marshall plan. This statement may seem startling but it is clearly true.

Attached to the bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee, and incorporated with the bill during the debate in the House, are features not envisioned by General Marshall in his Harvard speech last June.

For example, it is well known that Marshall has been wholly out of sympathy with military aid to China. You will remember his mission to China in which he attempted to get the National Government and the Communists together. His mission utterly failed, and he returned to the United States with some bitter statements concerning the corruption and inefficiency of the Chiang kai-Shek regime, and thereafter fought until quite recently against any attempt at Chinese aid. I do not believe the Secretary yet favors aid to China. He thinks that the field of our efforts should be confined to Europe; and there are many others who believe that while aid to China might be desirable, that $500,000,000 in an attempt to bolster up a nation of 450,000,000 people is the proverbial drop in a bucket, and can be no more than a first installment in a program which will make continuing and vast demands.

Secondly, the bill contains an additional appropriation of $275,000,000 for military aid to Greece—military aid, not economic assistance. This, of course, was never contemplated in the Marshall plan, and was not in the bill that passed the Senate.

Military aid to Greece is an implementation of the Truman doctrine—that broad conception which assumes it to be the duty of the United States to aid any government in the world whose regime is thought to be presently friendly to us, and which is being harassed by internal or external threats.

Under this doctrine, as I ponited out in the House some time ago, it must be the program of the United States to lend both economic and military assistance to every trouble spot in the world, and that, unfortunately includes most of the world at present. It is Greece and Turkey now—and China which is a half-world in itself—and it will be the Mid-East, Iran, Irak, India, and many others.

I am unalterably opposed to the Truman doctrine, which in its essence requires the United States—and who knows at what cost in blood and treasure—to become a sort of modern Roman empire insisting that our way of life and our form of government be conformed to throughout the world.

In just the one small spot to which this doctrine has been applied so far—Greece—$300,000,000 was appropriated last year on the assumption that that would do the job. Seven hundred million was spent before that. Greece is worse off than ever; the guerrilla bands harassing it have increased rather than decreased, and despite our lavish expenditure and assistance, 20,000 irregular troops are running circles around the Greek Army of 150,000 men armed with our equipment. The billion did not do the job, so this bill provides two hundred and seventy-five million more, and it will be an annual and useless expense as long as we can foresee. This Greek plan is truly "operation rat hole." It is not a part of the Marshall plan and was included in the bill only to be sure of its passage.

If all of this was not bad enough, the House on Tuesday included Spain, a Fascist country, whose dictator attained control through brutality and bloodshed, and whose regime is so completely hateful that it has not been invited to participate in the program by other European nations. When this was done, I offered an amendment to confine the plan to the 16 participating countries of Europe. The amendment was defeated, which means that not only will Spain remain in, but there is nothing in the bill to prevent the future participation of Russia or of any of her satellite nations.

The inclusion of Spain was the last straw. Have we so soon forgotten the war in which we fought the very fascism in Germany, Italy, and Japan that now exists in Spain? I hate fascism as I hate communism. Both are equally totalitarian and equally undemocratic, and yet the bill leaves the door wide open for assistance both to Fascists and Communists.

This is not the Marshall plan. This is a foreign policy so confused and so vacillating that I cannot subscribe to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana would strike title 3. It would strike out not only aid to China but also aid to Greece and Turkey and we certainly should extend our assistance to all three countries.

The gentleman from Montana said that General Marshall as Secretary of State had made good policies in China during the war and they were just as good now, yet the gentleman by his own amendment would strike out the amount that the General himself recommended for China, Greece, and Turkey.

But may I say that as far as cooperation with Congress is concerned, the Secretary of State has refused to give Congress either in executive or open session the Wedemeyer report. This action has forced this side of the Congress to come in here and act on the China policy without the full facts. The Secretary of State still refuses to let the American people know what is in the report of the man who was specifically sent by the President to find out the real facts on China.

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

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 1 minute.

NO TIME FOR OPPOSITION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to concur in the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] that there is not very much that can be said in 1 minute. It is shocking that this matter of aid to China should be taken up without it having been given adequate time in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, nor here on the floor.

There are many Members who feel as I do about this. We would like to vote for the Marshall plan as it was originally proposed, or even as the bill came over from the Senate; but you have added so many amendments and even one which includes Franco Spain, and the aid to Greece, Turkey, and China, known as title 3.

Why do you not separate them? Why do you not bring them to us in separate bills so we can consider each on its own merits and vote?

EITHER THIS BILL OR CHAOS

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that there are many of us here who would have voted with confidence, at least, if not with enthusiasm, for even the Senate bill, in spite of the fact that we have maintained from the beginning that this kind of economic rehabilitation should operate through the United Nations.

But the committee views were cut and dried. Minds were made up in advance. This unparliamentary jumble which included military aid for Turkey, Greece, and China along with rehabilitation plans for devastated Europe was sent to the floor in one big catch-all package, which we have to take or turn down en masse. We can exercise no discretion; we cannot make a choice. We cannot, by separate votes on the separate provisions, even voice an effective protest.

This is not the democratic way.

But if we were shocked by the inclusion of title III in this bill, then we were outraged by the adoption of the amendment which extends the benefits of this act to Franco Spain—to a Falangist Spain where the Fascist war of aggression against the democracies was first launched; to a Spain where jail awaits the dissident, where no creed but one may be propagated with safety, where Americans are treated as if they were an inferior race; to a totalitarian Spain which was allied to our enemies by every bond except armed forces.

VOTES FOR PASSAGE WITH RELUCTANCE

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for final passage of this bill, but only with the utmost reluctance, because the alternative to adoption of the bill as it is means hunger, misery, and continued chaos.

I know that you have the votes to pass the bill without my vote.

But I can still hear in my ears the shrieks of the Nazi victims. The Nazi beast was nourished on fear and hunger and unemployment. I cannot close my ears to the cries of 6,000,000 murdered Jews, nor to the importunities of those who survived the scourge of Hitler.

Perhaps nothing contained in this bill will directly redound to the relief of the survivors of the Hitler blood bath. Perhaps not one crumb will go to the aid of the wandering homeless victims of oppression.

Yet I cannot for that reason say that I vote against bread and gainful employment and the tools of production for the other survivors of the carnage of war.

We do not want, in Europe or anywhere else, another rise of fascism. We do not want more murders, more beatings, more destruction because the great masses of the population are hungry, cold and afraid. This bill is an imperfect instrument for the rehabilitation of the civilized world; but it is the only instrument we have at hand.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find it is not in my power to throw away this weak tool. At the same time, I serve notice that unless the conferees eliminate Franco Spain from the bill I will certainly vote against the conference report.

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

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes to close for the committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, just remember on this Greek-Turkish title, Secretary Marshall set the April 1 dead line. The President of the United States has said that this was needed by April 1. We spent 5 hours and 10 minutes in the Committee on Foreign Affairs in hearings upon Greek-Turkish aid and I am amazed to find this partisan line being drawn by Democrats here on the floor in our bipartisan attempt to carry out the foreign policy of this country.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the debate on this measure, I should like to point out that beginning last week we had three full days of general debate. All phases of the matters here under discussion were taken up at that time, and full opportunity was given for all Members to express their views. Today is the third day we have been in the process of reading the bill for amendment, and both yesterday and today we came in at 10 o'clock in the morning. Certainly there has been full and ample consideration given to every aspect of the bill. As a matter of fact, many proponents of this legislation have complained that we have not proceeded with sufficient speed.

Now, as to this title, as the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out, we are working against deadlines in certain of these matters. When it was decided to have the one-package bill, as the bill reported on this side of the Congress has come to be called, there was some complaint about such procedure, not because it was not desirable to dispose of these things all at once, if we could, but it was said such procedure would result in delay in final disposition of the matter because of what might happen in the other body. Since the determination as to method of procedure was adopted by the House the other body has adjusted its program and procedure to conform to the program thus laid out by the House.

What is the situation today? In the other body provision for aid to China has been passed, and likewise provision for aid to Greece and Turkey has been passed. As soon as action is taken here, the whole matter of foreign aid will be ready for conference.

What a shame it would be at this late hour when we have made this progress, when the whole thing has been extensively debated and is well understood by everyone, that we should turn around and march back down the hill, deserting and abandoning the course set out by us as the one best calculated to meet our responsibility. Why, I ask, render valueless the fine effort that has been made by the other body to cooperate with this body in the efficient accomplishment of the things that have to be done?

Before us are proposals that have come from the executive branch of the Government, being acted upon by a Congress controlled by a majority of the opposite party. In this measure, as in all other similar matters, we have sought to do that which we believe to be in the best interests of the country, without regard to narrow partisan politics. I think we have so demonstrated that our country comes first in the manner in which we have considered this measure. There is, to be sure, not unanimity of opinion about this bill either on the Democratic side of the aisle or the Republican side of the aisle. It would be too much to expect that there be any such unanimity of opinion, particularly on a matter of so far-reaching importance, now and in the future; but, by and large, everyone has had the opportunity to express his views and offer his ideas, and we have proceeded expeditiously. I for one wish the impression to go out to the country that we are so considering this matter and that we are meeting our responsibility the best way we know how, each Member of the Congress according to his own judgment and best conscience, for such has been the manner in which we have thoroughly debated this bill. When this

measure is passed this evening it will go to conference where differences will be ironed out and in the end the bill will represent the very best judgment of the Congress of the United States as a whole. This is representative government of a free people in action. It is, in itself, an example to the world.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. 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) there were—ayes 18, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 101, lines 3, 4, and 5, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR A NEW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, last November 10 I attended the meeting of the four-power allied control authority in the appellate courthouse amid the ruins of Berlin. The session was held in the large courtroom wherein the last Nazi trials were those in which the German generals who plotted against Hitler were condemned.

At this particular meeting the Soviet commander, Marshall Sokolosky was in the chair. Hundreds of soldiers were standing around the building and in the spacious grounds outside, at attention and with bayonets fixed—they were all the young red-coated Mongolian soldiers of the Soviet honor guard. The hammer and sickle flew over the courthouse indicating the Russians were in charge. Sokolosky conducted the meeting in the manner of one issuing orders to the commanders of the other zones. Of course the American, French, and British commanders parried the charges against them made by Sokolosky. But one could see in the Russian attitude the feeling that they were about to become the masters of Europe, and thereafter of the world. It is the settled and long-time Russian plan that these same red-coated, bayoneted sons of the Soviet will be stationed all over the continent.

Are there those who doubt the world ambitions of Russia?

Consider Stalin's report to the Tenth Russian Congress of Soviets:

The Soviet power is so constructed that, being international by its intrinsic nature, it systematically fosters the idea of unity among the masses and impels them toward amalgamation. * * *

I say, there, in the west, where capitalist democracy prevails and where the states rest on private property, the very basis of the state fosters national enmity, conflicts, and struggle; here, in the realm of the Soviets, where the power is built not on capital, but on labor, where the power is built not on private property, but on collective property, where the power is built not on the exploitation of man, but on hostility to such exploitation; here on the contrary, the very nature of the government power fosters a natural striving on the part of the toiling masses toward unity into a single Socialist family. * * *

Let us hope that by forming our confederate republic we shall be creating a reliable bulwark against international capitalism and that the new confederate state will be another decisive step toward the amalgamation of the toilers of the whole world into a single world socialist soviet republic.

On February 12, 1938, Stalin wrote to Ivanov in part as follows:

In the event of any success the invaders will try to destroy the Soviet system and restore the bourgeois system in the occupied regions.

We would be in a position to say that the victory (of socialism in the Soviet Union) is complete, if our country were situated on an island and if it had not many other (capitalist) countries around it. But since we live not on an island but in a system of states, a considerable number of which are hostile to the land of socialism, thus creating the danger of intervention and restoration, we say openly and honestly that the victory of socialism in our country is not yet complete.

This problem remains to be solved. * * * It can be solved only by uniting the serious efforts of the international proletariat with the still more serious efforts of the entire Soviet people.

In the letter to Ivanov, Stalin quotes Lenin with approval as follows:

We live not only in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic next to a number of imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either the one or the other will have the better of it. Until that end comes, a series of most terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that the ruling class, the proletariat, if it wants to and will rule, must prove this also by its military organization.

Stalin's ambition to take over Europe has not remained theoretical. During the final months of the war the Soviets, we now know, had definite plans for postwar expansion into what were meant to be independent countries. In the Soviet participation in the war, their object was not merely to defeat the enemy but to put themselves in a position to implement their postwar policy of expansion. We Americans had no worked-out postwar policy. Russia did.

For example, while the Charter of the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter piously speak of right of self-determination of all peoples, Stalin's philosophy has never been in accord with that. The following is an excerpt of Stalin's report to the twelfth congress of the Communist Party:

It should be borne in mind that besides the right of nations to self-determination there is also the right of the working class to consolidate its power, and to this latter right the right of self-determination is subordinate. There are occasions when the right of self-determination conflicts with the other, the higher right—the right of a working class that has assumed power to consolidate its power. In such cases—this must be said bluntly—the right to self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the exercise by the working class of its right to dictatorship. The former must give way to the latter.

Further, Stalin wrote Ivanov as to his views on self-determination:

There are two kinds of autonomy, national or cultural autonomy, and regional autonomy. National autonomy is contrary to the whole development of nations. * * * National cultural autonomy is unsuitable. Firstly, it is artificial and impracticable, for it proposes artificially to draw into a single nation people whom the very march of events, of real events, is disuniting and dispersing to every corner of the country.

Secondly, it stimulates nationalism, because it tends to the view which advocates the demarcation of people according to national curiae, the organization of nations, the preservation and cultivation of national peculiarities—a thing that is entirely incompatible with social-democracy. * * * Thus, national autonomy does not solve the problem.

What is the way out?

The only real solution is regional autonomy, autonomy for such crystallized units as Poland, Lithuania, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, etc.

The advantage of regional autonomy consists firstly in the fact that it does not deal with a fiction deprived of territory, but with a definite population inhabiting a definite territory.

Secondly, it does not divide the people according to nation, it does not strengthen national partitions; on the contrary, it only serves to break down these partitions and unites the population in such a manner as to open the way for division of a different kind, division according to class.

The aim must be to unite the workers of all nationalities in Russia into united and integral collective bodies in the various localities and to unite these collective bodies into a single party.

Thus the principle of international solidarity of the workers is an essential element in the solution of the national problem.

So, with her worked-out plan of postwar expansion, Russia has actually acted upon that plan. She has effectively penetrated and paralyzed the formerly free nations of eastern Europe and is well on her way to the establishment of a Soviet Europe.

Typical of the loss of freedom in the Soviet satellite states is the case of Czechoslovakia. Last July when Bidault and Bevin invited the European nations to Paris to discuss European reconstruction, Czechoslovakia openly expressed its desire to participate. But Gottwald and Masaryk were called to Moscow and advised by Molotov that the Czechs would not be permitted to go to Paris. So Gottwald got on the long-distance phone and informed the ministers of Czechoslovakia of the will of the Politburo.

In three short years a whole group of individual nations have thus succumbed to Russia.

It is true that they maintain the fiction of undependent governments in the satellite states but it is merely a fiction. These satellite governments still maintain embassies in Washington.

Several weeks ago the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], Mr. Douglas Cornell, an Associated Press reporter, and myself visited most of these satellite embassies in Washington and spent an hour with each of the Ambassadors. We took a stenographic report of the questions and answers. Typical of the attitude of the Moscow-trained ambassadors was the Yugoslav, Sava Kosanovich. He

said that to him Russia represented progress and reform and that United States represented reaction. The Polish Ambassador, Josef Winiewicz, had much to criticize the United States for and had only praise for Russia. Poor Poland crucified between the two thieves of her national independence—the Nazis and the Communists. Poor Poland that lost a quarter of a million of her Warsaw citizens while the Soviet Army rested just outside the city so that the extermination could be completed. And again, the massacre of 10,000 imprisoned officers of her army. And again the carving up of her nation by Russian fiat. And Ambassador Winiewicz has an attitude of nothing other than sweetness and light toward Russia and severe criticism for the United States.

One significant thing about all of these satellite countries is that in every one of them the Communist party has complete control of the police department. That is the way to keep the populace under control.

What is Europe facing in the Communist threat? It is not necessary to refer to the fifteen to twenty million people in slave labor camps. It is not necessary to recall the liquidation of all political opposition. It is not necessary to remind ourselves of the fate of Mihailovich Petkov, Nagy, Masaryk, and others. It is not necessary to refer to actions of men like the Czech Ambassador Slavik who recently resigned. It is not necessary to remember that in that workers' paradise the people are required to work under the guard of machine guns. It is not necessary to refer to all of these activities of the Soviet type of democracy.

It is necessary to point to the fundamental philosophy that motivates the Soviets in their ambition to be masters of Europe.

For example, Marx states that "communism begins where atheism begins." Marx further argued that man has been alienated from himself in two ways: by religion and private property. "Religion," stated Marx, "alienates man from himself by subordinating him to God. Private property alienates man from himself by subordinating him to an employer."

Lenin wrote in 1905:

> Our progress rests in its entirety on a scientific philosophy * * * our propaganda therefore necessarily embraces atheism.

When Molotov made his pact with Nazi Ribbentrop he stated:

> Fascism is only a matter of taste and our friendship has been sealed in blood.

In Novo Sibirsk in Soviet Siberia, there was published the 10 communist commandments for Polish youths, as follows:

> 1. Never forget that the clergy is a declared enemy of the state and of communism.
> 2. Try to convert your friends to communism. Do not forget that Stalin, who gave to the Russian people its new constitution is the leader of the anti-Gods, not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the World.
> 3. Try to persuade, but do not force, your friends to stop going to church.
> 4. Watch out for spies; denounce sabotage.
> 5. Spread atheistic literature among the people.
> 6. Every good Komosol is also a militant atheist. He must know how to shoot and be expert in military discipline.
> 7. Work eagerly to prevent any religious element you may notice from influencing your neighbors.
> 8. Every atheist must be a good Communist. Watching the security of the state is the duty of every anti-God.
> 9. Support the atheist movement by financial gifts that will especially aid the propaganda of foreign organizations, obliged through circumstances to work in secret.
> 10. If you are not a convinced atheist you will not be a good Communist and a faithful citizen to the Soviet state. Atheism is permanently linked with communism and the two ideals are the basis of Soviet power in Communist Russia.

The Communists use the word "democracy." Stalin in reporting to the Fifteenth Communist Party Congress defines democracy as follows:

> Democracy is of two kinds. It is clear, therefore, that democracy in the draft of the new constitution is not the ordinary and universally recognized democracy in general, but socialist democracy.
>
> All this talk about democracy! What is democracy within the party? Democracy for whom? If democracy is understood to mean the right of a few intellectuals, severed from the actual revolution, to twaddle without limit and to have their own press organs, we need no such democracy, for that is the democracy of a tiny minority opposing the will of the tremendous majority.

These are the fundamental concepts with which Russia would cover the world. It is not a mere political philosophy. It is a total faith. It is a religion. It is the religion of scientific dialectical materialism. It is the religion of atheism. It is a philosophy that would exterminate the spiritual equalities of mankind.

On March 24 there came over the Moscow radio excerpts from what was called the greatest speech made by Zhdanov, in which he says:

> The U. S. S. R. is at present that real guardian of universal human culture in the same way as, in all other respects, it is the bastion of human civilization and culture against bourgeois disintegration and the decay of culture.

Thus, Europe and the world are faced with the spread of the religion of materialism implemented by the Soviet military machine and implanted and secured by the clever machinations of an international Soviet secret police—the NKVD.

In the face of this force free nations are falling.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, there is a strange paradox about this new threat to civilization. Its origin is not really Russian. Communism is a compound. It is a compound of the materialistic philosophies of the historical liberalism of nineteenth-century Europe—the western world. Marx was born in the city of Treves, Germany. He studied in universities of western Europe. He was a disciple of the philosopher, Hegel, who gave him the dialectical technique. Marx got his materialism from Ludwig Feuerbach. His philosophy was further rounded out in its sociological aspects by Proudhon. So Marx developed his ideological materialism from three European philosophers, Hegel, Feuerbach, and Proudhon, and therefrom developed his theory of economic determinism and historical materialism.

Thus, the philosophers of Europe who forgot that European culture was grounded in Christianity, gave birth to a political philosophy that finally found its way into Russia. And now that same philosophy is finding its way back into Europe.

How do we propose to meet this force?

The ERP program? Yes, we must do all we can to assist the recovery of Europe so that it will not be the chaos that Communists delight in to accelerate their ideas.

Must we do more than afford economic help? Yes; we must regain military strength so that we can defend ourselves against this new aggression if the need arises. Is the ERP and a return of our military strength sufficient to stop communism? No; not even these two together are in themselves sufficient to stop the spread of communism throughout the world. The philosophy of communism can still seep through economic and military lines. It can seep through into the minds of scientists, of educators, or statesmen.

Communism must be met by an ideology that is stronger than communism.

Obviously, if the battle cries of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Molotov ring with the challenge of destruction of the spirit of man and would engulf the world with materialism, it is the spirit of man that must be defended.

Our forefathers did not disdain to state that our fundamental rights were given to us by our Creator. They so stated in our most basic document, our Declaration of Independence. Unless we defend the concept of the existence of God, the whole structure may fall. We will then be like the Soviet Government, where all human rights are gifts from the state.

How tragic, therefore, is the recent decision of our Supreme Court in the McCollum case wherein our highest court states that all the millions of our public-school children may have no connection in their school system with the study of religion—which is the study of the relationship between man and God. And, across the Atlantic in an English court, an English jurist denied a legacy to a religious order on the grounds that it was not a charitable institution because it did nothing to benefit mankind, because its members did nothing but pray.

The present tension between the United States and Russia is not a contest between communism and monopolistic capitalism. It is not a contest between communism and free enterprise. It is a contest of conflicting definitions as to the nature of man.

I make a distinction between monopolistic capitalism and capitalism. I am against monopolistic capitalism. I am for capitalism and I am against socialism and communism. But if capitalism would be preserved, it must be widely spread. Monopolistic capitalism breeds socialism and communism.

One of the most effective means of combating the spread of communism in Europe among the working class, will be to have sound American trade unionists,

industrial engineers, and businessmen aiding in European recovery. If the European worker is to be kept from going Communist, his European employer should assist him to become a capitalist by giving him a living wage, enabling him properly to care for himself and his family. The dynamism of communism are the injustices of the capitalist system. The west cannot be sustained on a foundation of secular monopolistic capitalism. The roots of western culture will live in a soil with a spiritual strata as well as material. And in that soil only is the dignity of the human personality made to grow. If real justice is encouraged for European workers, the idea of a class struggle—which is essential to communism—will become irrelevant. Labor will become interested in capital when labor has capital to defend. Property is the economic guaranty of human liberty.

The Western World has been living on the fruits of Christianity for many years now. The roots have been severely severed. The Western World must cultivate the soil of the spirit.

We cannot effectively oppose the new driving materialistic faith that comes from Russia with a mere change in newspaper policy. There must be a rebirth of the things of the spirit. Nor can the issue be solved by any mere political tinkering.

So, Mr. Chairman, the United States is facing one of the fiercest forces in human history. It is the objective of the Communist Party of Russia ultimately to overcome the Government of the United States. In view of modern weapons, that objective could be accomplished if we permitted Russia to continue its advance and to put itself in a position where it can deliver a lethal blow to civilization.

It is the solemn duty of every Member of this House to vote in favor of this bill. It is our further duty to make ourselves sufficiently strong so that we can defend ourselves if the necessity arises. And, finally, we must regain spiritual strength because we are opposing a materialistic philosophy which is now not merely an abstract idea, but a materialistic philosophy that has embodiment in the Red army; embodiment in machine guns; embodiment in the hammer and sickle.

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.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes allotted to me on this amendment. I realize the temper of this House and I realize the parliamentary situation. I intend to vote for the Marshall plan. I intend to vote for it notwithstanding the fact that there are sections in it which I deplore and which I wish I could have the opportunity of voting on separately. I refer to the inclusion of Spain, the Fascist nation, in the 16 nations; the nation that proved to be the proving ground for the Wehrmacht and the Italian dive bombers, that started the history of aggression in Europe; a country that we do not even yet recognize diplomatically. I refer also to the extending of military aid to Greece, Turkey and China as contained in this bill.

Now, I am not against the principle of extending military aid to constitutional governments to maintain their constitutional integrity, but, Mr. Chairman, I want to do it the square way, the fair way, the open way. I want to do it on the basis of regional alliances which are recognized under the United Nations' Charter. I want to do it through interregional alliances and agreements between those regional alliances. I do not want to do it in the unilateral way in which we are doing it. I do not want to wage an undeclared war through the back door of an economic rehabilitation act. I want to do it honestly, and I think there are other Members in this House who are not extreme isolationists and who do not follow the Russian policy and who are not pro-Russian, who feel the same way. I think there are Members in this House who are true Americans, who want to go at this thing in the open way and do it in the way it should be done. It is for that reason that I rise and take the time at this time to say that I intend to vote for the Marshall plan, notwithstanding these parts of the Marshall plan which I do not approve, because I believe that it will give us just 1 year—I do not hope for any more—to bring these 16 nations into a functioning United Nations organization. A year ago I introduced a resolution which asks the President to call a conference of the United Nations. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has more recently introduced a similar resolution. Many other resolutions from Members of the House are before the Committee on Foreign Affairs asking that the United Nations be strengthened; that we try to solve the problem of universal peace through the multilateral solution which was envisaged in the Charter some 2 years ago and which we have deserted.

I say again, in all seriousness, that there are not enough men, there is not enough money, there is not enough food in the United States to fight or to buy or to feed the world, and when we spread our resources thin throughout all the danger spots that exist at the present time and will exist in the future, I say to you in all seriousness we are not big enough and rich enough to do the job.

No one nation can rule the world, whether it be Russia or the United States. Our only safety lies in collective security, in working through the United Nations Organization, and in solving problems between nations through majority decisions of the United Nations members, and then enforcing those majority decisions. Let us turn back to the principles of the United Nations before it is too late. It is true that we are moving toward war in every step we take in a unilateral manner, especially when we are extending military aid, the same as Russia is extending it to her satellite nations. Let us turn back to the principles of the United Nations before it is too late, before we have to send millions of our boys overseas to try to police and fight the world. We do not have enough boys to do it. Their lives are too precious. Let me plead with you before it is too late that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs take up these resolutions that lie before you and give them some consideration. Let us try to strengthen the United Nations and go at this thing in the only way that will eventually work. I say this with my knowledge of atomic energy as a member of the Atomic Energy Committee. I know what I am talking about. We cannot win unless we do it the United Nations way. We cannot conquer the world, even though we have the atomic bomb. We can only destroy the cities of the world and kill millions of people. The chaos of atomic warfare will not bring peace to the world. The Galilean said 2,000 years ago, "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword." The sword of the next war will be the atomic bomb. If we use it, we will bring upon ourselves the hatred of millions throughout the world. Their hatred will be as great as the destruction caused by our use of atomic bombs. Again I say let us turn to the United Nations. It is the only way to avoid a third world war.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to strike out title III, which would provide military aid to Greece, Turkey, and China.

We cannot beat an idea with a gun. I was opposed to the Greek-Turkish program when it was first presented because I believed it would fail in obtaining its objective.

I oppose the program today and for the same reason. We have sent guns to Greece but that has not stopped communism or civil war. There are twice as many guerrillas in Greece today as there were a year ago. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense so stated.

We have spent our good dollars to train, equip, and advise Greek troops to fight Greek Communists. The Greek Army has now been expanded to 132,000 men—but this army is a bust. Testimony before our committee showed that these Greek troops armed by American hard-earned dollars have not had much enthusiasm to fight guerrillas.

A United Press dispatch from Athens a few days ago reported:

> The American-aid mission said in a blunt and critical report tonight that the Greek Army had failed to take the offensive against the Communist-led guerrillas despite its great superiority in size and weapons. As a result the detailed report said rebel forces were enabled not only to increase their marauding activities but also to increase their strength through forcible recruitment.

As Harold Ickes pointed out in his column:

> One hundred and seventy-two million dollars spent by American taxpayers to help the Greek Government to kill or crush 20,000 Greek guerrillas works out to $8,600 per guerrilla.

He goes on to say that—

> Even so, this might be regarded as a good investment to prevent the spread of communism—if the guerrillas had been overcome. Now the Government is talking about an additional $275,000,000 which would make

a total of $450,000,000 to dispose of 20,000 guerrillas. This would mean $22,500 per guerrilla, which seems to be a pretty high price, especially since we would be expected to keep pouring in more money.

There is no evidence to convince me that our dollars this next year will accomplish what they failed to accomplish last year.

I think it is fair to assume that communism in the next year will increase in Greece. I think it is fair to assume that Congress will again be asked to appropriate money to support the Greek army which does not want to fight.

Why? Because people cannot eat bullets; because guns cannot sell a corrupt government to a disillusioned people—weary and poverty ridden. The only way to stop communism in Greece is to promote and support democracy in Greece.

Mr. Chairman, the Members may remember I pointed out this all important fact last year.

Oh, yes; we appropriated money last year for economic rehabilitation. It was earmarked for food, clothes, machines, houses, fertilizer and the many other desperately needed items for the people of Greece. But a great part of this money was not spent for these purposes. No; it was instead transferred to the military budget.

Bullets, not bread, was our answer to the people in Greece.

We sought to solve the Greek dilemma solely with guns—well, we have had our answer. Communism has doubled.

What madness.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title III and all amendments thereto do now close.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: On page 104, line 6, strike out title IV.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title IV and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CELLER, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. POWELL objected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment to strike the provision for aid to China from this bill, I do not wish to give the impression that I am unsympathetic to China's plight nor that I am against all aid to China. I am offering the amendment because I do not believe that title IV has any place in this bill.

The charge that the United States has betrayed China is a gross libel. The total American funds spent in aid of China since VJ-day amount to $2,000,278,000. The items included $844,721,000 for military aid, $970,107,000 for relief, rehabilitation, and trade development, $30,450,000 for educational and philanthropic aid, and $155,000,000 for fiscal aid. There may be added to these figures millions of dollar values for which little or nothing was paid on account of bargain price sales of munitions and other goods. In addition, China now has the pick of our surplus military supplies and equipment in the Pacific area.

There are now in China 400 American Army officers and 400 technicians who are helping the Chinese military establishment in the fight against the Communists. In title III of this bill, this House has already provided $150,000,000 additional military aid for China.

However, any proposal for further relief to China should be carefully considered and should be considered by this House in a bill entirely separate from the ERP bill.

The Senate considered civilian relief for China in an entirely different bill. Yesterday that bill passed the Senate, and, during debate, Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said:

We cannot deal with the Chinese economy on an over-all basis as we have done in the European Recovery Program. China is too big. The problem is too complicated.

This bill started out as a European recovery program, and that is the way it passed the other body. The bill originally proposed the authorization of funds for the economic recovery and rehabilitation of 16 nations who had banded together to help themselves. I would not support title I of this bill if its provisions were not predicated on the condition that these nations give and take among themselves and help themselves.

Regardless of what has been said to the contrary, this bill is the first step in a 4-year program to help Europe. The termination date of the program, 1952, is written all through the bill. It is true that the bill requires that next year another authorization and another appropriation will have to be provided by the Congress before the program can be continued. That language is mostly surplusage, as everyone knows that this Congress cannot bind a succeeding Congress. The fact remains that we are here embarking on a 4-year program.

If title IV remains in this bill, although no long-range program has been worked out for China, you can count on it that next year China will be back for additional millions, yea billions, on the ground that we are committed to a long-range program in China as we are committing ourselves to such a program in Europe.

Any plan for relief in China must be studied carefully in the light of conditions in the Pacific. It should be studied in the light of the needs of the Philippine Islands, Korea, and Japan, and it should be based on what those countries are willing and can do for themselves.

It is true that communism is bearing down on China, too, and that it is to our interest to combat communism on all the fronts of the world. However, our wealth is not unlimited and it would be extremely unwise to spread our help lines too thin and in a way that would benefit no one in the long run. Such a procedure would be pouring money into a rat hole.

The focal point of the world cold battle against communism is in Europe and the Mediterranean area. There you will find potentially forty-odd percent of the industrial output of the world. That is the area communism covets most because they need control of industrial output most. The hammer and sickle already waves over plenty of land, raw materials, and manpower. Let that flag fly over the 16 nations of Europe with their mechanical genius and industrial know-how and Russia will be a long way on the road to world conquest indeed.

While I deeply sympathize with China and admire her steadfastness in her battle against foreign domination, I am afraid that the money allowed here for China will not accomplish any worthwhile purpose—that is, unless we follow up with a 4-year program such as has been proposed for Europe and spend billions of dollars to carry through. I simply do not believe that the United States can afford such expenditures with no logical expectation of a return on the investment.

As a matter of fact, the money here proposed for economic support and military aid to Italy, Greece, and Turkey will in the long run prove to be of more benefit to China than the money provided in title IV of the bill. If Italy, Greece, and Turkey fall to communism, and the Dardanelles come under Russian domination, then the road to China is open to the Soviet from the south and the west, as she will be encircled by the forces of communism.

As was said by Peter the Great, "He who controls the commerce of India will control the destiny of Europe and of the world." He might well have added that he who controls the Mediterranean and the Dardanelles will eventually control the commerce of India and China as well.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to the conclusion that over a 4-year period the United States must make this $17,000,000,000 investment to rehabilitate and restore the economy of Europe.

During the recent war, General Marshall chose France as the focal point of his attack and he amassed a preponderant strength there, and we won. Had he divided his forces to attack all over the world at the same time, we would have lost the war. Now, in attempting to build a bulwark against Communist aggression, we must use such resources as we can spare in the area it will do the most good, and that area is Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all

amendments to title 4 close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] will be recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. I believe this amendment is a reasonable one, because we have not fully considered the effect of the aid that is going to be given to China.

It has been reliably reported that our military intervention in China today, if continued to a successful conclusion, might very well commit this Nation to an expenditure of an additional thirty to forty billions of dollars. I want the record clearly to show that the funds authorized for China in this bill are not to be construed in any manner as committing me to a program of future support to the extent of this enormous sum of money. In my opinion aid to China should be considered separate and should be further explored before this Nation is committed to a course of action either legal or moral. Every legislator knows that sound and constructive legislation cannot be written upon the floor of this House. Yet during the consideration of this bill, in many instances, wisdom and caution have been thrown to the winds.

Only yesterday this body, by passage of amendment to bring Spain into the provisions of this bill, dealt the forces of democracy a staggering blow.

This intemperate action has had serious repercussions all over the world and particularly in Europe. The action of this body with reference to Spain has caused bitterness and despair among the democratic forces of Italy according to wire reports from Rome. Press reports from Rome indicate that all of the good that came from the recent Trieste proposal has been wiped away by the action of this body. From London and other parts of the world anger follows amazement and despair. It is incredible to them that this body could have been so inconsiderate and unwise in its action. Fourteen of the 16 nations of Europe have said they will not include Spain within ERP. It ought to be clear to every Member of this body that whether or not Spain is to be included within the group of the nations of western Europe is a matter for the determination of those nations, and is not subject to political dictation by this Congress.

Not only has your action jeopardized the success of the coming election in Italy—you have given fuel to the flame of propaganda that is designed to blacken the spirit, the intent and the purpose of this legislation. You have done a great injustice not only to the American people but to the spirit of this program which has been labeled a recovery program, a program designed to achieve peace in the world.

This ought to be a lesson to you. Minds and tongues should be curbed, for the well of this House has become a sounding board for much of the propaganda that is being used against us in Europe and other parts of the world. Let us devote our thoughts and speech to our faith and hopes for peace and for real democracy, and never permit ourselves to be placed in the position of embracing or sponsoring any totalitarian force in any part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has expired.

The Chair understands there are some further amendments pending, and will ask that those names which have been read who desire to speak on the Richards amendment will please indicate it, and they will be recognized first.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, to my mind, the inclusion of title IV, Chinese aid, is a sort of a stand-and-deliver attitude taken by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I want to vote for the bill, but title IV, Chinese aid, like military aid to Turkey and Greece, is holding my vote in ransom. To my mind, that is mean, shabby politics.

Let us read what General Stilwell said about China only in 1944, as appears in a recent publication:

> Under Chiang Kai-shek they may expect greed, corruption, favoritism, more taxes, a ruined currency, terrible waste of life, callous disregard for all the rights of men.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee only day before yesterday issued a public statement highly condemnatory of China. The chairman of that committee turned right about and withdrew the statement, but the statement is still true. It in part follows:

> The unfavorable factors (in China) presently outweigh the favorable.
>
> Inefficiency, corruption, and bureaucratic maladies became even more devastating in a period of dislocation and inflation. Ineptitude in military leadership and corruption among army commanders has contributed largely to the lowered morale of the Chinese Government troops.
>
> The country never developed a favorable balance of trade and the unfavorable balance obviously grew worse in the past few years. An important psychological factor is the lack of popular confidence in the Chinese Government.
>
> Under the present circumstances, it is not possible to develop a practical, effective, long-term over-all program for China's economic recovery predicated upon outside assistance from the United States. We cannot underwrite the destiny of China.

That is the government we are seeking to aid by this title. Note the conclusion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that under the present regime no economic recovery is possible. Thus our goods and money and material would be wasted.

It will not be any aid to the Chinese peasant who is desperately in need. Those who are entitled to aid will not get it. Instead, we will be bolstering up a decadent and bureaucratic government that is not entitled to the slightest vestige of support.

I have done all I can to eliminate the vexatious provisions of the bill. I have fought to cut out aid to Franco and Fascist Spain. I have struggled to drop aid of military character, especially to Greece and Turkey. I battled against aid to China. I believe in ERP. It is sound doctrine. It is temporary aid to war-torn Europe and permanent economic rehabilitation. It envisages that the 16 European countries to be aided will do all and sundry to reestablish themselves, especially with the aid of United States capital and consumer goods.

Several evil provisions have been added. I opposed them. For the sake of the basic structure of the bill, I will have to swallow the provisions I dislike. That is unfortunate. I fervently hope the bill will be perfected in conference. Particularly I pray that the Senate will refuse aid to Franco and China and that the conferees will return a bill to us clean and wholesome.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Richards amendment to strike out title 4 to cut out the economic aid to China. The gentleman from South Carolina said, "We are appropriating money we know not for what." The gentleman from Colorado, another Democrat, said, "We have not considered the effect of the aid given to China."

May I point out that Secretary Marshall himself, Secretary of State, said before the Foreign Affairs Committee on February 20, 1948:

> The Chinese Government is in dire need of assistance in its present serious economic difficulties. However, the political, economic, and financial conditions in China are so unstable and so uncertain that it is impossible to develop a practical, effective, long-term, over-all program for economic recovery. Nevertheless, it is desirable that the United States Government render assistance to China in her present critical situation in order to help retard the present rapid rate of economic deterioration and thus provide a breathing space in which the Chinese Government could initiate important steps toward more stable economic conditions.

Also the Secretary at that time said specifically:

> The proposed program of aid for China would provide economic assistance in the amount of $570,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1949. Of this amount $510,000,000 would cover minimum imports of essential civilian type of commodities, chiefly foodstuffs and raw materials, and $60,000,000 would be for key construction projects. The program concentrates on those commodities believed to be of maximum aid to Chinese civilian economy and those which will insure the greatest aid per dollar spent.

That is the Secretary of State speaking, and here you find the Democratic Party in Congress trying to cut out the program specifically sent up by the Secretary of State to the Foreign Affairs Committee of this Congress. I do not understand it.

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

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] will close debate on this side.

Mr. JUDD. First, Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment that is at the desk. It is in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 105, line 23, strike out the period and insert the following: "at any time."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this is just to correct a typographical omission in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment being in the nature of a perfecting amendment will be voted upon now.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, no one, I think, can rightly justify this bill, or title 4 or any other part of it, on a basis primarily of humanitarianism or charity. The Committee has heard me say on other occasions beginning early last year that such measures as this could be justified in this present world situation and in the present straitened state of America's finances and supplies only if they are essential from the standpoint of the security of the Nation. This is primarily a national defense bill.

We had hoped it would be an alternative to a military policy. Six months ago it perhaps could have been. But world events and Communist aggression have advanced so rapidly that now it probably is more in support of a military policy than an alternative to one.

It was not to divert attention or assistance from Europe to Asia that the aid-to-China sections were put into this bill. Rather, it was to strengthen and support the program in Europe. We do not believe that Asia is more important to our security than Europe, but we do not believe it is less important. As General MacArthur put it in his cabled reply to the committee's request for his view—

It would be utterly fallacious to underrate China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all.

How much more will it cost us, in money and resources and men, to keep western Europe free—or even ourselves—if China and Asia go down and Russia is able to concentrate all her attention and strength on the west?

I doubt that ERP can succeed in Europe if Russia gets control of China—which means of Asia—as Russia will if we do not help effectively and at once. To contemplate spending $17,000,000,000 on one flank during a period of 4 years and nothing on the other is hardly good sense.

An intelligent and immediate program of aid to China consisting of moral support, munitions, American personnel for military training and advice at all levels, dollars to balance China's international payments for necessary imports, to steady her currency, and loans for specific development projects—the sort of program these two titles authorize—should not cost more than about $500,000,000 a year for 3 years. If that billion and a half for China should make the difference between success and failure of the proposed seventeen billion for Europe, it would seem to me a good investment—and a necessary one.

It is not a scattering of our shots, a diversion from Europe; it is in order to win in Europe that we must try to win also in China.

Suppose we concentrate on Europe alone and succeed there even better than we expect, all we will have is two great armed camps glaring at each other—on one hand Russia and her satellites, strong because essentially one economic and political unit; on the other hand the 16 nations of western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, and a few other nations. The success of ERP is necessary merely to restore an uneasy balance with the Soviet-controlled system. But it does not give us preponderance. Which side will have preponderance depends upon which way China goes. The billion people in Asia control the balance of power. China's immediate fate is in our hands. But our ultimate fate is in no small degree in her hands. The people of Asia understand that. They wonder why so many of us fail to see it.

So I repeat, it is not because we care more about Asia and China than we do about Europe. On the other hand, we do not think they are less important. In order to save either, in my judgment, we have to make an honest effort to save both. In both cases our primary concern is and must be the security of our own Nation.

The deadline for China does not come on April 18, as it does for Italy. The deadline for China came a year and a half ago. Any less courageous and tenacious people would have broken long ago under the terrific blows they have suffered and the strains they have endured. They may yet crack up before we can get going. But I have great confidence in the Chinese, based on their record. If we adopt this program and it is carried out in good faith and vigorously, there is good reason to believe that with the amazing resilience and recuperative capacities the Chinese people have, it will succeed in enabling them to retain their independence and their territorial and administrative integrity and to resume the march toward freedom and democracy and better government which they made under their present leadership from 1927 to 1937 in one of the most amazing renaissances of all history. That was interrupted by the Japanese war. They stood alone against Japan for 4½ years while we were daydreaming. They are still resisting valiantly, all attempts to enslave them.

Two months after Pearl Harbor the Congress unanimously passed a bill to grant $500,000,000 to China. Why? Because it had a good government? No. Because it was an honest or efficient or democratic government by our standard? No. It was still struggling to emerge from an ancient medieval feudalism. We appropriated that money without a single dissenting vote because we desperately needed China on our side. Well, is an independent and friendly China less vital to our security now than then? I think not.

If it had not been so humiliating it would have been a little ludicrous in February 1942 to see the great United States which had been supplying Japan against China, now on its knees pleading, "Please, China, please hang on with your bare hands and hold the Japanese three long years until we can rebuild our sunken Navy, capture the islands one by one, and eventually bring our superior power to bear upon Japan."

China made good then when we were threatened. We must do no less now.

Mr. Chairman, it is to help the United States of America and to advance our hope for security and peace that we must do the best we can on both flanks. It is to save money, not waste it, that I believe we must make a real effort to keep China independent and on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 31, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Peace and Reconstruction Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that after the horror and devastation of World War II, the victorious coalition, responding to the highest and noblest hopes of mankind everywhere, established the United Nations for the promotion and maintenance of peace. It is the declared purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security; to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples; to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character; to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these ends. Realization of these principles through the United Nations remains the world's last best hope for peace. The United States as initiator of the United Nations and a signatory to its Charter has the high responsibility of strengthening its organization and, through it, building the foundations of an enduring peace.

"Yet the foreign policy of the United States as embodied in the Truman doctrine and as practical continuously since the announcement of that doctrine has seriously weakened the United Nations as an instrument for world peace and collaboration, and negated the high purpose of its Charter. Instead of taking collective measures, through the United Nations, for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, unilateral action under the Truman doctrine has divided the world into hostile blocs. Instead of employing international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, the Truman doctrine has employed the economic might of the United States unilaterally for political ends. Instead of respecting the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, the Truman doctrine has intervened in the internal affairs of other nations. Instead of making use of the United

Nations as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations, the Truman doctrine has bypassed the United Nations and provoked international suspicion and tension which, if unchecked, can lead only to war.

"It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States take immediate steps to repudiate the Truman doctrine and reassert leadership in the great task of establishing and maintaining peace through the United Nations. It is the further policy of the Congress to respond to the desperate need of the European victims of Axis aggression for the reconstruction and economic development of their war-devastated lands by providing aid through the instrumentality of the United Nations and in accordance with the purpose of its Charter to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, while guaranteeing their right to determine for themselves the forms of their social, political, and economic institutions, without intervention or interference.

"UNITED NATIONS EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Congress calls upon the President to request the Secretary General of the United Nations to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at the earliest possible date.

"(b) The Congress calls upon the President to instruct the representatives of the United States in the General Assembly, upon the convening of that body, to submit a proposal for the establishment of a European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration (herein referred to as the 'Administration') within the United Nations, based upon the following principles:

"(1) The Administration shall include representatives of the United States and of all European members of the United Nations.

"(2) The Administration shall be charged with the administration and distribution of a European reconstruction and economic development fund (herein referred to as the 'fund').

"(3) The fund shall be made up by voluntary contributions from members of the United Nations, or by quotas determined by the Administration on the basis of ability to pay and shall be in the aggregate amount of at least $25,000,000,000 over a period of 5 years.

"(4) The fund shall be available to provide loans or grants to individual European nations for the purposes of rehabilitation, reconstruction, and economic development, to the end that the immediate human suffering of their people may be alleviated and their industry and agriculture restored and placed on a self-sustaining basis at the earliest practicable time. In addition, loans and grants may be made available for industrial development, with special emphasis on the industrially backward nations, to raise the living standards of their people, provide for the full utilization of their natural resources and promote economic cooperation and world trade.

"(5) Priority in the allocation of funds shall be given to those nations which suffered most severely from Axis aggression. All allocations of funds shall be based solely on this consideration and on the basis of need, without regard to the character of the political and social institutions of the recipient nation and without the imposition of any political conditions or any economic conditions other than those necessary to insure that the allocated funds will be expended for the purpose for which the allocation was made, without waste or inefficiency.

"(6) The entire fund shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, and no allocation shall be made to finance the purchase, manufacture, or maintenance of any military establishment, armaments, munitions, military supplies, or equipment of any kind or character whatsoever.

"(7) Special attention shall be given to raising the levels of food production, providing an ever-normal world food granary and raising the minimum nutrition and shelter standards of all recipient nations.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and a like sum for each of the four fiscal years next following, which shall be available for payment by the United States to the European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration from and after the date it is established.

"EMERGENCY AID

"SEC. 5. In order to provide immediate emergency relief to the peoples of the war-devastated European nations pending the establishment of the United Nations' European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, the President, acting through such departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government as he shall direct, may make grants to the governments of European nations to finance the procurement, from any source determined by the recipient of food or fuel or any commodity, machinery, or equipment required for the production of food or fuel. In determining the nations to which grants shall be made under this section, and the amounts of such grants, the President shall be bound by the provisions of subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act and no economic, political, or other conditions shall be attached to such grants except for the united purpose expressly provided in subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 5 of this act: *Provided*, That no funds shall be obligated under such appropriation subsequent to January 1, 1949, or the date of the organization of the United Nations' Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, whichever is earlier.

"REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

"SEC. 7. From and after the effective date of this act, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not in time of peace, unless the Security Council of the United Nations shall otherwise determine, give, or sell to any other nation any military or naval equipment, munitions, arms, armament, or supplies, or finance the purchase of the same by any other nation, and any moneys heretofore appropriated by the Congress for any such purpose shall not be obligated therefor.

"SEC. 8. It shall be the declared policy of the United States to promote universal disarmament as a means of preventing war and removing the crushing burden of mounting armament appropriations from the people of all lands, including our own. To that end, the Congress calls upon the representatives of the United States in the United Nations to propose to the Commission for Conventional Armaments the immediate reduction by all nations in their armament and military expenditures for all types of armaments to an amount not in excess of 10 percent of the current rate."

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where the debate on title I of the bill was concluded.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I realize the effort we are now making is a futile one here. I know that nothing I can say or anyone else can say here this evening will change the course of events in this House. However, in the final analysis, our efforts are not futile because we believe that judgment on this matter will not be finally rendered here today. Final judgment on this far-reaching issue will be given by time and events and the American people. So as to have the record complete, and so that the record will demonstrate that efforts have been made by some of us to preserve the peace of the world, I have offered this substitute. In making the fight that we are making in these last minutes of the debate, I assure you we are not going to be deterred by smears, threats, and lies from carrying this fight back to the people.

We have been told to go back to the country that we love. We take that advice. We are going back to the country we love—we are going back to the election precincts of our cherished United States, and we are going to take this fight to the American people. Let me say right here and now we are not going to be deterred by any vituperation that may come from any tobacco patriot or from any cotton king or from any corn and corny orator or from any arrogant Jim Crow flag-waver who brazenly talks of democracy here, but personally refuses to apply it in the communities that he represents. In making the fight against this bill, we have charged it to be a bill for imperialism and monopoly capitalists, and what has happened during the last 3 days demonstrates the correctness of our position. You started out with a bill which was intended to write into law agreements and policies that extend the control of monopoly capital over these nations—yes, Wall Street monopoly capital, and when we attack Wall Street monopoly capital from the floor of the House, we are not attacking America—we are defending America because the enemy of America today, the enemy of the world today, is Wall Street monopoly capital. Now let us see what has happened to this bill, this monopoly capital bill conceived in fascism. You have the proof of it before you. As a logical sequence and as an integral part of this big trust, Wall Street Marshall plan, let me say to my so-called liberal friends, you had nothing else to expect but aid to the Chinese Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek. You had nothing else to expect but aid to the Fascist governments of Greece and Turkey. You had nothing else to expect but the betrayal of Palestine. Yes; and you could not expect anything else but the insertion of aid to the Butcher of Spain, Franco. All this had to be expected because all this is an integral part of the living flesh and blood of imperialism in which this bill was conceived. Let me say further that in consequence of the alleged anti-Communist policy with which some of you so-called liberals seek to justify your vote for this measure, there would have been included aid to Mussolini and Hitler if they had been alive and if they were still ruling their respective countries. This so-called anti-Communist policy is driving this Nation not only to war but also into

fascism. In sharp contrast to the bill you support our substitute is the way of the United Nations; and as Fiorello LaGuardia described it, the way of Christ, toward peace and security and freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment, on the committee substitute, and all amendments thereto, do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 6, noes 270.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee substitute for the Senate bill, as amended by amendments that have been adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The committee substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee now 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 (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, pursuant to House Resolution 505, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order, that the House has not been given an opportunity to request a separate vote on any amendment that was adopted. The rule under which the bill was considered, as I understand it, provided that it should be read for amendment, and any amendment agreed to by the Committee of the Whole would be subject to a request for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state there was no effort being made to deprive Members of that opportunity.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not imply that at all, Mr. Speaker. I want to publicly state that I think the present Speaker has at all times been eminently fair to the minority.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he did not ask if a separate vote on any amendment was demanded.

Is a separate vote on any amendment demanded?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I request a separate vote on the so-called O'Konski amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on title III and title IV.

The SPEAKER. Those amendments were not agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'KONSKI: On page 50, line 16, after the word "including" add "Spain" and a comma.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 188, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that S. 2202 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 74, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—329

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bender
Blackney
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bonner
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buck
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burke
Burleson
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carroll
Carson
Case, N. J.
Celler
Chadwick
Chapman
Chelf
Clark
Clason
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Crow
Cunningham
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Donohue
Douglas
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fogarty
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Goff
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Gross
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Hart
Hartley
Harvey
Havenner
Hays
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Huber
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Lucas
Ludlow
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Madden
Mahon
Maloney
Mansfield
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morrison
Morton
Muhlenberg
Multer
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norton
O'Brien
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patterson
Peden
Peterson
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Ploeser
Plumley
Poage
Potter
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Ramey
Rayburn
Redden
Rees
Reeves
Regan
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sabath
Sadlak
St. George
Sarbacher
Sasscer
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—74

Allen, Ill.
Arnold
Banta
Barden
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Buffett
Case, S. Dak.
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Clippinger
Cole, Mo.
Crawford
Curtis
Dondero
Dorn
Doughton
Ellis
Gillie
Griffiths
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hand

Harness, Ind.	McGregor	Schwabe, Okla.
Harrison	Marcantonio	Scrivner
Hoffman	Martin, Iowa	Shafer
Hull	Miller, Nebr.	Short
Isacson	Morris	Smith, Kans.
Jenison	O'Hara	Smith, Ohio
Johnson, Ill.	Owens	Smith, Wis.
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Calif.	Stefan
Johnson, Okla.	Powell	Twyman
Knutson	Rankin	Vail
Landis	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
Larcade	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Lemke	Rich	Wood
Lewis	Sadowski	Woodruff
Love	Sanborn	Youngblood
McCowen	Schwabe, Mo.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Brown, Ohio	Macy

NOT VOTING—26

Abbitt	Hendricks	Rains
Andresen, August H.	Jarman	Rivers
Andrews, Ala.	Lesinski	Rizley
Boykin	Manasco	Rooney
Busbey	Mason	Sikes
Coffin	Mitchell	Taylor
Dingell	Norrell	Thomas, N. J.
Grant, Ala.	O'Konski	Walter
	Passman	West

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Busbey against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Passman against.
Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Rizley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "yea." I have a live pair with my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] who, if present, would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment ask for a conference, and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint conferees.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EATON, VORYS, MUNDT, BLOOM, and KEEFE.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following the business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

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

There was no objection.

RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Rubber Act of 1948'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is the policy of the United States that there shall be maintained at all times in the interest of the national security and common defense, in addition to stock piles of natural rubber which are to be acquired, rotated, and retained pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 23, 1946), a technologically advanced and rapidly expandible rubber-producing industry in the United States of sufficient productive capacity to assure the availability in times of national emergency of adequate supplies of synthetic rubber to meet the essential civilian, military, and naval needs of the country. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the security interests of the United States can and will best be served by the development within the United States of a free, competitive synthetic-rubber industry. In order to strengthen national security through a sound industry it is essential that Government ownership of production facilities, Government production of synthetic rubber, regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber, and patent pooling be ended and terminated whenever consistent with national security, as provided in this Act.

"AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE CERTAIN CONTROLS OVER NATURAL RUBBER AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING NATURAL AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER

"SEC. 3. To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 of this Act, the President is authorized to exercise allocation, specification, and inventory controls of natural rubber and synthetic rubber, and specification controls of products containing natural rubber and synthetic rubber, notwithstanding any changes in the supply or estimated supply of natural rubber or synthetic rubber; and he shall exercise such controls by issuing such regulations as are required to insure (a) the consumption in the United States of general-purpose synthetic rubber in a specified percentage of the combined total estimated annual consumption of natural rubber and general-purpose synthetic rubber consumed within the United States, and (b) the consumption in the United States of any or all types of special-purpose synthetic rubber in specified percentages of the combined total estimated annual consumption of natural rubber, general-purpose synthetic rubber, and special-purpose synthetic rubber consumed within the United States. Such percentages shall be established so as to assure the production and consumption of general-purpose synthetic rubber and special-purpose synthetic rubber in quantities determined by the President to be necessary to carry out the policy of section 2 of this Act, and the provisions of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 23, 1946: *Provided*, That the minimum percentages established by the President shall result in a total annual tonnage consumption of synthetic rubber of at least the amounts specified in section 5 (d) of this Act, and that any mandatory consumption in excess of the quantities specified in section 5 (d) of this Act shall not be more than is deemed by the President to be necessary in the interest of national security and the common defense.

"IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The President may impose such import restrictions on finished and semifinished rubber products as he deems necessary to assure equality with like or similar products produced within the United States in accordance with regulations issued under this Act.

"(b) The President may exempt from the regulations issued under this Act finished and semifinished rubber products manufactured in the United States exclusively for export outside the United States.

"DOMESTIC RUBBER-PRODUCING CAPACITY

"SEC. 5. (a) There shall be maintained at all times within the United States rubber-producing facilities having a rated production capacity of not less than six hundred thousand long tons per annum of general-purpose synthetic rubber and not less than sixty-five thousand long tons per annum of special-purpose synthetic rubber.

"(b) Of the sixty-five-thousand-long-ton rated production capacity for special-purpose synthetic rubber, specified in section 5 (a) of this Act, at least forty-five thousand long tons shall be of a type suitable for use in pneumatic inner tubes.

"(c) The synthetic rubber used to satisfy the mandatory consumption provided in section 3 of this Act shall be produced by the Government or for the Government account, or purchased from others for resale by the Government or for the Government account.

"(d) Facilities in operation by the Government or private persons shall produce annually not less than one-third of the rated production capacities specified in section 5 (a) and (b) of this Act.

"(e) The facilities to be maintained in operation by the Government and those to be maintained in adequate stand-by condition shall be determined from time to time by the President.

"(f) At least one facility for making butadiene from alcohol shall be maintained in operation or in adequate stand-by condition.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6. (a) To effectuate further the policies set forth in section 2 of this Act with respect to a technologically advanced domestic rubber-producing industry, continuous and extensive research by private parties and the Government is essential. The Government is hereby authorized to undertake research in rubber and allied fields and the powers, functions, duties, and authority of the Government to undertake research and development in rubber and allied fields shall be exercised and performed by such departments, agencies, officers, Government corporations, or instrumentalities of the United States as the President may designate, whether or not existing at the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) The cost of undertaking and maintaining the research and development authorized in section 6 (a) of this Act may be paid from such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"OPERATION OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 7. (a) The powers, functions, duties, and authority to produce and sell synthetic rubber conferred in section 7 (b) of this Act shall be exercised and performed by such department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate, whether or not existing at the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) The department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designated by the President pursuant to section 7 (a) of this Act shall have the powers, functions, duties, and authority to produce and sell synthetic rubber, including the component materials thereof, in amounts sufficient to assure the production of synthetic rubber as required by the President in section 3 of this Act: *Provided*, That so far as practicable the President shall authorize such production of synthetic rubber, including the component materials thereof, as may be necessary to satisfy voluntary usage of synthetic rubber including the component materials thereof.

"(c) The aforesaid powers, functions, duties, and authority to produce and sell include all power and authority in such department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States to do all things necessary and proper in connection with and related to such production and sale, including but not limited to the power and authority to make repairs, replacements, alterations, improvements, or betterments to the rubber-producing facilities owned by the Government or in connection with the operation thereof and to make capital expenditures as may be necessary for the efficient and proper operation and maintenance of the rubber-producing facilities owned by the Government and performance of said powers, functions, duties, and authority.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, the aforesaid powers, functions, duties, and authority to produce and sell include the power and authority in such department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States to (1) lease for operation for Government account all or any part of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities in connection with the performance of said powers, functions, duties, and authority to produce and sell; (2) lease, for a period not extending beyond the termination date of this Act, Government-owned, rubber-producing facilities for private purposes if such lease contains adequate provisions for the recapture thereof for the purposes set forth in section 7 (b) of this Act and if such lease provides that any synthetic rubber or component material as may be produced by the leased facilities shall not be used to satisfy mandatory requirements established by section 3; (3) grant permanent easements or licenses for private purposes in, on, or over land comprising part of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities if such grant provides that such easement or license shall not interfere with the use at any time of the rubber-producing facilities involved; and (4) sell or otherwise dispose of obsolete or other property not necessary for the production of the rated capacity of the particular plant to which such property is charged.

"STAND-BY FACILITIES

"SEC. 8. (a) To effectuate further the policies set forth in section 2 of this Act, the President is authorized to place in adequate stand-by condition such rubber-producing facilities as he shall determine necessary to maintain the continued existence of rubber-producing facilities capable of producing the tonnage of synthetic rubber required by section 5 (a) of this Act.

"(b) Rubber-producing facilities placed in stand-by condition by the President pursuant to section 8 (a) of this Act may be maintained by such department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States, whether or not existing on the date of enactment of this Act, as the President may designate: *Provided*, That nothing contained in section 8 (b) of this Act shall preclude such department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States from entering into contracts with private persons for the maintenance of stand-by facilities: *Provided further*, That the cost of placing facilities in stand-by condition, maintaining such facilities in adequate stand-by condition, and, when necessary, reactivating such facilities, may be paid from such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

"SEC. 9. (a) The department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designated by the President pursuant to section 7 (a) of this Act shall undertake immediate study, conducting such hearings as may be necessary, in order to determine and formulate a program for disposal to private industry by sale or lease of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities other than those authorized to be disposed of pursuant to section 9 (b) of this Act. A report with respect to the development of such a disposal program shall be made to the President and to Congress not later than April 1, 1949. On or before January 15, 1950, the President, after consultation with the National Security Resources Board, shall recommend to the Congress legislation with respect to the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities other than those authorized to be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of under the provisions of section 9 (b) of this Act, together with such other recommendations as he deems desirable and appropriate: *Provided*, That the Government shall maintain the ownership of a rated rubber-producing capacity of 600,000 long tons of general-purpose rubber and a rated rubber-producing capacity of 65,000 long tons of special-purpose rubber until a program is formulated and adopted for the sale or lease of such facilities as provided in this section.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, the department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designated by the President pursuant to section 7 (a) of this Act may, after consultation with the National Security Resources Board, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of to private persons any rubber-producing facility, including such facilities as have been declared surplus pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, not required to fulfill the capacity set forth in section 5 (a) of this Act upon such terms and conditions as it may determine providing that such sale or lease shall be on the condition that any synthetic rubber or component materials produced in such facility shall not be used to satisfy the mandatory requirements established by section 3 of this Act.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 10. (a) The President may issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The President may exercise any or all of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this Act, including but not limited to the powers and authority conferred in section 12 of this Act, through such departments, agencies, officers, Government corporations, or instrumentalities of the United States, whether or not existing at the date of the enactment of this Act, as he may direct.

"(c) The President, insofar as practical, shall consolidate all of the powers, functions, and authority contained in this Act in one department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States, whether or not existing at the date of enactment of this Act. The President is authorized to cause a corporation to be organized for the purpose of producing and selling synthetic rubber. Any such corporation so organized shall be authorized, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act and to pertinent provisions of law affecting Government corporations, to sue and be sued, to acquire, hold, and dispose of property, to use its revenues, to determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed and paid, and to exercise such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, out of appropriations made for that purpose, to subscribe to the capital stock of such corporation.

"(d) The President may transfer to the departments, agencies, officers, Government corporations, or instrumentalities of the United States, or to any of them, which he directs to exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this Act, such rubber-producing facilities, personnel, property, and records relating to such powers, authority, and discretion, as he deems necessary; and he may so transfer all appropriations or other funds available for carrying out such powers, authority, and discretion.

"(e) In addition to the reports required by section 9 (a) of this Act each department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States to whom the President may delegate any powers, authority, and discretion conferred by this Act shall make an annual report to the President and to the Congress of operations under this Act.

"PATENT POOLING AND USE OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION

"SEC. 11. (a) To effectuate further the policies of this Act, the President is authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate with respect to patent pooling, patent licensing and exchange of information agreements entered into with the Government as a part of the wartime synthetic rubber program and, insofar as practicable and consistent with the purposes of this Act, to effectuate immediate cessation of further accumulation of technical information or rights to patents under the agreement dated December 19, 1941, as supplemented June 12, 1942, between the Government and others.

"(b) Any department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate to perform the powers, functions, duties, and authority referred to in section 7 (b) of this Act shall be entitled to the

benefits of the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 851), as amended July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 705), or any similar Act.

"INFORMATION, REPORTS, SUBPENAS, WITNESSES, AND TESTIMONY

"SEC. 12. (a) The President shall be entitled to obtain such information from, require such reports and the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, any person and make such investigations, as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of this Act.

"(b) For the purpose of obtaining any information, verifying any report required, or making any investigation pursuant to section 12 (a) of this Act, the President may administer oaths and affirmations, and may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any books or records or any other documentary or physical evidence which may be relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, or other documentary or physical evidence may be required at any designated place from any State, Territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided,* That the production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person resides or transacts business, if, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the President with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into a stipulation with the President as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing any books, records, or other documentary evidence or certified copies thereof, or physical evidence, in obedience to any such subpena, or in any action or proceeding which may be instituted under this Act on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be subject to prosecution and punishment, or to any penalty or forfeiture, for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, except that any such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The President shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this section which the President deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information, unless the President determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the interest of the national defense and security; and anyone violating this provision shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeding $1,000 or be imprisoned not exceeding 2 years, or both.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 13. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required by any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

"SEC. 14. (a) The district courts of the United States, and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall have jurisdiction of violations of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order or subpena thereunder, and of all civil actions under this Act to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of this Act or any rule, regulation, order, or subpena thereunder.

"(b) Any criminal proceeding on account of any such violation may be brought in any district in which any act, failure to act, or transaction constituting the alleged violation occurred. Any such civil action may be brought in any such district or in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business. Process in such cases, criminal or civil, may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found; and subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court in any district in any such cases may run into any other district. No costs shall be assessed against the United States in any proceeding under this Act.

"EXCULPATORY CLAUSE

"SEC. 15. No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any default under any contract or order which shall result directly or indirectly from compliance with this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, notwithstanding that any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

"EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 16. Functions exercised under this Act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act except as to the requirements of sections 3 and 10 thereof.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 18. For the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'natural rubber' means all forms and types of tree, vine, or shrub rubber, including guayule and natural-rubber latex, but excluding reclaimed natural rubber;

"(b) The term 'synthetic rubber' means any product of chemical synthesis similar in general properties and applications to natural rubber, and specifically capable of vulcanization, produced in the United States, not including reclaimed synthetic rubber;

"(c) The term 'general-purpose synthetic rubber' means a synthetic rubber of the butadiene-styrene type generally suitable for use in the manufacture of transportation items such as tires or camel-back, as well as any other type of synthetic rubber equally or better suited for use in the manufacture of transportation items such as tires or camel-back as determined from time to time by the President;

"(d) The term 'special-purpose synthetic rubber' means a synthetic rubber of the types now known as butyl, neoprene, or N-types (butadiene-acrylonitrile types) as well as any synthetic rubber of similar or improved quality applicable to similar uses, as determined from time to time by the President;

"(e) The term 'rubber-producing facilities' means facilities, in whole or in part, for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, and the component materials thereof, including, but not limited to, buildings and land in which or on which such facilities may be located and all machinery and utilities associated therewith;

"(f) The term 'rated production capacity' means the actual productive capacity assigned to any rubber-producing facilities at time of authorization of construction or as thereafter amended in authorizations of additional construction or alterations thereto and used in published reports and in the records of the Office of Rubber Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or successor agency, or privately owned plants, determined by the President based upon operating experience and records as determined from time to time by the President;

"(g) The term 'component materials' means the material, raw, semifinished, and finished, necessary for the manufacture of synthetic rubber;

"(h) The term 'stand-by condition' means the condition in which rubber-producing facilities, in whole or in part, are placed when determined to be not needed for current operations, but are maintained so as to be readily available for the production of synthetic rubber or component materials;

"(i) The term 'person' means any individual, firm, copartnership, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons whether incorporated or not, and except for the provisions of section 13 any Government department, agency, officer, corporation, or instrumentality of the United States; and

"(j) The term 'United States' includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 19. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"(b) Until such time as appropriations herein authorized are made, any department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States may, in order to carry out its functions, powers, and duties under this Act, continue to incur obligations and make expenditures in accordance with laws in effect on March 31, 1948.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 20. This Act shall become effective on April 1, 1948, and shall remain in effect until June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PAUL W. SHAFER,
DEWEY SHORT,
W. STERLING COLE,
CARL VINSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN W. BRICKER,
HARRY CAIN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is substantially the same as the House bill.

The House accepted the Senate language of section 2 with an amendment. In effect the new section adopts the principle that the security interests of the United States

will best be served by the development of a free, competitive synthetic-rubber-producing industry, and that Government ownership of synthetic-rubber-producing facilities, regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber, Government production of synthetic rubber and patent-pooling should be ended whenever consistent with national security. The House bill, as passed, provided that the Government retain its synthetic-rubber-producing facilities. The Senate amendment provided for the termination of Government ownership, production, and control of synthetic-rubber-producing facilities "at the earliest practical date" consistent with national security. The conferees agreed to strike out the language "at the earliest practical date."

Section 3 remains as passed by the House, except that controls over rubber products are limited to specification control.

Section 4 remains as passed by the House except for a minor clarification of the language in subsection (b).

The conferees rewrote section 5 to provide that there shall be maintained in the United States rubber-producing facilities having a rated production capacity of not less than 600,000 long tons per annum of general purpose rubber and 65,000 long tons of special purpose rubber. The rubber required for mandatory consumption is to be produced by the Government, for Government account, or purchased from others for resale by the Government. The House subsection (d) prevailed in requiring the annual production of not less than one-third of the above-mentioned 665,000 long tons of synthetic rubber.

In all other respects section 5 remains as originally passed by the House.

In effect the new section 5 differs from the original House version in the following respects:

(a) The amount of special-purpose rubber capacity required to be maintained is reduced from 75,000 long tons to 65,000 long tons.

(b) Synthetic rubber is required to be consumed or to be manufactured by the Government or for Government account. However, to provide for the stimulation of private production and technological progress, the Government may purchase and resell synthetic rubber produced by private persons.

Section 6 of the conference amendment is identical with the House version except that the conference amendment specifically authorizes Government research in rubber and allied fields, as well as encourages continuous and extensive research by private persons. This places emphasis on the necessity for research and development to improve the qualities of synthetic rubber, and strengthens the original House language.

The conferees accepted the House version of section 7 with the following changes:

(a) The House conferees accepted a Senate amendment to the effect that the President "shall" rather than "may" authorize production of synthetic rubber for voluntary consumption.

(b) The Government may lease for the duration of this act rubber producing facilities, provided any such lease contains adequate recapture provisions. Such leased facilities may produce synthetic rubber for voluntary consumption.

The original House version allowed leasing for 1 year and prohibited the production of synthetic rubber in any facilities leased under this section.

There were no differences in section 8, which deals with stand-by facilities.

The House accepted the Senate version of section 9, with amendments. Under section 9 (a), as agreed to by the conferees, a study shall be undertaken immediately to formulate a program for the disposal, by sale or lease, of the facilities required to be maintained in the United States under section 5 of the act. A report is required to be presented to the President and to the Congress prior to April 1, 1949, with respect to the development of such a disposal program, and the President is required to present to the Congress, not later than January 15, 1950, his recommendations for legislation on this subject. However, the new section requires that the President shall consult with the National Security Resources Board before presenting his recommendations to the Congress. A proviso was added to section 9 (a) requiring the Government to retain the ownership of 665,000 long tons of rated synthetic-rubber-producing capacity until the program for disposal has been formulated and adopted. This strengthens the provisions of the bill prohibiting the disposal of any facilities required for the rated production capacity to be maintained in the United States.

Section 9 (b) permits the disposal, by the proper agency, as designated by the President, of all facilities in excess of those required to be in existence in the United States over and above the 665,000 long ton rated production capacity. However, the new section 9 (b) as agreed to by the conferees requires the designated disposal agency to first consult with the National Security Resources Board before approving any disposal under this subsection.

Section 9 (b) also provides for the disposal of all facilities not required to maintain the 665,000 long ton rated production capacity, under such conditions as the disposal agency may prescribe, provided that such facilities may not be used to produce synthetic rubber for mandatory consumption.

Section 10 as passed by the House remains substantially the same except the conferees accepted the language in the Senate amendment that authorizes the President to organize a Government corporation for the purpose of producing and selling synthetic rubber.

Section 10 (d) of the House and Senate bills are identical except that the House bill provided an exemption from civil-service laws for personnel that might be transferred within the Government in the administration of the Act. The House conferees agreed with the Senate in the omission of this language.

A Senate amendment to section 10 provided that industry advisory committees should be appointed. The Senate receded on this point. The conferees agreed that by this action there was no intent or inference that the Government should not continue to seek the advice of industry and consult with industry through advisory committees.

The House conferees accepted the Senate language in section 11 which authorizes and directs the President, insofar as practical and consistent with the purposes of the act, to effectuate immediate cessation of further accumulation of technical information or rights to patents under the agreement dated December 19, 1941.

Sections 12 and 13 of the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical, and were not changed by the conferees.

The Senate conferees accepted the House language of section 14.

Sections 15, 16, and 17 of the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical, and were not changed by the conferees.

The Senate accepted substantially all of the definitions contained in section 18, except the conferees combined the definitions of "rated production capacity" in such a way as to permit the rated production capacity assigned to each facility to be changed in the future as determined from time to time by the President.

The House conferees accepted a minor change, for purposes of clarification, in section 19.

The Senate accepted the House language on section 20.

The conferees agreed to the term "synthetic rubber" throughout the act, in lieu of the original House language which referred to this product as "chemical" rubber.

PAUL W. SHAFER,
DEWEY SHORT,
W. STERLING COLE,
CARL VINSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the House managers for the Rubber Act of 1948 met with the Senate conferees yesterday and agreed upon a rubber bill which I believe to be a happy compromise of the two bills. All the House conferees who signed the statement are in accord.

As you know, the present law with respect to controls over synthetic rubber expires at midnight tonight. Therefore speed is essential in order that the production of synthetic rubber can continue without interruption.

The policy of the act recognizes the fact that the security interests of the country can best be served by the development within the United States of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry. It also recognizes the fact that all Government controls and Government ownership should terminate whenever consistent with national security. In effect, it recognizes what the history of two world wars has proved to this country, that private industry plays a vital role in our national security.

However, it is not our intention, nor does this bill permit, our vast synthetic rubber industry to be turned over to private industry at this time. The bill requires that there be maintained in the United States rubber-producing facilities capable of producing a rated production capacity of 600,000 long tons of general purpose rubber and 65,000 long tons of special purpose rubber. Everyone agrees that this capacity is ample to protect the United States in the event of an emergency.

Of this amount, the bill requires that one-third be produced and consumed in the United States. This will assure the development of the synthetic industry, and progress in the method of manufacturing this product. The remaining capacity, which includes fringe plants and those not specifically required for national defense, may be sold or leased under certain conditions after the disposal agency has consulted with the National Security Resources Board.

The bill before you authorizes the President to exercise allocation, specification, and inventory controls over natural rubber and synthetic rubber and authorizes specification controls over natural rubber and synthetic rubber products. This applies to all rubber products and permits the President, if necessary, to require the use of synthetic rubber in all rubber products. In addtion, as I have indicated before, the bill requires that there be manufactured and consumed in the United States a minimum of 222,000 tons of synthetic rubber per year.

The bill encourages private enterprise by permitting the Government to purchase rubber from private producers for resale by the Government, to satisfy mandatory consumption. This, then, will permit a private producer, who has developed a new and better synthetic rubber, to sell his product to the Government, but since we are requiring the consumption of synthetic rubber, the Government, in turn, will assure equal distribution by selling it to those who are required to use this rubber. In addition, the bill stimulates private enterprise by permitting the leasing of plants for the duration of the act for private purposes, which will allow the production of synthetic rubber for voluntary usage.

An important item of the bill pertains to the disposal of the facilities now owned by the Government. The bill now before you requires that a study be undertaken immediately to formulate a program for disposal by sale or lease of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities required to maintain the 665,000 long tons that must be maintained in the United States. A report with respect to the development of this program must be made to the President and to the Congress not later than April 1, 1949. Then, on or before January 15, 1950, the President, after consultation with the National Security Resources Board, must recommend to the Congress legislation with respect to the disposal of these facilities. Note that this will allow the Congress to approve, amend, or disapprove any legislation with respect to the disposal of the 665,000-ton rated production capacity that is to be maintained in the United States. And none of this 665,000-ton capacity can be sold except by congressional action. Other plants beyond this capacity may be sold by the disposal agency only after consultation with the National Security Resources Board.

We believe this to be a workable, efficient bill that will be acceptable to the Government and industry and, at the same time, will protect the American consumer, and above all, our national security. We have provided adequate safeguards for the disposal of these facilities. We have provided for technological progress and we have assured the maintenance of our synthetic-rubber industry. This is the culmination of a year's hard work by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I am convinced the bill in the form now before you is sound, just, and practical.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did I understand the gentlemen to say that under the provisions of the conference report as the House conferees brought it back here, none of the 665,000 tons of rated-production capacity may be sold unless and until the Congress authorizes that sale?

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman is correct. The Congress must act on that and fix it by statute before any of it can be sold.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman has indicated that this bill authorizes the sale of our rubber plants in excess of production capacity of 665,000 tons. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that those plants, for which authority is given in this act for the current sale, should be the plants which are the least efficient; that is, the high-cost plants should be sold first?

Mr. SHAFER. The so-called fringe plants; yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want it definitely understood that the excess-production-capacity plants which the bill authorizes for sale are to be those which are the high-cost plants, and not the low-cost or efficient plants.

Mr. SHAFER. That is right.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. In referring to this provision that regulations requiring the mandatory use of synthetic rubber should be ended whenever consistent with the national security, who shall determine whenever it is consistent with the national security to end them?

Mr. SHAFER. Why, the President is to determine that, after consultation with the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. CURTIS. Is his determination final, or is that up to the Congress?

Mr. SHAFER. No. The Congress decides that after the President recommends.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What tonnage is left in the bill as mandatory use?

Mr. SHAFER. Six hundred and sixty-five thousand tons.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think the gentleman understood me. What would be the productive capacity?

Mr. SHAFER. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand mandatory use.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On GRS?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How much on special purpose?

Mr. SHAFER. Altogether 225,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, you preserve one-third of the 665,000 and 75,000 or 65,000 special?

Mr. SHAFER. I think that is very plain. It is not quite that amount, but around 200,000 general and 65,000 special.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. These special-purpose plants, similar to the neoprene plant in Louisville, can be sold under this bill without action of Congress?

Mr. SHAFER. They can be sold? We take care of that in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, last night at about 7 o'clock, after a 5-hour session, the House and Senate conferees agreed on a final version of the Rubber Act of 1948. For reasons that I will make abundantly clear, I did not join my colleagues in signing the conference report. The final version of the conference report is considerably different in its most important aspects from that which the House has heretofore unanimously approved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that, in my opinion, the House bill represented the product of real statesmanship. The House unanimously passed a bill, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], which recognized the security interests of the United States as paramount. I want to say also that the House conferees, Messrs. SHAFER, SHORT, COLE, and VINSON, carried on a strong and vigorous fight at the conference for the bill which the House had approved. All that the House could have done has been done, and all that the House conferees could have accomplished has, in my opinion, been accomplished.

However, I do not feel that I can associate myself with this piece of legislation which, in essence, is an order to the President of the United States requiring him to speed disposal of the Government's rubber properties which I think, and which the House bill declared, to be essential to the national security of the United States.

The conference report is a tribute to the efforts of those who believe we should speed the sale of our rubber plants. They think the bill a good bill. The rubber companies think the bill a good bill. We are told certain people in the administration think the bill a good bill.

I do not think the bill a good bill.

I was unable to support the conference report because I cannot agree with the congressional policy enunciated in it and the provisions regarding disposal of the people's synthetic rubber plants.

The House bill declared that the security interests of the United States represented the paramount consideration in dealing with the rubber plants, and that the rubber plants must not be disposed of unless those interests are facilitated and advanced. It is almost superfluous to say that unless the defense of the United States is securely maintained, private enterprise, along with all of our other democratic institutions, will be destroyed by alien philosophies and the force of alien arms.

The policy section adopted by the conferees largely reflects the philosophy expressed in the Senate bill. The policy section of the Senate bill declared that, in effect, the security interests of the United States can best be served by turning the Government rubber plants over to the giant rubber companies. It declares, in so many words, that, and I quote, "It is essential that Government ownership of productive facilities, Government production of synthetic rubber, regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber, and patent pooling be ended and terminated whenever consistent with the national security as provided in this act." I emphasize the words "as provided in this act." The act provides that the security interests of the United States will best be served

by sale of the plants. Therefore, sale of the plants will be consistent with national security, as that language is used in the act. In short, they say sale of the plants is security—and security is sale of the plants.

Use of the seductive words "consistent with national security" is thus seen to be a cynical use of appealing language in an effort to make palatable and defensible a course of action I believe to be inimical to that security.

At a time when we are mobilizing the blood and flesh of our boys, I am profoundly shocked that the Congress should declare a policy which sets the stage to demobilize a vital part of our physical defense—yes; cancellation of what Harvey Firestone, Jr., stated to be the best paid-up insurance policy this country ever had.

If the philosophy underlying the Senate bill and this report were to be carried out on a consistent basis and to a logical conclusion, would it not result in the Congress selling atomic-energy plants, our naval-petroleum reserves, our shipyards, and all of our public lands?

If the Congress declares it essential that Government ownership of rubber-production facilities must end and terminate, why not end and terminate the ownership of Government oil facilities, Government ship facilities, Government atomic-energy facilities, Government ordnance facilities?

By what I have said I do not mean that the Senate conferees have not made concessions. They did. For example, one important concession was the elimination from the conference report of the provision of the Senate bill which insured that zeal for the sale of the rubber plants on the part of the Government employees administering the bill would never flag. Failure of a Government employee to perform any act required by any provision of the Senate bill would have subjected him to a $10,000 fine or 2 years in jail, or both.

Under section 9 (b) of the bill certain plants can be disposed of forthwith. There is located at Louisville, Ky., a neoprene plant operated by the Du Pont Co. having a rated capacity of 60,000 tons and which cost the Government about $38,000,000. There is a Du Pont offer of 29 cents on the dollar waiting for an answer in a department downtown.

This bill is the bill of sale.

Section 9 (b) makes possible the sale of the Louisville plant to Du Pont, the present operator, the present holder of the know-how, the company on the ground and on the inside all ready to grab it at a fraction of the cost to the people of the United States.

But the conference report does have a saving grace. It is a public announcement of coming events. It is a warning to the Congress, to small-business men everywhere, to the Small Business Committee of both Houses, to the Attorney General, and to all the people, that eternal vigilance will be required if the resources of the United States owned by all of the people are to be saved for them and for their defense.

Again I say that the agreement embodied in this conference report is a victory for those who want to sell quickly. The rubber companies are in agreement too. This is not the first time the companies have agreed. Even as we consider this bill the rubber companies, eagerly waiting to gobble up the Government's rubber plants, stand charged with violations of the antitrust laws on the basis of having entered into other agreements during the war.

Unless the President and the Department of Justice, which is charged with the enforcement of the antitrust laws, are ever alert, the giant companies now charged will peel off the Government's rubber plants and dominate to an even greater extent (the big five and their three coconspirators now produce more than 90 percent of the tires and tubes manufactured in the United States) the entire rubber industry in this country.

I happen to believe in free enterprise, but to me free enterprise does not mean that the big five companies in the United States are free to gobble up all the enterprise in the United States and hold the smaller companies, the armed services, and the public at their mercy.

This conference report is bad, but I believe it is better than the Senate bill might have been. It is the best agreement that earnest and reasonable men could produce.

In that connection, House conferees were able to obtain a proviso to section 9 (a) under which the Government must continue to maintain a rated rubber production capacity of 665,000 long tons until a disposal program is formulated and the President recommends legislation and the Congress passes it. The present law expires tonight. This legislation is better than no legislation. The stage is set, but it postpones the time when the people are divested from their plants. Government eviction is plotted, but execution is stayed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECTION 112 (D) (2) PROCUREMENT OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO TOBACCO

Mr. FLANNAGAN. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss section 112 (d) (2). On yesterday the question was raised that this subsection presented administrative difficulties.

Section 112 (d) (2) implements subsection (1). It provides for "the procurement of each class or type of any such surplus agricultural commodity in the approximate proportion that the Secretary of Agriculture determines such classes or types bear to the total amount of excess of such surplus agricultural commodity over domestic requirements." In the administration of this subsection, the Administrator will be guided by four considerations as follows:

First. Is procurement for a participating country on this basis practicable and applicable? If not, the section would not apply to procurements for such country.

Second. Is such commodity in excess of domestic requirements? This information is readily available from the Department of Agriculture.

Third. Have producers of any such surplus agricultural commodity relied in the past upon markets for such commodity in participating countries? This information is readily available from the Department of Agriculture.

Fourth. Can the approximate proportion that each class or type bears to the total surplus of such commodity be readily determined? Yes, the Department of Agriculture can supply this information.

The administration of subsection (2) should therefore cause no great difficulty as the basic information required would be readily available to the Administrator.

This subsection, in its relation to other provisions of section 112, has the approval of the State Department and the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Charles E. Gage, director of Tobacco Branch, P. M. A., Department of Agriculture, stated on March 19, 1948, that he thought the section "provides a guiding principle that can be applied effectively with respect to the utilization of private trade channels and the procurement of surplus agricultural commodities."

This subsection applies to the procurement of any surplus agricultural commodity for supply to participating countries. There are however few such commodities. Tobacco and certain dried fruits are in surplus supply.

In the case of tobacco, the major portion of surplus stocks are held by Commodity Credit Corporation for farmers under nonrecourse loans, under its price-support program. The surplus stocks of tobacco include flue-cured, fire-cured, burley, dark air-cured, and Wisconsin.

Since funds for the supply of commodities to participating countries will come from taxes, the burden of aid to European countries will fall on all taxpayers. The supply of commodities to European countries will be neither on a historical basis or as a commercial transaction. There is no historic basis for such aid and it is not intended to be commercial. This being so, all producers of agricultural commodities should share proportionately to their surplus in the supply of products to participating countries.

The language of this subsection is intended to give effect to this condition. It would enable the Administrator, insofar as the different types of tobacco are suitable for the requirements of participating countries, to liquidate surplus stocks of each type and class of tobacco in the supply of this product to participating countries. This would give each producing area equal consideration and at the same time probably save loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation in its price-support program, as applied to tobacco. This subsection was incorporated in the bill at the request of tobacco growers, tobacco warehousemen, and tobacco dealers.

As there are those who question the wisdom of including tobacco in the program, I desire to call attention to the following facts:

TOBACCO AND THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM IN GENERAL

It is generally agreed that increased production of food products and industrial goods is the primary requirement for the recovery of western and southern European countries. Increased food production is necessary to supplement imports and thereby decrease the dependence of European countries on other parts of the world, particularly the United States. Unless the people of Europe have adequate food they cannot do the work required in rebuilding the war-torn countries. Industrial goods are necessary for bodily comfort and to increase exports by which European countries can obtain exchange to pay for imports and thereby become self-supporting.

Long years of war in Europe have not only wrecked much of its industrial potentials but the hardships and privations suffered by its population have sapped their vigor and left many of them not only almost helpless but almost hopeless. Under these circumstances, incentives, as well as basic food and shelter, are necessary to improve the morale of the population and to stimulate their energy for the needed increase in production of farm commodities and industrial products.

Previous aid to Europe has been on an austerity basis and the results obtained were not commensurate with the cost. We should now make proper allowance to human nature and give the people of Europe some of the things they want most as well as the basic necessities of life.

(B) INCENTIVE VALUE OF TOBACCO

Money is regarded as the universal incentive and under normal conditions an offer of money, in sufficient sum, usually produces the desired stimulus to action. However, money will obtain the desired action only when it can be exchanged for basic necessities and for the things which make life worth the living. Consumer goods in many countries of Europe are so scarce and expensive that money has slight appeal to the population as they cannot exchange it for the things they desire most. Money, therefore, has slight incentive value. Under these circumstances other incentives are necessary, and tobacco is unexcelled for this purpose.

In his address at Atlanta, Ga., on January 22, 1948, the Secretary of State said:

> Tobacco comes within the category of incentive goods. As a practical matter, it has been found that the availability of tobacco is an effective stimulus to morale and productivity.

Testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee showed that the Department of the Army recognizes the incentive value of tobacco as a spur to industrial production and in building and sustaining morale. The people of all nations want and need something more than bare necessities; something which adds a sense of home comfort and well being. Tobacco products, cigarettes, pipe and chewing tobacco, and cigars, supply this need. Mr. Edmund Cody Burnett, in the July issue of Agricultural History, makes this observation:

> I have mentioned coffee as one of the prime contributors to the more abundant life, but its yokemate in furtherance of the pursuit of happiness is tobacco. These two, I maintain, have done more to promote human fellowship and contentment than all the mechanical inventions of our age.

(C) REVENUE VALUE OF TOBACCO

Tobacco is a ready source of revenue to governments. Some countries derive most of their revenue from tobacco through customs duties, some from excise taxes, and others through government monopolies whose profits, from the manufacture and distribution of products, accrue largely to the treasuries of these countries.

For the period ended June 30, 1947, the Government of the United States obtained $1,264,157,478 from tobacco. This was distributed as follows:

Internal revenue (excise)	$1,237,768,000
Customs duties	26,389,478
Total	1,264,157,478

It should be noted that the total scheduled expenditure for the supply of tobacco from the United States to all countries for the 4 years and 3 months under the proposed European recovery program is less, by $350,000,000, than the revenue obtained from tobacco by our Government during the last fiscal year. The above revenue does not include income taxes from individuals and corporations engaged in the several phases of the tobacco industry. So far as I can find, there is no other commodity, raw or manufactured, from which this Government derives sufficient direct revenue to pay for the amount to be supplied under the European recovery program.

The countries to receive aid under the program are in need of increased governmental revenue. Their revenues can be increased greatly through receiving adequate supplies of tobacco. For the fiscal year 1947–48, it is estimated the Government of the United Kingdom derived from all duties on tobacco the sum of 525 million pounds sterling or more than $2,000,000,000 at the present rate of exchange. In 1946, the French Government's net profit from the tobacco monopoly was approximately 30,369,000,000 francs, equal to about $255,000,000 at the legal rate of exchange. The Government of Austria derived from tobacco about 34 percent of its total revenue in 1946 and during the same period tobacco supplied about 30 percent of the total revenue which accrued to the Government of Italy. Aside from its incentive value, an adequate supply of tobacco is important as a source of revenue to the countries which will receive aid under the European recovery program.

(D) EUROPEAN BLACK MARKET IN TOBACCO

The black market in many products flourishes in several European countries. The most widespread is the black market in cigarettes. This is so because of their shortage in many countries, and their barter value as well as their desirability for consumption.

A recent report from the Netherlands states that "the black market is doing a roaring trade in English and American cigarettes which are selling at about four guilders ($1.24) for 20 and are stocked by the hall porters of most big hotels. Cigarettes still seem to be the only item for which the Dutch are prepared to pay any price." The black market in cigarettes in Germany is notorious. Cherished household goods and other valuables are exchanged for cigarettes and the Germans are in that way being deprived of their assets by unscrupulous persons, some of whom are Americans.

The operation of black markets leads to misdemeanors and sometimes to actual crime. The Associated Press reported in the Washington Star of December 9, 1947, as follows:

> Two attempts to transport a total of 589 cartons of cigarettes from Massachusetts to Germany were thwarted by customs officials last week, United States Attorney William T. McCarthy reported last night.
>
> Mr. McCarthy said customs officials prevented an Army officer from transporting 110 cartons from Westover Field. The cigarettes, he added, would have brought $9,000 in the German black market.
>
> He said that 479 cartons were found in the possession of crew members of the American freighter *F. Marion Crawford*, loading wheat for the Army in Germany.

Life magazine, November 3, 1947, reported that children smugglers of coffee and cigarettes for the German black market were numerous. When caught "they are brought before a British-operated juvenile court which may sentence them to a special 'children's prison' for 28 days or to a detention school for 2 or 3 years."

The black market and illegal trade in cigarettes can be stamped out by an adequate supply of tobacco to several European countries.

(E) CURRENCY STABILIZATION VALUE OF TOBACCO

Currency stabilization is one of the pressing problems of many European countries. The shortage of consumer goods has caused prices to soar to levels out of line with the incomes of the population in many countries. This inflationary situation causes great hardships to the urban population with fixed wages and salaries but makes black market operations profitable to those engaged in this illegal trade.

It is well known that in many European countries cigarettes are more valuable than their currencies. Not because their currencies are worthless but because an individual can acquire food and other desirable articles more readily with cigarettes than with money. Travelers from Europe tell of services obtained and goods purchased with cigarettes where money could not obtain either the services or the goods. The Economist, London, of April 12, 1947, published an article on the "Tobacco standard" as a medium of exchange and as a basis for currency valuation. The article indicates that the cigarette was, at the end of the war, the most valuable medium of exchange in many European countries. This condition still exists in some countries.

The fantastic prices paid for cigarettes in many European countries, especially in the black market, indicates the need for adequate supplies of tobacco. Adequate supplies of tobacco products would drain off surplus cash from the population and this would tend to decrease the pressure on prices of other consumer goods and act as a brake on inflation.

So long as tobacco products, particularly cigarettes, have a trading value greater than their currencies, it will be difficult to stabilize the currency of any of these countries. An adequate supply of tobacco would remedy this particular difficulty.

POLITICAL VALUE OF TOBACCO

In Europe, the ideology of totalitarianism made great headway before the war and in fact was the cause of World War II. In some countries this ideology still exists, and is spreading in certain countries which have a democratic form of government.

The European recovery program is designed and intended not only to rebuild the economy of western Europe but to combat the extension of any ideology intended to enslave people through false propaganda. Aid to European countries on a purely subsistence basis will not frustrate the designs of those who would destroy all democracies. To achieve any marked political results, aid must supply some of the things people desire, as well as their basic needs. It is probably difficult for the people of any country to be truly thankful for aid supplied on the basis of austerity and to understand the value of democratic government when the democracies supply them with only the bare necessities which they might as easily obtain if they subscribed to any form of autocracy.

It appears desirable from the political viewpoint to include some of the things that will give the people of Europe what they most desire, as well as what they must have, to sustain life. Something that will give a sense of satisfaction, that will add comfort, and will soothe strained nerves and tired bodies. Tobacco products will provide one item of consumer goods that will give the people of Europe these things. Tobacco is something they want, and it will instill a desire to strive for the better things of life which can be obtained under freedom of initiative provided by democratic governments.

SUMMARY

To summarize, adequate supplies of tobacco to participating countries under the European recovery program will:

First. Provide an incentive for greater production on farms, in factories, and in mines.

Second. Improve the morale of the population.

Third. Provide revenue badly needed for internal purposes.

Fourth. Stamp out the black market in cigarettes and decrease crime. Inadequate supplies will perpetuate the black market.

Fifth. Assist in stabilizing the currencies of European countries and aid in reducing inflation.

Sixth. Aid in eliminating or retarding the spread of ideologies antagonistic to democracy and to world peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN of New York (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EQUALIZATION OF OUR NATURALIZATION LAWS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, carried by the Milwaukee Journal for March 29, provides additional evidence of the need to equalize the application of American naturalization law. Such equalization, long overdue, will be provided by passage of the bill H. R. 5004 which I introduced some weeks ago. Hearings on this measure are to be held shortly.

END THIS DISQUALIFICATION

There is in this country a mother who had five sons in service. Every one volunteered. Every one was in combat. Every one was wounded and one was killed. The other four veterans have more than 30 individual decorations and medals among them.

Yet the mother of these five sons is not allowed to become an American citizen. In another instance, the mother of a soldier who won the Congressional Medal of Honor is not allowed to become a citizen.

Why? Because these mothers were born in Japan. If they had been born in China or India or the Philippines they could be naturalized, provided, of course, they qualified as all other applicants for citizenship must qualify.

About 33,000 Americans of Japanese descent fought side by side with other Americans. They stormed the heights of Cassino. They rescued the lost "Texas" battalion in the Vosges Mountains. As the late Gen. Joseph Stilwell said: "They bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood."

But their mothers and fathers, unless born in the United States, cannot become full Americans.

All of these persons have lived in this country at least 24 years, because the Japanese Exclusion Act was passed in 1924. Most have lived here longer. All told, there are about 88,000 Americans of oriental descent who are still not allowed to become citizens, no matter what they have contributed to the country or how loyal their lives have been.

American citizenship has been extended many times. In 1790, eligibility included only free white persons; in 1870, it was extended to persons of African nativity or descent; in 1900, to inhabitants of Hawaii; in 1917, to inhabitants of Puerto Rico; in 1924, to American Indians (big hearted of us, wasn't it?); in 1927, to inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; in 1940, to races indigenous to North or South America; in 1943, to Chinese; in 1946, to Filipinos and natives of India.

Let's finish the job in 1948. Immigration controls are one thing. Citizenship is another. All qualified permanent residents of the United States should be eligible for citizenship. It is the only consistent democratic policy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication and enclosure received from four postal employees from Waterbury, Conn.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a constituent.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 1 hour.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Signal Corps of the United States Army observed its eighty-fifth anniversary this month. It was in the year 1860 that Albert J. Myer, an assistant Army surgeon, developed a system of signaling with flags which became known as wig-wag. In that same year he was made first Chief Signal Officer of the Army and 3 years later by act of Congress the Signal Corps was established as a separate branch of the Army. At that time this branch of the service consisted of less than 100 officers and men. The present Weather Bureau evolved from the weather reporting system established by the Signal Corps in 1870.

Since 1900 the Signal Corps has been part and parcel of the Alaska scene. First known as the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System, and more familiarly as the WAMCATS, the agency is now designated as the Alaska Communication System. But whatever name it bears, it ranks high in the esteem of Alaskans and has played an important part in the development of the Territory. There civilian as well as military communication service is furnished by the Signal Corps. Nowhere, I venture to say, is there a closer community of interest than between the per-

sonnel of the ACS and the civilian residents of Alaska. There the military and civilian have lived in perfect harmony. It is interesting to note that at Point Barrow, Alaska, the Signal Corps established, in days long since passed, one of the first outlying stations of the weather reporting system. It is interesting also to recollect that Gen. Billy Mitchell, great Air Force general, served as a first lieutenant in the WAMCATS. Alaskans—and this description includes those of the ACS—are proud to note that the training received on the system stood the Nation in good stead in World War I and World War II. Experienced men from the system provided the foundation upon which the expanded signal organization of the wartime armies was built.

The Signal Corps actively participated in the construction of thousands of miles of new land lines in Alaska and Canada.

MILITARY GARRISONS

During the days of the gold rush in the Klondike, 1897 to 1900, and the resultant influx of people into Alaska, the United States Government found it necessary to establish military garrisons at various points to maintain law and order in the Territory. In order to furnish telegraphic communications between these garrisons and the military department of Alaska, with headquarters at St. Michael, Congress authorized in 1900 the construction of the necessary telegraph lines and cables for the purpose. It was stipulated in the basic act that this communication system would be available to handle commercial communications and communications for the general public. Construction of these lines was started in the summer of 1900 and completed in 1903 by the Signal Corps, United States Army.

A cable was laid in 1900 between St. Michael and Nome. In 1903 a cable was also laid between Juneau and Skagway which connected with Canadian telegraph lines at that point. The cable between St. Michael and Nome was not satisfactory, mainly because of frequent interruptions caused by heavy icing which severed the cable and carried it out to sea. The cable was therefore replaced by radio in 1903. This was the first point-to-point radio channel put into service on the American continent for commercial use.

In 1903 and 1904, Congress appropriated approximately $800,000 for the purchase and laying of cables, and in those same years cables were laid from Seattle to Sitka and Sitka to Valdez, with a connecting lag Sitka to Juneau.

During the next 20-year period, 1904 to 1924, all of the original cables wore out and in 1924 Congress appropriated $1,500,000 for new cable to replace the old. During the next few years, with the rapid development of radio, several of the old telegraph lines were replaced by radio. In 1930 high-power radio stations were established at Seattle, Ketchikan, and Anchorage, being finally placed into operation on November 1, 1931.

CABLE REPAIRED

In 1932 the Ketchikan-Seward cable was converted to simplex operation and continued to operate in such a manner until 1934 when it was abandoned. However, in 1941 when war was imminent, the cables were repaired and put back into use. In 1942 the Ketchikan and Seward cables were converted to duplex operation, which allowed messages to be sent both ways simultaneously on a single conductor cable. During the same year the Seattle-Ketchikan cable was also converted to duplex operation. On July 16, 1942, a two-channel multiplex installation between Seattle, Ketchikan and Anchorage was completed and put into operation. This installation permitted four messages to be sent simultaneously over a single conductor cable. In February 1943, multiplex machines were installed at Fort Richardson, headquarters of the Alaska Defense Command, which made possible direct transmission from Fort Richardson to Seattle.

During the early years of World War II, radiotelephone circuits to Alaska were reserved for military use. However, on July 17, 1944, the Seattle-Juneau, Seattle-Ketchikan and Juneau-Ketchikan circuits were opened to the public and commercial business was resumed. The Seattle-Anchorage radiotelephone circuit was opened to the public on October 15, 1944, extended to Whittier and Seward on November 25, 1944, and on to Fort Richardson on December 15, 1944. On May 14, 1945, the circuit was extended to Fairbanks and radiotelephone circuits were opened from Seattle to Adak on July 13, 1945, Seattle to Nome on July 24, 1945, and Seattle to Kodiak on May 9, 1946.

In March 1946 an improved service was made available at the major ACS stations in Alaska whereby local circuits could be provided to commercial customers on a lease basis, either in their entirety or to connect with the ACS commercial network facilities. Such special and fast service has been particularly helpful to the commercial air lines in their development of Alaska.

SHIP-TO-SHORE SERVICE

In 1946 coastal harbor radiotelephone service to ships at sea was initiated at Craig, Nome, Seward, Sitka, and Valdez. This was intended to provide for the demands for such service from fishing vessels operating in Alaskan waters, and will later provide a modern ship-to-shore telephone service to passenger vessels operating in the area.

In April of 1946, the Alaska Communications System was given the responsibility for the operation and maintenance of that portion of the Alcan Highway telephone line between the Canadian border and Fairbanks, Alaska, a distance of approximately 300 miles.

It should be observed that, with rising prices all around us and with demands from many communication agencies for increases in rates, the Alaska public was treated to the unusual situation of having their telephone and telegraph rates generally reduced approximately 20 percent a few months ago. It should be observed also that this particular organization, the Alaska Communications System, is one of the very few Government agencies that very definitely pays its own way. Money appropriated by Congress in support of this agency either comes back to the United States Treasury in actual cash or in direct savings to Federal Government agencies whose communications are carried free over the system. In addition, it provides the only field today where a highly technical branch of the military service is able to train on live communications. This one feature has a very high value which cannot easily be measured in dollars, but it paid off in a remarkable manner during the war just concluded, when ACS trained personnel furnished on short notice many highly trained signalmen to meet urgent military demands before the civilian communication specialists could be made available at remote locations in our worldwide effort.

ACS, like all other military organizations, has been seriously handicapped, due to the sudden demobilization of the military. ACS personnel dropped from 2,200 in 1943 to 650 in 1945—many of the latter practically untrained recruits. Nevertheless, communication men are returning to the system from all over the world, reenlistments are increasing, and the organization is gradually getting back on its feet. Prior to the war, ACS had the highest reenlistment rate of any organization in the United States Army. This is a sure sign of an outstanding military organization. It appears that ACS is fast resuming its position in this matter.

STATIONS OPERATED

The Alaska Communications System presently operates a total of 35 stations. One of these is in Seattle and the other 34 are located in the major towns and villages in Alaska. The headquarters of the system, together with the engineering and construction division, the detachment headquarters, which handles the flow of military personnel north and south through Seattle, as well as a sizable supply and maintenance set-up, all operate from Seattle. New projects and major rehabilitation projects for existing plant are planned, equipment obtained, tested and modified to meet the rigors of Alaska climatic conditions in Seattle, with installation teams then moving into the Alaska area during the workable summer months to carry out such projects. Since the ending of the war, it has been noted that ACS has been aggressively relocating and improving its installations, which will be of immediate benefit to the general Alaska public and of definite value to the military in the event of any emergency in the future.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the system is the intense pride and proven loyalty of the personnel belonging to the system. Many of the officers and men have been with the system for over 20 years. They know Alaska and the Alaskans, and the Alaskans know these men and women of ACS. This unique military organization is definitely considered a part of Alaska. It has been Alaska's means of communicating with the world in moments of disaster as well as moments of triumph. It was the ACS who in 1903 provided the first commercial radio service on the American Continent; it was an ACS man at the lonely Point Barrow station, well

within the Arctic Circle, who on August 15, 1935, found the bodies of Will Rogers and Wiley Post and brought that sad news to the world; the ACS provided the ground communication to the early day Russian and American pioneering air flights over the North Pole regions; this is the organization which on short notice provided a reliable and dependable communication system over a stretch of approximately 2,000 miles through the Aleutian Island chain in the tense days of 1941 and 1942 when it appeared that the Japs might use those islands as stepping stones to our west coast. Recently, and since the war, the ACS was the agency that kept contact with the *Dreamboat* flight all the way from Honolulu to Cairo; it was an ACS operator at Valdez who performed heroic service in connection with the fire which burned the hospital there during a wintry night and who then opened his radio station and sent for aid to the community; it was the ACS who rendered such valuable service to the Alaskan Air Command recently as to win a commendation from General Atkinson of that command for valuable assistance in the search and rescue efforts connected with the recent loss of one of our new B-29's in the wilds of the Alaska Peninsula. It is no wonder then that the Alaskans are proud of this particular Government agency, and that the men and women belonging to ACS are proud of their organization.

EFFICIENT DIRECTION

Under Maj. Gen. Spencer B. Akin, chief signal officer of the United States Army, the Alaska communication system is now, thanks to appropriations being made by this Congress, preparing to expand and extend its facilities to meet civilian as well as military needs.

Col. T. J. Tully, commanding officer of the Alaska communication system, has in my judgment done an outstanding job in a most difficult assignment. He is the fourteenth Army officer to command the system. Like his predecessors, Colonel Tully has won a firm place for himself in the esteem of Alaskans.

We in Alaska are proud of the Alaska communication system and its accomplishments. As a training ground for the Signal Corps and as the communication agency for all of the Territory, the ACS has discharged its responsibilities in a manner which reflects credit upon the entire Army.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and the House has had a busy day, so the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will not take the time allotted to her.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACKSON of California, indefinitely, on account of attendance at Pan-American Conference at Bogota, Colombia, South America.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2393. An act to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5314. An act to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 718. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson;

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

H. R. 1215. An act for relief of Kazue Oda Takahashi;

H. R. 1586. An act for relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, and others;

H. R. 2214. An act for relief of Dave Hougardy;

H. R. 2347. An act for relief on Mrs. Akiko Tsukado Miller;

H. R. 3061. An act for relief of Victor C. Kaminski;

H. R. 3118. An act for relief of Mrs. Susan W. Roe;

H. R. 3229. An act to exempt Hawaii and Alaska from trade statistics Act of 1902;

H. R. 4177. An act for relief of William L. Cunliffe;

H. R. 4478. An act to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4938. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with reference to platinum foxes;

H. R. 4943. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 5049. An act to reopen the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; and

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution making appropriations for foreign aid, welfare of Indians, and refunding internal-revenue collections.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1948, 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:

1427. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1428. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946, and June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 585); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1429. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary allocation plan for conservation of grain by the brewing industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1430. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6065. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 6066. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 6067. A bill authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6068. A bill to amend section 131 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 6069. A bill to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of compensation payable to veterans of World Wars I and II for service-connected total disability and to the widows and children of veterans of World War II for service-connected death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 6070. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 6071. A bill to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6072. A bill to clarify the status of inactive members of the Naval Reserve relating to the holding of offices of trust or profit under the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6073. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 6074. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, being an act entitled "An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6075. A bill to define the status of retired firemen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 6076. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Callahan area, Nassau County, Fla., for flood control, drainage, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6077. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Rice Creek and its tributaries in Putnam and adjacent counties, Florida, for flood control, drainage, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 6078. A bill to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 6079. A bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 6080. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of salt, in certain containers and of certain crystal sizes, not having a prescribed content of iodides; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to provide for the exportation of arms, munitions, and implements of war from the United States to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution relating to the immediate establishment of armed forces under the Security Council of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 517. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; 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 Commonwealth of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass a law providing Federal aid for equalizing educational opportunities among the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal aid for an educational program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6081. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6082. A bill for the relief of Sadako Takagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 6083. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6084. A bill for the relief of Julia E. Vail; 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:

1677. By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of American Legion Post No. 2, of Valdez, Alaska, in support of legislation for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1678. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 61 residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1679. Also, petition of David A. McKillop and 60 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1680. Also, petition of T. D. Bonney and 120 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1681. Also, petition of 60 residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1682. Also, petition of Mrs. Maude H. Nelson and 60 other residents of Long Beach, Calif., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1683. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Hubert Ahaus and 18 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation to reduce postage for relief packages mailed to European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1684. Also, petition of James T. Lannon and 35 other residents of Norwood, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation to reduce postage for relief packages mailed to European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1685. Also, petition of the Reverend Severin Lamping, O. F. M., and 18 others, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation to reduce postage for relief packages mailed to European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1686. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the Rhode Island Committee on European Recovery Program, signed by some 3,000 Rhode Island people, urging the Congress of the United States of America to cast a favorable vote on legislation designed, in the light of Secretary of State Marshall's proposal, to fulfill the needs of a sound European recovery program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1687. By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, relative to an international boundary fence; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1688. Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, relative to repealing the Federal transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1689. Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, relative to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1690. Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, relative to investigation of the Drefkoff plan to rehabilitate the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1691. Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, relative to the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1692. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing 29 signatures, from James T. Bergen Post, No. 39, American Legion Auxiliary, Amsterdam, N. Y., advocating legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1693. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, favoring enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1694. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Senate of the Arizona State Legislature, requesting Congress to repeal the Federal transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1695. Also, house memorial of the State Legislature of Arizona, requesting the Congress to enact a universal military training law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1696. Also, house concurrent memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, requesting critical investigation of the Drefkoff plan for industrialization of the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1697. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Northern Baptist Convention, petitioning consideration of their resolution opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1698. Also, petition of Ernes W. Cox and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1699. Also, petition of Mrs. Maggie Goldsmith, Orlo Vista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1700. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Knapp, Orlo Vista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1701. Also, petition of R. E. Young, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1702. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1703. Also, petition of Mrs. Lizzie E. Beers, Cassadaga, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1704. Also, petition of Mrs. Jennie R. Morris, Winter Park, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1705. Also, petition of Hughes R. Hilliard (through acting warden's office, Atlanta, Ga.), petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a petition and a motion for a change of venue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1706. Also, petition of Central New England Council of B'nai B'rith, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reversal of the United States with respect to the Palestine policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1707. Also, petition of Helen L. Curtis and one other person, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.