

William Morton Cole, O58148.
 John Warren Collins, O63332.
 Robert S. Collins, Jr., O63383.
 Stanley Pendleton Converse, O62262.
 Sidney Herbert Cook, Jr., O58133.
 Hugh Cort, Jr., O62839.
 Gordon Ra nblor Cubbison, O60234.
 William Joseph Cummings, O57807.
 Cecil McKinley Curles, O63298.
 Frederick Clarke Dahlquist, Jr., O60221.
 Charles Riggs Darby, O58072.
 Charles Edward Davis, O60726.
 Glenn Allen Davis, O63295.
 Oren Edwin DeHaven, O63382.
 Frederick Gerard Dempsey, O63097.
 James Edward Dempsey, O63101.
 Alfred Louis Dibella, O59489.
 Jack LaVerne Dinkel, O62270.
 Henry Dudley Doiron, O57850.
 Otis James Doty, O62269.
 X James Ewell Echoles, Jr., O63334.
 Harold Norman Elliott, O58138.
 Hodges Samuel Escue, O63375.
 Frank Clay Eubanks, Jr., O62838.
 Lloyd Rueben Evans, O59942.
 Bert Phillips Ezell, O59818.
 Lawrence Beach Farnum, O61211.
 Charles Henry Fisher, O58142.
 William Grey Foreman, O63106.
 Charles William Forsthoof, O59485.
 Romaine Shiere Foss, O59947.
 John Donald Gard, O59820.
 Hugh Manson Garner, O60218.
 Floyd Samuel Gibson, O60844.
 Leo Nicholas Goche, O59937.
 Alonzo John Golden, O61210.
 Ray Mack Golden, O58175.
 Nicholas Nick Gombos, O63100.
 Charles Edward Green, O58125.
 Alfred John Grigsby, Jr., O60727.
 Douglas Dale Grinnell, O62843.
 Tom Saxton Groseclose, O63108.
 William Byrd Hale, O59478.
 James Garhart Harper, O63379.
 John Leland Hart, O62261.
 John Nelson Hassell, O63368.
 Donald James Hassin, O63361.
 Strather William Hawkins, O58157.
 Return Carter Haynes, O63102.
 Robert James Heckendorn, O59945.
 Dennis Eldon Henricks, O60225.
 X Lee Swink Henry, Jr., O63337.
 William Herbert Henry, Jr., O63109.
 Lewis Eckert Hess, O59815.
 William Burnette Hill, O58167.
 George Robert Hoddinott, O59479.
 John Daniel Albert Hogan, Jr., O60720.
 Jackson Harold Martin Holbrook, O58155.
 Needham Claudius Holden, Jr., O63105.
 John Harold Hougen, O63107.
 James Leroy Hundemer, Jr., O58149.
 Clarence Henry Jackson, O57803.
 Kenneth Francis Jackson, O58159.
 John Mark Jenkins, O58139.
 Richard Milburn Jennings, O58935.
 Maurice Edward Jessup, O59821.
 Walter Freeman Johnston, O63302.
 Walter Floyd Jones, O60208.
 Jesse Lee Jordan, Jr., O63362.
 Edwin Boagni Junge, O59964.
 William Pryor Junk, Jr., O63380.
 Paul Raymond Kaster, Jr., O59483.
 Phillip Paul Katz, O59957.
 William Orval Keeling, Jr., O58150.
 Ernest McNeill Kelly, Jr., O58744.
 Howard William Killam, O62268.
 Monroe Kirkpatrick, O59926.
 Travis Monroe Kirkpatrick, Jr., O59924.
 Arthur Henry Kuhlman, Jr., O59963.
 Wheeler Edward Laird, O58153.
 Joe Ben Lamb, O62266.
 Robert Douglas Lambourne, O57851.
 Wilson Albert Landry, Jr., O63378.
 Jack Benjamin Lang, O63381.
 Vincent Walter Lang, O62841.
 Gerald Edward Ledford, O60219.
 William Carroll Leist, O60220.
 Earl Robert LeVier, O59925.
 William Mayo Lipsey, O60840.
 John Curtis Littlejohn, O57886.
 Hoyt Robert Livingston, O60228.

Theodore Frelinghuysen Locke, Jr., O59951.
 Elwood George Lodie, O59958.
 Robert James Lee, O59960.
 Henry Frederick Lopez, O62840.
 Phillip Edward Lowry, O60721.
 Donald Bror Malmberg, O59955.
 Clarence Henry Manly, Jr., O59941.
 Norman Lewis Martin, O63370.
 Allen John Mauderly, O63369.
 LaVern William Maxwell, O59484.
 Richard Mark McBride, O58071.
 Robert Carl McCulloch, O60723.
 George Linus McFadden, Jr., O60722.
 William Runciman McNeil, O59931.
 Richard Grover McSwain, O63098.
 John William Meek, Jr., O63095.
 Carl Joseph Merck, O57801.
 Richard Christopher Millard, O63356.
 Wilburn Edwin Milton, O59943.
 Richard Francis Mitchell, O63338.
 Clifford Edgar Mize, O60838.
 Albert Edwards Moore, O63364.
 Orbra Garfield Mullins, O63353.
 Powell Davis Murphy, O62842.
 William Richard New, O59961.
 William Elmer Noble, O63363.
 Thomas Ernest Oberley, O58161.
 Francis Stephen Obradovich, Jr., O63055.
 Harold Hellmann Olsen, Jr., O63351.
 Joseph Francis Paradis, O63305.
 Clyde Harris Patterson, Jr., O58173.
 Richard Reyburn Peabody, O63354.
 Quentin Pease, O59934.
 George Edward Peck, O58126.
 Alva Wesley Pendergrass, Jr., O58169.
 Robert Graham Penny, O59946.
 Fred William Peters, Jr., O58129.
 Martin Luther Pitts, Jr., O57920.
 Frank Slater Plummer, Jr., O63093.
 Lewington Stuart Ponder, O59823.
 James Valentine Preult, O63360.
 John Gerald Ransler, O63376.
 Arnold Rathlev, O59944.
 Clyde Earl Reed, Jr., O59927.
 James Bruce Reed, O57921.
 John Edwards Reed, O57809.
 William Herschel Rhodes, O58154.
 Norman Joseph Richards, O59482.
 George Mark Richardson, Jr., O60843.
 Thomas Bruce Richey, O59938.
 Vernon Renice Rider, O59488.
 Edward Melvin Riddlehoover, O60222.
 William Burnell Robinson, O62813.
 Charles Willis Root, O59950.
 George Herbert Rosenfield, O58163.
 David Ray Rosson, O58174.
 John Peter Ruppert, O62273.
 Paul Sanders, O59953.
 Louis Gerard Sandkaut, O57922.
 Wittmer Ira Schleh, O62271.
 James Irvin Scott, O63319.
 Donald Albert Seibert, O60224.
 Charles Calvin Sempie, O59929.
 Edgar Bennett Sharpe, O62263.
 Francis Joseph Shearer, Jr., O60227.
 James Roy Shelnut, O60725.
 Buren Riley Shields, Jr., O60230.
 Donald Eugene Smith, O62001.
 Harry Edward Smith, O60233.
 Paul Clifton Smithy, O59817.
 Robert Wilson Smithson, O63086.
 George Snipan, O62264.
 Ralph Wycliffe Spence, O58145.
 J. Wayne Staley, Jr., O60842.
 Posie Lee Starkey, Jr., O63373.
 Warren Bell Steele, O63377.
 John Ellis Steinke, O57885.
 Chester Raymond Stelman, O63352.
 Joel Ellison Stone, O58165.
 Robert Merle Stump, O58134.
 Charles Eugene Taylor, O60231.
 Eugene Tedick, O59481.
 Charles Milton Thomas, O63357.
 William Hoeffcker Vail, O59954.
 John Robert Voseipka, O63365.
 Andrew Jackson Waldrop, O57808.
 Vernon Virgil Wallis, O63072.
 Billy Hugo Watson, O59932.
 Charles Lancaster Weaver, O59935.
 Donald Christy Weaver, O59962.
 Robert William Webb, O57804.
 Dobson Lindley Webster, O59816.

Charles Rushton Westcott, O63374.
 X Nevin Clarence White, O63286.
 Richard Vernon White, O58172.
 Robert Willoughby Williams, O60839.
 Calvin Oscar Wilson, O63094.
 Joseph Orr Wintersteen, Jr., O58151.
 William Wallace Woodside, O63315.
 Jerome Zohn, O60229.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Howard Clifford Lelfheit, O63460.
 Albert Leon Paul, O63461.
 Lyle Harrison Wharton, O58123.
 James Bernard Woodrum, O62802.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

X Janet Marion Rasmussen, L351.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard:

Russell E. Wood
 James A. Hirschfield

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 2 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Otto Kerner, Jr., to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art always providing for us so abundantly and whose goodness and mercy follow us all our days, we pray that we may never make a selfish use of our blessings.

We penitently confess that we know very well that there would be far less of suffering and sorrow in our world if human nature had in it more of Thy divine compassion and self-giving love. Inspire us with a magnanimous spirit and a keener sense of social responsibility.

Grant us the Christlike vision and perspective, and may we see our fellow men and their struggles as Thou wouldst have us see them. Help us to look at needy humanity through the eyes of our blessed Lord which were the eyes of sympathy and kindness and hope.

We pray that the day may be hastened when every need will be supplied and the heart of all mankind shall be filled with happiness and peace.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and

joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 27, 1951:

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Sylvio Latino;
H. R. 3708. An act for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; and
H. R. 4165. An act for the relief of A. D. Wood.

On July 30, 1951:

H. R. 385. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son;

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani;

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Lum Ying;

H. R. 1200. An act to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States";

E. R. 1233. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vasilisa Parselles;

H. R. 1443. An act for the relief of Paul Matelli;

H. R. 1899. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution";

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Sanae Iida;

H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko;

H. R. 2170. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine;

H. R. 2204. An act for the relief of Lamar Calloway;

H. R. 2299. An act for the relief of Biagio Poldimani;

H. R. 2406. An act for the relief of B. H. Manley;

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 3217. An act for the relief of Peerless Casualty Co. and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Katharina Metz; and

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide that an aircraft carrier shall be named the *Forrestal*.

On July 31, 1951:

H. R. 671. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara;

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff;

H. R. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel;

H. R. 3455. An act to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners; and

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1951:

H. R. 1834. An act for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; and

H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHEELER asked and was granted a 10-day leave of absence.

FREIGHT-RATE DIFFERENTIAL

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, years ago, long before I came to Congress or even went to law school, I discovered that the South and West were being discriminated against in the matter of freight rates. In spite of this added and unfair burden the South and West have prospered in agriculture, industry, and business generally.

The answer I received to my first inquiry as to why carrying charges were higher on shipments from the South to the North than on the identical shipments from the North to the South was it is down grade from the North to the South and less fuel is consumed. This explanation was ridiculous and untrue.

One of the first measures I introduced in Congress was a resolution seeking to eliminate freight-rate discrimination. In each succeeding Congress I introduced similar legislation. And I have appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission, urging that this much-needed and too-long-delayed relief be granted.

Some time ago the Commission, for the first time, took favorable action upon the pleas of the South and West; and, under date of July 31, 1951, a final order was issued which will lead to a complete elimination of all discriminations in freight rates. This decision on the part of the Commission is greatly appreciated by us and should be hailed by all who believe in fair play. Those of us who have so faithfully labored with this grave problem received wholeheartedly the new regulation to which we are justly entitled. I am delighted to have had the privilege of making a small contribution toward the elimination of unjust freight rates.

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

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That burden was imposed not only on the Southern States but on every State west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. BRYSON. I was conscious of that, but, of course, I was thinking principally of the South.

Mr. RANKIN. This regulation wipes it out. It is the first thing that has brought justice in freight rates to the people of the South and West in the last 50 years.

Mr. BRYSON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] deserves the major portion of the credit for the issuance of this order.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN DISASTER AREAS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 303, which has passed both Houses of Congress, will, if approved, take care of immediate flood emergencies.

House Joint Resolution 305, which I introduced on August 2, if enacted, will enable local redevelopment groups to make the necessary speed in providing critically needed permanent shelter.

There was a housing shortage in many flood-stricken areas before the floods came. That shortage is, of course, more acute than ever with thousands of families driven from their homes.

There is still a large pool of private money that could be made available for large housing developments with only a little encouraging by, and at no expense to, the Government.

All that is needed is broader power, in disaster areas, for the Federal National Mortgage Association—"Fannie Mae."

For that reason I have today introduced a House Joint Resolution to empower the FNMA to enter into agreements, prior to construction and its completion, assuring the purchase of the mortgage on such privately built housing.

This action will, I am certain, assure the immediate construction of many hundreds of new housing units, perhaps 1,500 to 2,000 which are badly needed in Kansas City, Kans., alone.

ACQUISITION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper carried a story that the President has set up a separate branch or agency to be known as the Defense Production Administration to have charge of the acquisition and development of strategic and critical minerals. This agency will be under the jurisdiction of Jess Larson, present Administrator of the GSA of the Federal Government. This carries out, at least in part, an effort that has been made for some time by the Mines and Mining Committee of the House to centralize in one agency the domestic development, production, and acquisition of strategic and critical materials in this country. I think it is a step in the right direction. It is a recognition that we have not gone ahead with this program up to date. We hope that under the new agency under the direction of Mr. Larson the development of these critical and strategic materials, chrome, manganese and others that are found in this country, will go ahead in a big way for the benefit of our war effort and for the benefit of the mining industry of this country.

Up until now, under the Defense Production Act, results in developing domestic critical and strategic materials has been most disappointing. Few purchase contracts have been signed, and tax benefits have been nil. None of the 500 or more applications for loans have been granted. In short, the program has not rolled.

Let us hope that with the establishment of one responsible agency, development of our domestic strategic and critical minerals can go forward.

It is high time that some such step was taken to end the stalling, delay and red tape that has characterized the administration of our strategic minerals program since its inception. The announced purpose of the new agency is to speed up expansion of minerals production in the United States and abroad. Nothing is more important to our national security than this. I sincerely hope that Mr. Jess Larson, whom Mr. Truman has said he will nominate for administrator of the new agency, will get to work at once to unravel the complications that have virtually stagnated minerals production under the joint administration of DMA, GSA, DPA, NPA, and forty-odd other agencies that have interfered.

I cannot help but call attention to the fact that the President's action follows the suggestion of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] who have introduced bills to accomplish the same purpose essentially as the President has accomplished by his order.

Indeed, I must say that this is another illustration of how difficult it must be for the members of the majority party to maintain a reputation as loyal supporters of the administration. In this House on July 13 the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] introduced an amendment to the Defense Production Act to establish a separate agency in charge of procurement of strategic minerals. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle who were familiar with the situation supported that amendment. However, the idea apparently had not yet received the stamp of approval of the hierarchy downtown with the result that it was strongly opposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and other stalwarts of the administration. Some of their remarks concerning the folly of establishing an additional agency may be found in the RECORD of July 13 on pages 8149 through 8160. As a result of their efforts, the amendment was defeated. I would be very sorry if the action of the President, directly contrary to the judgment they expressed at that time, has been embarrassing to them. I am glad, however, that the President has at last taken some action that may lead to a better program for the procurement and production of strategic minerals.

HIGH TAXES

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter this morning from Pittsburgh, which is not in my district, which did me good. I would like to share it with you because the writer understands what is going on. He came up the hard way. He carried scrap iron and drove an old horse to start with to get going in this country. He is the son of an immigrant. He says, "It has been impossible for men of moderate incomes, including those with incomes from \$25,000 up, to invest or save, because of the high taxes which have been with us a great many years. What has made America great? What has given a man an incentive to work? Making it impossible for a man to succeed and better his income will give us socialism and finally communism. If that is where we are headed, why slaughter the youth of our Nation fighting something that we are at present pointing our heads toward?" Then he implores Congress to "let each man have the incentive to get ahead—an immigrant to become a millionaire, a laborer too could become a millionaire." These are facts, and history has proven the exactness of these statements.

"Worry! Yes, worry—what has been done to us taxwise, not what they are going to do."

I hope such men and women will become articulate and organize to be effective as a pressure group for liberty from the tyranny of taxation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MR. AND MRS. HOWLAND SARGEANT

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the State Department appropriation bill, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] said that Mr. Howland Sargeant, of the Department of State and chairman of the American delegation to the UNESCO Conference in Paris, took along his bride, one of the greatest American actresses of all time, Miss Myrna Loy, at Government expense and spent a beautiful honeymoon in Paris. I felt sure when the gentleman made the remarks that he was in error. But before calling this error to his attention, I checked with the Department of State. In order to clarify this matter and in fairness to Mr. Sargeant and his bride, Miss Loy, I want to say that her expenses were paid entirely by Mr. Sargeant. Furthermore, as I observed his activity there, it turned out to be a mighty poor place to spend a honeymoon. He worked until 2 o'clock in the morning frequently and had conferences as early as 8 o'clock in the morning. So I suggest to anybody who has any such idea not to

take their bride along on an international conference but to wait until the conference is over and then take her on the honeymoon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence for 10 days in order to go home to vote.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, I cannot understand why it is necessary to leave the Nation's business to go home to vote. As far as I have been able to ascertain, nobody in his district ever votes for anybody but the gentleman from Mississippi. Why go down there to vote?

Mr. RANKIN. Because it is my friends who are running now, and not your humble servant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean to say you let somebody else run?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. They are running now for every office from balliff to governor.

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

There was no objection.

ONE-WAY FREIGHT RATES ABOLISHED

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TWELFTH REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twelfth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472), as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid in the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public

Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended March 31, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1951.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 146]

Allen, La.	Golden	Pickett
Anfuso	Gore	Poage
Bakewell	Granahan	Poulson
Baring	Grant	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Green	Price
Bates, Mass.	Greenwood	Prouty
Blatnik	Gregory	Quinn
Boggs, Del.	Hall	Rabaut
Bosone	Edwin Arthur	Radwan
Breen	Hand	Rains
Brehm	Havener	Redden
Buckley	Heffernan	Regan
Budge	Heller	Rivers
Busbey	Horan	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Irving	Saylor
Case	Johnson	Scott
Celler	Kearney	Hugh D., Jr.
Chatham	Kennedy	Scudder
Chelf	Kilburn	Shelley
Chudoff	Kilday	Sheppard
Corbett	Kirwan	Short
Coudert	Latham	Sikes
Cox	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Sittler
Dawson	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Delaney	McGrath	Staggers
Dingell	McGregor	Stockman
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Taber
Donovan	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	Thomas
Eberhart	Morgan	Thornberry
Ellsworth	Morrison	Van Pelt
Elston	Morton	Vaughn
Engle	Moulder	Velde
Fallon	Murphy	Vinson
Fine	Murray, Tenn.	Watts
Fisher	Murray, Wis.	Werdel
Fogarty	Ostertag	Whitaker
Fulton	O'Toole	Wickersham
Furcolo	Patten	Wood, Ga.
Garmatz	Perkins	Yates
Gillette	Philbin	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 140) expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovak Government.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will explain the resolution and then there are a few of us on this side who wish to make some statement on the matter. I do not be-

lieve then that there will be objection to the gentleman's request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also reserving the right to object, is the resolution open to amendment under the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. There will be several committee amendments to the resolution. The resolution will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that we have four other bills on the program. If there is going to be debate on amendments to this resolution I would prefer that this be taken up after we have disposed of the other matters. Is the gentleman from Michigan going to offer an amendment to this?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman wait until later in the day on this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second sentence of House Resolution 51 is hereby amended by inserting the words "or outside" after the word "within."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for some time the Rules Committee had refused to approve resolutions giving legislative committees the right to go outside of the United States. However, after several pleas had been made by outstanding committees, we came to the conclusion that certain committees really needed this authority, so it became necessary for the Rules Committee to concur in their requests.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also desired this same privilege. In the original resolution which the Rules Committee reported, such authorization was not provided. Since that time, the evidence discloses that that committee finds it necessary to go to Canada in connection with its investigation of the pulp and newsprint problem. In view of this fact, the Rules Committee favorably reported this resolution—House Resolution 323—amending the original resolution—House Resolution 51—giving the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the right to go outside of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What reason is given for this committee wanting to go on investigations outside of continental United States?

Mr. SABATH. As I stated, it became necessary for the committee to obtain information in Canada relative to the increased cost of newsprint and pulp, because only a few weeks ago the price was increased \$10 a ton and in some instances \$20 a ton. Also, they desired

to ascertain why a certain amount of pulp that at one time came to the United States is now being shipped to other countries instead of being obtained by the paper mills of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The resolution is not limited to Canada, however.

Mr. SABATH. Well, Canada is outside of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly it is. But the resolution takes in all the world.

Mr. SABATH. Well, there is another reason that was considered, and it is of great importance. At first, that privilege and right was denied, but later on the committee came to the conclusion unanimously that this power should be granted to that committee.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think we ought to practice all the economy we can and stop some of these around-the-world tours?

Mr. SABATH. That was the policy of the Rules Committee, and we did that. Finally, we realized it was absolutely necessary for some of the committees, for instance, the Committee on Immigration, which is now a part of the Judiciary Committee, to go to Mexico. They proved that it was necessary. Mexico is also outside of the United States. We granted that committee the right and power to go outside of the United States.

I am satisfied that these committees, even those that have been charged with making joy rides out of these trips, have benefited, and the House and the country has benefited by the information which the members of those committees have obtained in the investigations they made, and which information has been imparted to the Congress. The few dollars that it has cost the Government has been fully justified because of the information which they have obtained. It places them in a position to legislate judiciously, based on information they did not theretofore possess.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I know he will not use it all because he does not like to talk at length.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee has made the present situation very clear to all of you, and in all probability I will be unable to add very much in the way of enlightenment on this subject. But I do want to discuss, if I may, for a few minutes some of the reasons why this resolution is before us and what it does. This resolution amends the original resolution which gave certain investigative powers to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, by adding the words "or outside" so that actually it gives the committee authority to conduct its investigations within the United States or outside of the United States.

As the chairman of the Committee on Rules has explained, the Committee on Rules has been rather careful in considering any resolution coming before it which would permit committee travel outside of the United States on the

theory that we certainly want to keep as many Members of Congress as we can here during sessions, and with the additional thought that we did not want the Congress to be put in the position where anyone could charge Members or committees with engaging in junkets. It is perfectly true, of course, that some committees of the Congress have had power to travel wherever they pleased and have done so, and also that some individual Members of Congress have journeyed far and wide with considerable regularity, to be charitable. I recall that quite a number of Members of Congress were recently invited to make a trip to Europe, not as members of any standing committee, but rather on a selective basis, as it were, and that their trip was paid for and financed, as I understand, out of counterpart funds, or some such funds, which, in reality, were actually put up by the taxpayers of the United States. I do not think many of us have been misled, but know that the American public in the end pays for such trips.

I have been quite interested in reading some of the dispatches from the Far East, telling about the recent visit there of one of the distinguished members of my own party, which carried the story that this particular individual and his party were traveling in an Air Force plane. Whether such a report is true or not I do not know, but if planes have been furnished by the Air Force or by the Federal Government for this trip it has been at the cost of the American taxpayers.

I have said many times on the floor of this House that in my opinion, the Congress of the United States has two great fundamental and primary responsibilities, and that I have never been quite sure in my own mind which was the most important. One of those responsibilities is to investigate and the other is to legislate. I really do not know which we should put first, but I am convinced it is not easy for the Members of this body or of the other body to legislate wisely and well on subjects with which they are entirely unacquainted. I am certain a great deal of money can be saved, and perhaps better legislation will emerge, if the Congress or some Members of Congress in whom all of us can have faith and trust can first investigate so as to know something about the subject involved before we consider legislation dealing with it.

One of the great standing committees of this House is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had the pleasure, the opportunity, and the responsibility of serving on that committee for some time, and I know something about its work. That committee is charged with handling legislation which deals with both foreign and domestic commerce. The committee not only has jurisdiction over practically all matters dealing with transportation, but also all legislative matters dealing with communications, with the public health, with trade practices here in the United States, with the problems of the air which is a part, of course, of transportation, and with the conservation of many of our natural resources. For in-

stance, the committee has primary responsibility in connection with the conservation and production of oil and many other mineral resources.

This committee also has jurisdiction over a problem that is quite important to a great many businesses and industries, and, I think, to all American people for that matter. That is our newsprint and paper supply. During World War II we reached the place where it became doubtful whether we could get a sufficient supply of paper and paper pulp to maintain a free press here in this country, and at the same time to also produce the paper products we needed for our military effort. There were times, I might add, that the supply of paper for ammunition cartons and for gun wads was very, very short. Newspapers and other publications were sharply restricted in the use of paper.

We get between 80 and 85 percent of our paper supply from a foreign country—Canada, not very far away. The Canadian Government and the Canadian paper and pulp producers during World War II did cooperate fully with the United States. Of course, the sale of newsprint and paper pulp by Canada to the United States was their largest single source of dollar income. Now, once more, the paper and pulp supply of this country is becoming very, very short. It is necessary that we authorize a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to go into this whole paper supply situation. I am hopeful we will never get to the point where we once more will have to have paper priorities allotments and quotas, and all of that for the newspapers and the magazines of this country and for the manufacturers of boxes, shipping material, wrapping paper, and so forth, as we had in World War II. But, I do think it is of the utmost importance that this committee be permitted to go to Canada to help work out the procurement and distribution of the paper and pulp supplies that are available there.

I think this resolution is important, too, from another angle. I am going to speak very frankly. This committee must be permitted to visit one or two countries on this continent where we have every assurance that we can obtain the increased supplies of oil and certain strategic metals for the war effort.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is another element in the production of paper and that is sulfur. It is very necessary to have a sufficient amount of sulfur.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you. I was going to mention that, may I say to the gentleman. I am glad he called my attention to it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not this resolution have been worded to confine it to the countries which the gentleman speaks about?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that would probably be a mistake. I believe it would be a mistake to designate here just exactly what countries this committee could or should visit. This committee is charged by law with the responsibility and jurisdiction over both foreign and domestic commerce and trade. To answer the gentleman a little further. This is the one standing committee which is charged with that responsibility. While it may become necessary later, I do not know. The committee members who appeared before the Committee on Rules said they had no intention of making any trips to Europe or elsewhere under this authority. They told us if they did, that they would send only subcommittees to these other countries. For instance, there is no reason I know of why any one member of the full committee, who is not a member of the subcommittee dealing with paper and pulp supply, should go to Canada. I do not know why any member of the committee who is not on the subcommittee dealing with oil or petroleum should go to Mexico, we will say. I believe, under the circumstances—because we must remember that your Committee on House Administration must pass upon any expenditures that are made under this resolution—that this power will not be abused. I cannot conceive in my mind, sir, of a situation where we will say to one of the few legislative committees of the House that is directly charged with the responsibility of looking after foreign and domestic commerce that its members cannot go here or there; that we will limit them, but that we will let anybody else in Congress, or any newspaper publisher in the United States who just indicates he would like to go over and see how ECA is working, and will write a good story and give good publicity to ECA when he comes back, will be invited to fly anywhere in the world at the expense of the American people. Now, why should we be so foolish as to question this resolution? I say to you that a few dollars spent on proper investigations by the Congress will save millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. All I desire to call attention to is that this is the only committee that has jurisdiction of foreign commerce.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. I tried to point that out a while ago.

Mr. SABATH. That is the privilege and the right of this committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, then this resolution does not contemplate sending the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any subcommittee, over to Iran, for instance?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope not. Iran was not mentioned, and I know of no reason why the committee should go to Iran, although some situation could develop where it might become necessary. But it may develop that that may be a wise thing to do. I do not know. However, I do know this, because I hap-

pen to have served on the oil subcommittee at one time. I do know that if Iranian oil production is shut off we will hear here in the Congress, and throughout the country from many, many sources, and from the administration itself, a demand that we immediately begin to share our oil supplies with Europe. I want this committee to take all proper steps to see to it that in case a situation develops where Europe cannot get the oil it now receives from Iran that we can get the additional production here in this hemisphere that will do two things, one, that will protect us from rationing oil and gasoline here in America, in time of peace, and two, if war comes, that we will have a sufficient oil supply available here so we can fight a war if it becomes necessary to do so.

We can say the same thing about sulfur, which is very important to our war effort, and we can say the same thing about iron ore. We have great iron deposits that the American industries now own in Venezuela and Colombia, and certain other South American countries. Am I right, may I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

Mr. HINSHAW. Venezuela; yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do know it is important that we keep those supplies flowing to this country. I do not want just to sit idly by here and let something go wrong over in Iran, and then have somebody impose rationing of gasoline and oil on my farmers, as we did in World War II, when we said, "You cannot even go to town to buy your groceries, because you are interfering with the war effort." I do not want that to happen, and I am sure it will not if this committee can do a job in connection with insuring the proper oil potential on this continent in case of need.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This resolution seeks to amend House Resolution 51. The only thing this resolution seeks to do, that I can see, is to add two words.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; "or outside."

Mr. STEFAN. "Or outside," but after the word "within." The only "within" in House Resolution 51 is where it states that it may be deemed advisable with respect to any matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, and so forth. "Within the jurisdiction." After the word "within" you insert "or outside" of the jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, "within or outside the United States." The gentleman read the "within" in the wrong place.

Mr. STEFAN. The resolution does not say so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will read "within or outside the United States."

Mr. STEFAN. House Resolution 51 has no reference to the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman will find that it does.

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot find it there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman have the original resolution?

Mr. STEFAN. This resolution is dated January 1, 1951, and it is House

Resolution 51. That is the resolution we are seeking to amend. Adding the words "or outside" would mean you are seeking to give the committee jurisdiction to go outside its own jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know what copy of the resolution the gentleman has before him, or whether or not it is House Resolution 51, or perhaps it is a misprint, which it could be.

Mr. STEFAN. House Resolution 51 has no reference to that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wait just a minute; the gentleman has asked a question and I want to answer it. The question we had before us in the Rules Committee, and on which this rule was granted, was to amend the resolution adopted by the House which gave power to the committee to conduct investigations, so as to permit the committee to go outside the United States. Originally, when we gave the authority for investigation early in the year, we limited it so the committee could not go outside the United States. There may be a typographical error in this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. I will pass the resolution to the gentleman for his perusal. There is no reference there to the United States. If you amend that particular resolution you will give the committee jurisdiction outside the jurisdiction they have now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield no further until I answer the gentleman. If by typographical or clerical error this resolution does not do what the Rules Committee intended, then we of course shall amend it so that it does. The intent and purpose of this resolution is simply to give permission to the committee to go outside the United States on its investigations of matters coming under its jurisdiction. If the wording is not correct, as the gentleman has pointed out, we shall amend it so that it will be correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I am not opposing what you are trying to do but I wish you would read the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very appreciative of the gentleman calling it to my attention. If this resolution does not do it, as the gentleman has pointed out, we shall certainly have the clerical staff draw it again to give the authority.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman read the resolution he now seeks to amend?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I did read it at the time; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Has he read it now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have not read the resolution you just gave me because I have been standing on the floor listening to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Why does the gentleman not read it?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will read it just as soon as I have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. STEFAN. Please read it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman from Nebraska would read the original resolution—

Mr. STEFAN. I have the original resolution here.

Mr. SABATH. So have I. It reads that the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the report he has read.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, and that is the resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. You are reading the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. STEFAN. That is not the resolution which has been sent to the desk.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). May the Chair suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that the engrossed copy of the resolution under discussion is here and it apparently is not the same as the copy the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has been reading.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is just what I started to explain.

The original resolution which we had before us in the Committee on Rules is not this resolution which the gentleman from Nebraska has just given me. The resolution which we now have before us reads, "To amend line 2 by adding after the word 'within'—and there is no such word here. I would like to have reported the engrossed copy here to find out whether a clerical error has been made.

Mr. SABATH. There is no question about that. What I read is part of the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield until I have read the engrossed copy. I want the gentleman from Nebraska to give careful attention to it. Here is the official engrossed copy, and this is what we had before us in the Committee on Rules. The engrossed copy of the resolution, House Resolution 51, is as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1951, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The amendment carried in the resolution we have offered is simply to add after the words "at such times and places within the United States" the words "or outside of the United States." That is all it does.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman certainly has read a resolution carrying the same number as the resolution that I submitted to him which was passed in January 1951. The gentleman read the amendment which was certainly satisfactory and that is the resolution that we are discussing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, that is the resolution. This other copy of the resolution which you gave me is probably the resolution which as originally introduced before we put it in order in the Committee on Rules. I hope that has been made clear.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). May the Chair suggest that when Members seek recognition by another Member who has the floor, the request should be to the Chair, so that we can preserve some semblance of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should be glad to yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. If I may make so bold as to say, I believe the word "within" appears twice in the resolution; once in line 2 or 3 and again in line 15. I think that is where the confusion arises, perhaps.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Resolution 51 as given me by Mr. STEFAN was the original resolution introduced, rather than the one which was adopted in the House which we now seek to amend.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean the one the gentleman just read has two "withins."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is "within" in the first sentence, and one in the second sentence also. The one we seek to amend is in the second sentence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, how do you expect a Member on the floor to know what the resolution is about when we had the old House Resolution 51. Is a printed copy of Resolution 51 now available?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It should be.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know. I am not responsible for the operation of the House. I sometimes wish I were.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DEWART. In regard to the shortage of oil, I would like to call attention to the remarks that I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 31, at page A4807. This is with reference to the nationalization of oil in Iran. Iran at that time was producing 700,000 barrels and exporting 600,000 barrels. Since then the export countries have increased their production to 668,000 barrels daily, thus taking up any shortage that might have been caused by the na-

tionalization of the oil industry in Iran. I think those remarks have a bearing on this subject.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Before concluding, I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] if he obtained a copy of H. R. 51 from the desk. If so, then the clerical staff should have been more careful and not brought in the original resolution, because their error has been embarrassing to all of us.

Mr. STEFAN. When I came on the floor of the House today, when this resolution came up to amend H. R. 51, I called for a copy of H. R. 51, and it was dated January 1951. No copy of a subsequent resolution, which you are now attempting to amend, is available to the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We now understand each other. Of course I was talking about the resolution adopted by the House which we had before the Rules Committee. The gentleman was speaking about the resolution he obtained from the Clerk's desk. It was evidently an error, that the bill clerk brought in the original resolution as first introduced, from the document room, rather than the one which was adopted by the House. I can see how the mistake has occurred and it is embarrassing to both of us.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations for the State Department, I would like to have the gentleman tell the House approximately what the committee estimates are as to the expense of the program you have in mind, for travel.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman does not know, will the gentleman tell the House where the money is coming from?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, very easily. Any appropriation made for travel or expenses of any committee must be approved by the House in the form of a resolution offered for that purpose by the Committee on House Administration. I do not believe that the expenditures of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for all their expenses in connection with any of these investigations, have ever run very high. I cannot tell you what the total cost of all investigations conducted by the House has been this year, but I believe in the Eightieth Congress, when we had a great many investigations, was somewhere around a million dollars for all. We may throw away billions of dollars all over the world, we may pass a billion-dollar bill in no time, and that is all right, but there are a great many people in America who think that if any public money at all is spent by any committee of Congress to find out anything about the subject on which we are legislating, that it is just a junket. There are some Members who may possibly waste their time on committee trips, but practically all Members of Congress—and I want to say this publicly in defense of the Congress—put in

long hours of hard work whenever they make a survey. The gentleman from Nebraska has gone a number of times to represent this House in the study and investigation of our diplomatic and other activities by the State Department abroad, I believe every dollar that he has ever spent has been well spent in that particular effort and has often brought about great savings. I think this committee can be trusted to do the same sort of a job.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I merely rise to ask the gentleman what particular appropriation subcommittee would deal with appropriations for this particular committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It comes out of the contingent funds of the House. I understand \$40,000 has already been assigned, by House action, to the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to carry on its work under the original resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few years ago that we had a reorganization bill, the purpose of which was to cut down Federal expenditures, to save a little money for the taxpayers and to render the Federal service more efficient. Shortly after that bill was adopted by the House, the House not adhering to the thought expressed in it to, so far as possible, confine congressional investigations to the standing committees of the House, began to create special committees to carry on investigations. The resolution creating each of those committees, carried of course, an authorization; and later there was an appropriation for the expenses incurred by those committees.

This particular resolution seems wholly unnecessary because the House can at any time either authorize the committee it has in mind to make that investigation and appropriate the money—and that we have done many times—or it can create a special committee for a specific purpose.

This resolution, as I understand it, gives authority only to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—of which I have no criticism—it makes no mention of other committees; nevertheless I know very well from experience that if this resolution is adopted other committees will, and there is no reason why they should not, come in asking for similar authorizations.

I have a very, very vivid recollection of a subcommittee from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments making a trip abroad. I do not know what it cost the taxpayers, direct cost for travel and other expenses. Of what it cost incidentally and indirectly, I have no idea. I do recall that on one trip of a House committee making an investigation abroad, one of the members of the subcommittee lost his pants, and I have often thought that the taxpayers of the United States came very near losing their shirts because of some

of the recommendations made by that and other committees and individual members of that and other committees.

The full Committee on Expenditures never received, at least it never accepted or printed a report, not one from one subcommittee, nor did they get a recommendation from a subcommittee that traveled in Europe. Neither did we have report or recommendation from another subcommittee which made a trip into the Pacific regions, over the Far East. I have no recollection that they ever made or printed a report, or a recommendation.

Are we to go along with and translate into action the thought we had when we adopted this much-praised reorganization recommendation? The Hoover Commission to give us greater efficiency, to save several billion dollars, made certain recommendations, to activate which I offered some 19 bills, which have in the main been ignored. Why should not the House wait until the necessity or the desirability of making an investigation arises? Instead of granting a general authorization to this or any other committee to be followed hereafter by similar requests by, and authority granted to other committees, why should we not wait until the occasion comes up and then authorize whatever committee we want, standing committee or special committee, to do that particular job? Why just expand and spend now when we are so greatly in debt, when we need all of these billions for national defense? Why extend a broad, open invitation for any committee and by implication to all committees to travel here, there and all over outside the United States? I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] investigation is necessary, we should have it. For years I have advocated a policy which would aid us in getting facts which would aid the Congress in writing necessary legislation. There is not one Member of this House who does not know, if he has paid any attention at all to these investigations, but that time and time again, in fact so often that it can almost be said to be the practice of the House, that committees have been sent off on what our folks call junketing expeditions. If we are to have economy, instead of talking about it all the time, why do we on every occasion when there is an opportunity to practice a little economy fail to vote to bring it about? Our folks are growing tired of talk without action.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was necessary to use a great deal of the 30 minutes in order to yield to Members of the House, including the gentleman.

I would like to correct the gentleman as to what the Hoover Commission did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The Congress passed the Reorganization Act before the Hoover Commission was created.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that we all realize the Hoover Commission is his baby, that anything and everything it did is all right. Now, the reorganization bill may have been passed before, but the whole purpose of the Hoover Commission and its recommendations as well as the purpose of the reorganization legislation was to give us economy and efficiency and the Eighty-second Congress has not, though it has been in session for 7 months, given the people either efficiency or economy. Bills to implement the legislation recommended by the Hoover Commission have been introduced by me but, with one or two exceptions, have been pigeonholed.

Congress should first, itself, economize, set the example, then force the executive departments to follow that example.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite the ranking member of the committee, but I am the ranking member present on the Republican side. The gentleman from Michigan has just made reference to travel abroad by certain committees of this House. He started to mention the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but wandered off to a subcommittee of his own Committee on Expenditures and perhaps to other committees.

I do not believe there is any Member of this House who will deny the fact that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at any time it has made an investigation outside the United States, has never suffered criticism whatsoever by any Member of the House or of the press or anyone else anywhere in the United States or abroad. I think it is only by inference that the gentleman was attempting to talk about the work of my committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is a fact that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is one of the few standing committees which under the provisions of the Reorganization Act the gentleman from Michigan mentioned is charged with the responsibility of taking care of matters pertaining to foreign commerce and necessarily, therefore, should have some contact with foreign commerce on foreign ground?

Mr. HINSHAW. Quite so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was making no attack on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. I gathered from his remarks it was by inference only.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know about the gentleman's committee. I do know about my own.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has been referring to his own committee. If any Member of the House can point a finger in any derogatory way whatsoever against the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when it has gone abroad to make a study or reported to the House, I would like to have that Member stand up here now and point. I do not think anyone can. As a matter of fact, the work we have done abroad on occasion has been at considerable sacrifice to ourselves in time we would otherwise have spent with our families and we have come back with reports that have been very wisely and rightly used by the House of Representatives. In making those investigations, we have saved the American taxpayers thousands of times the few dollars that were expended.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand the committee has already been making investigations outside of the United States?

Mr. HINSHAW. Except for the last couple of years, we have.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Even though they did not have authority under the law?

Mr. HINSHAW. We have always had authority except in the last Congress, as I remember. For instance, a subcommittee of my committee made a trip through Europe a while back to study socialized medicine, and I think that study contributed enormously to the proper consideration of the bill on that particular subject.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think a look at these things is worth a dozen people coming before your committee and trying to explain the situation.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is my opinion. I have found, myself, from the few trips I have made as a member of the committee that it has been of enormous value by seeing first-hand just exactly that which we were to present and discuss before this House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who for many years served with great distinction on our committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to me now to point out, in reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this resolution is passed, cannot just go out and spend any amount of money they desire on travel but that, instead, the House itself must approve legislation appropriating the funds necessary for this purpose.

Mr. HINSHAW. Exactly so. And, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman, and I know it is within his knowledge, that my committee is one committee of this House that has always turned back money from the amount appropriated for its investigative use every time it has been appropriated, to my knowledge. Our committee has one of

the best records of economy in that respect. We have had one of the most economically run committees in the entire Congress, and certainly we do not go out on junkets and spend all the money which is appropriated just for the purpose of spending the money. We go out and do a job of work and come back with important information of great value to the Congress and the people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt but what the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will go to the Committee on Appropriations and get an appropriation.

Mr. HINSHAW. No. We go to the House Committee on Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you get a direct appropriation.

Mr. HINSHAW. We already have one.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] told us a few moments ago that a committee of the House of Representatives not long ago used counterpart funds.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, we did not do that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was not a committee. That was a group of Members of Congress selected by someone to go abroad. It was not an authorized committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I remember that, it was not an authorized committee of the House at all. It was merely a trip being made at the instance of some other department of the Government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] mounted his horse and rode off in all directions making charges and insinuations about the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He was talking about two subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I happened to have been on one of those subcommittees, and I might say that that committee did a lot of hard work and made a number of recommendations, many of which were put into effect, and which have resulted in the saving of several million dollars in the matter of surplus property alone. I might say that I have listened frequently to the harangues of the gentleman from Michigan, and I think, perhaps, if he had been so inclined and had gone along on that trip, when he was invited to go, that he might change his attitude, because he would have had the opportunity to observe first hand, and therefore he would have known what he was talking about the numerous times he has spoken on international affairs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I accept the admonition to be more careful hereafter, and I want to ask the gentleman just one question. Did your committee ever file a report?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There was a report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did you ever file a report?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, I will answer the gentleman if the gentleman will just be calm about the whole thing and not get too excited.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not very excited.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not yield any further. Yes, there was a written report and there was a report filed. There was some disagreement on the report, and I might say I was one of the disagreeing parties to some matters in the report because the chairman of the subcommittee wanted to recommend more money to certain international organizations than some of the rest of us did. But, there is a report in the committee, and that answers your question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was the report ever printed and filed with the Clerk where it was supposed to be filed? Where is the report? Has anybody ever presented a report?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The report was submitted to the full committee. If the gentleman wants the report filed, he is on the committee, why does he not see that it is filed?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I asked that it be filed three or four times, and we have never been able to get it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Has the gentleman read the report?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I have not.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Come around some time, and I will give the gentleman a copy of it, then he will know more about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do that. I will be happy to have it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I might say to the gentleman in conclusion that the studies made by this subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is also a member, were to be in the nature of continuing studies and that the report which is available is not complete because the committee did not have an opportunity to study the situation with respect to certain strategic materials in Africa, and therefore was unable to evaluate the entire picture. The report which is available to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] consists of some 200 pages and is complete and thorough insofar as the field covered in the amount of time available to the committee. The gentleman's attitude on this whole matter has been: "Where is the report? I am against it. What is in it?"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this resolution, except that I do not think it goes far enough.

I should like to underscore what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] said about the functions of the Congress being investigative and legislative. I say that when Congress acts in ignorance

of the facts it acts weakly and ineffectively, and is not discharging its responsibility to the American people. It cannot legislate wisely without being informed, because without knowledge we just have to accept whatever is handed to us from the administration without passing independent judgment upon it.

I think there is altogether too little investigation in the Congress. The Congress ought to be much better staffed. Instead of having some 300 people to go out and find the facts on these important problems that we have to deal with, we ought to have many times that number.

As far as field investigations and junkets are concerned, I am somewhat tired of hearing the cry of economy raised against the Congress itself. When the Congress, through false economy, denies itself the means of getting the pertinent facts necessary to wise legislation, the Congress is clipping its own strength. Congressional field investigations, derided in the press as junkets, are always well publicized. But we hear very little about the 30 European editors that I saw in Detroit about a month ago, accompanied by 15 people from the departments in Washington—and that was only one of six such trips—all financed at the taxpayers' expense. I do not know whether that junket did any good or not, because the American representatives accompanying those foreign editors disgraced themselves. Instead of creating good will they created ill will for the United States.

I think that when Congress starts limiting its own funds and economizing on itself it is penny wise and pound foolish, because every penny we spend finding out about the Government's business we return manifold in savings to the American taxpayers. Even if there is no dollar saving, I say that when we act intelligently we are serving our people well. When we act in the dark we are not.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this observation: I do not know whether all of you Members realize that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has at all times been composed of the most outstanding Members of the House. Its chairmen have been such men as Mr. Lea, of California, and Mr. CROSSER, of Ohio. It formerly had as members the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is a member of the committee. It is one of the outstanding committees of the House. I wish I could mention the names of all the other members.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman might include in that list of distinguished members of that committee the Speaker of the House. He was chairman of that committee.

Mr. SABATH. That is right. I forgot to mention that. During his chairmanship we obtained a great deal of nec-

essary legislation. I remember that the gentleman from Illinois who is now addressing you was a member of that committee for 4 years. Since he got off the committee it has improved and it is really a deserving committee.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. May I invite the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] was a distinguished chairman of that committee in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. SABATH. I realize that. As I say, I do not have time to mention them all. I fully appreciate his activities as chairman of that committee and I know the House is familiar with his splendid work.

Now let me speak with reference to pursuing a policy which generally is known as penny-wise and pound-foolish. We spent over \$1,000,000 on the Hoover Commission and I have not heard anybody complain about that. They have done splendid work in some respects. The entire amount approved for these committees to investigate conditions abroad I do not think amounts to more than ten to fifteen thousand dollars. I cannot quite agree with the gentlemen who are shouting and clamoring and demanding economy. When millions and millions of dollars are asked for they vote for these sums without any information. I feel if they were properly informed in many instances they would not be so reckless with the taxpayers' money. The Committee on Rules refused to grant this authorization to the first two or three committees whose investigative resolutions came before it. A sincere effort was made to curb unnecessary junkets. Later, the committee was furnished with concrete evidence of the necessity for certain committees to go outside the United States to study matters concerning legislation within their jurisdictions vital to the best interests of our Nation and its industries. It was clearly shown before our committee that in order to properly investigate the newsprint situation, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would be required to go to Canada, the source of the great share of our newsprint and other paper stocks.

Most of you are aware of the fact that some nations which we have befriended and have done a great deal for, are discriminating against us on certain things which they produce or grow. I think it will be to our interest for a committee to investigate what is going on and to find out who is responsible for the conspiracy between the importers and the corporations which I have in mind which I shall not mention.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You spoke about the Hoover Commission and what it cost and the recommendations being good. Can you tell us why it is that not more of them have been adopted?

Mr. SABATH. Many of them have been adopted. Most unfortunately some of you gentlemen on that side opposed some of these reorganizations. If that had not been done those that were deserving of adoption would have been approved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FREE IMPORTATION OF TWINE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], who is absent because he is attending a very important conference with the Government departments, I report a privileged resolution (H. Res. 366, Rept. No. 786).

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 359) providing for the consideration of H. R. 1227, a bill to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1227) to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee

on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I conclude my brief remarks on this resolution I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 1227, which increases the authorization for the construction of experimental submarines. In 1947 we authorized, upon the request of the Defense Department, \$30,000,000. Later on we increased it to \$41,000,000. Now the Department maintains it is absolutely impossible to complete these submarines unless an additional \$9,000,000 is authorized.

Of course, some gentlemen say it is money wasted, that we are spending too much money. If the high prices, for which most of you on my left are responsible, had not taken place, this would not be necessary. General Marshall testified that because of the high cost of materials and production our national defense outlay for the current year would run over \$7,000,000,000 more than originally anticipated; not a few thousands or millions, but \$7,000,000,000 more. In this instance alone we are obliged to appropriate an additional \$9,000,000 to complete two submarines that are vitally necessary.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I notice the gentleman sort of blames that on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SABATH. What is the question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the demands by the Government itself for all these war materials, critical materials, has brought about the increased cost for this defense program?

Mr. SABATH. Well, it is absolutely necessary that we proceed with our defense. You cannot get manufacturers to produce without paying them; it requires money to pay for these necessary implements of war. I wish it would not be necessary. I for one would be thankful to God if we would not have to spend another dollar for defense preparation. But these are the conditions, and we want to preserve our independence, our freedom, and our liberty. That is the reason we are expending these large sums.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman know of anybody who is against this proposition?

Mr. SABATH. No one should be. No one can be, if he is a good American and has the interest of the country at heart.

There is 1 hour general debate on the resolution. I do not know whether the

gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], in view of the fact that he occupied 30 minutes on the other resolution, desires any time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like a few minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois explained, House Resolution 358 makes in order H. R. 1227, a bill from the Committee on Armed Services, which provides for the construction of experimental submarines, something that is most important to our national defense effort. I believe it will have the support of all Members of the House.

The rule was reported by unanimous vote in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cole].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's New York Times—August 2 issue—there appeared an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, one of the foremost, if not the foremost, military observers and writers in the country, which article I hereafter include as a part of my remarks. That article points out:

Navy-Marine Corps air participation in the largest joint training exercise in this country since the end of World War II has been canceled as a primary result of service differences about the system of air control to be employed.

The article goes on to explain that the cancellation represents "an indirect by-product of far broader service differences about the control of aviation assigned to the front-line support of ground troops."

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is long overdue for a full-scale investigation to be made of this question of close air support for Army troops. There have been so many rumors, so much statistical data circulated, so many dispatches from the front lines in Korea, so many allegations and insinuations on the pros and cons of this important matter that certainly it is evident that congressional intervention is now necessary if we are to perform effectively our constitutional responsibility of providing for the national defense.

I most sincerely hope that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will direct a thorough investigation of this problem, as was undertaken by the committee in the last session of the Eighty-first Congress but not carried through. There can be no doubt that there is very definite interservice antagonism and basic disagreement on this important problem, and the services have evidenced a clear inability to resolve the matter by themselves. In fact, there is serious disagreement within the Air Force itself. It is reported that Lieutenant General Quesada, the outstanding tactical air commander of World War II, has asked for retirement largely because of his disagreement with the policies of the Air Force which he feels to be vital and fundamental to our national defense, an attitude which I understand is shared by a great many younger officers within the Air Force.

Included in the problem are such questions as Army command over its own aviation, the design of the aircraft used for close air-support missions, the ground training and ground knowledge of the pilots flying aircraft giving close air support to Army units, the numbers of aircraft to be assigned for close air-support work, and many collateral problems relating to the institution of unification.

In the last war it took the first 3 years of combat to develop effective close air support for Army troops by the Air Corps. This was due to the Air Corps concentration on and near-hypnotism with the dual missions of air-to-air combat and the then overemphasized heavy bombardment mission, to the exclusion of tactical air support as an essential military operation. Then, after unification, the Army was deprived of its command over its own aircraft. Ever since, aviation problems of the Army have been the stepchild of the Air Force.

During this period, and for the past decade or longer, the United States Marine Corps has concentrated with the most extreme specialization on the development of close air-support aircraft and techniques which have won the praise of Army commanders here and in Korea. During the close of the last war this training paid off remarkably in the Pacific and today it is paying off in Korea, where Naval and Marine aircraft, even though the press does not reflect this fact, are providing half of the total air strikes daily in Korea.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any person with any reasonable familiarity with military problems that this close air-support question can never be successfully resolved until the ground commander is given full command over his airborne artillery in the same manner as he commands the use of his ground artillery. The situation is critical. It is producing today service animosities and a serious impairment of our national defense which must be checked before our national security is more seriously affected and the animosities reach more serious proportions.

One of two things must be done in the interest of a sound national defense structure. We must return close air support aviation to the Army and to that extent undo the excess of unification, for we went too far in unification in this field. The only other alternative that would make sound military sense would be to assign to the Marine Corps this close air support mission for the Army. The Marine Corps is the acknowledged specialist in this field today. They perform the same function for the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the field of amphibious operations and have won world-wide acclaim for the remarkable techniques and advancements they have made in this branch of military science. They have accomplished the same outstanding results in the field of close air support for ground troops and it would be not at all inconsistent with the spirit of the present Unification Act to assign this function to the Marine Corps as one of its missions under the law.

The most sensible thing to do would be to return to the Army all matters relat-

ing to the close tactical air support of ground troops but the other alternative I just mentioned should be thoroughly considered. This would leave to the United States Air Force its major missions of providing for the aerial defense of the United States, for strategic aviation, meaning heavy bombardment aviation, and leaving also to the Air Force the mission of achieving air mastery over battlefields in all-out war.

These assignments are large enough chores to occupy the full time and attention of the Air Force. Moreover, these are the things which the Air Force has the greatest interest in and always has had.

At all events this problem has reached such proportion, the world-wide dangers are so serious, the lives of our ground troops are so precious, that we can no longer permit the continuing wrangling and failure to grapple with this problem of close air support aviation for the Army. I hope and trust that Chairman VINSON will direct a full-scale investigation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article of Mr. Baldwin to which I have referred and which points out clearly the need for a congressional investigation, at the earliest possible time, in the field of close air support aviation in our national defense:

[From the New York Times of August 2, 1951]

NAVY AIR OUT OF WAR GAMES IN SERVICE RIFT OVER TACTICS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Navy-Marine Corps air participation in the largest joint training exercise in this country since the end of World War II has been canceled as a primary result of service differences about the system of air control to be employed.

The cancellation represents, according to informed sources, an indirect byproduct of far broader service differences about the control of aviation assigned to the front-line support of ground troops.

A major shift in the Army's top-level official attitude on this matter has occurred, these sources said, partly under pressure from the field and from Congress, since the Korean war started.

The Army now is asking for control of aviation assigned to close-support duties, and it wants the Air Force to provide a minimum of one close-support air group per Army division. Official sentiment, however, is still opposed to the suggestion, often voiced by Army officers in Korea, that the Army—like the Navy and Marines—should have its own Air Force.

The failure of Navy and Marine air squadrons to participate in the impending exercise is thus an interservice problem set in a far broader frame.

The maneuvers, scheduled this month on the Fort Bragg military reservation, near Fayetteville, N. C., will include three Army divisions and other ground troops totaling about 85,000 men, 400 Air Force planes, and 12,000 Air Force personnel, but the participation of several Navy and Marine squadrons, totaling more than 100 aircraft, was canceled.

None of the services or commanders concerned was willing to be quoted publicly, but it was learned yesterday that the fundamental reason for the cancellation—a year after the Korean war had demonstrated the necessity for interservice cooperation and for far more emphasis on close air support of ground troops—was agreement to disagree.

In effect, the Army—which wanted sizable Navy-Marine air participation—had desired a field demonstration to the troops engaged of the difference in concept and execution between the Air Force and Navy-Marine methods of close air support. The Air Force showed no enthusiasm for such a demonstration.

As planning for the maneuver progressed, the differences in concept between the Navy and Air Force—and, inferentially, between the Army and the Air Force—loomed larger and larger.

The Navy agreed willingly to put its planes under Air Force command, but argued that unless its system of communication and control from the ground was employed there would be no point in Navy-Marine participation. At a final conference of high commanders, there was agreement that the differences could not be resolved satisfactorily, at least on any level below the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Contributory factors in the Navy decision were: The postponement of the maneuvers from June to August, which complicated the Navy's operational schedule geared to a shift in August of ships and planes assigned to the Mediterranean; the fact that the planned Air Force participation already would have utilized most of the fields available in the Fort Bragg area and most of the time available for training, therefore Navy participation would have been partly at the expense of training time for the Air Force; the Navy-Air Force agreement that the Army was not well prepared in trained personnel or equipment for ground-air maneuvers; the Navy's reluctance to become involved as a "cat's-paw" in Army-Air Force differences.

REFLECTS LARGER RIFTS

The cancellation of Navy-Marine participation reflects the larger service differences about air support for ground troops. During World War II, the Air Force—then the Army Air Forces—which was slowly winning its fight for autonomy, insisted that air and ground were coequal—even when fighters, fighter bombers and light bombers were "intervening" in the ground battle. The Air Force then opposed the term "air support" and used, instead, air-ground coordination. The air commander was not under, but was co-equal with, the ground commander, and the two "cooperated" and "coordinated." These concepts were incorporated in a then famous field manual—FM 100-20, published in 1943, which was the Air Force's "Declaration of Independence." This manual stated in its opening sentence:

"Land power and air power are coequal and interdependent forces: Neither is an auxiliary of the other."

The manual defined as a third priority task "to participate in a combined effort of the air and ground forces, in the battle area, to gain objectives on the immediate front of the ground forces."

Higher priorities of the tactical air force were defined as the winning of air superiority and the severance far behind the enemy front of enemy supply lines.

The field manual stated that "missions against hostile units (enemy ground units in the front line) are most difficult to control, are most expensive and are, in general, least effective."

WARTIME CONCLUSIONS DIFFER

The Army, particularly in Europe, seemed well satisfied with this system during World War II, although there were intermittent criticisms, and General of the Army Omar N. Bradley in his recent book, *A Soldier's Story*, was caustically critical of lack of air-ground training prior to the Normandy invasion and of some of the air mistakes made in Normandy.

But in the Pacific, where Army ground units compared Army Air Force methods

with Navy and Marine close support, different conclusions were drawn. A famous report by the Army Air Force Evaluation Board of the Pacific Ocean Area, headed by then Brig. Gen. Martin F. Scanlon of the Air Force, compared Navy-Marine air support with that of the Air Force in the Pacific, and took fundamental issue with some of the statements in Field Manual 100-20. This report, written during the war, was suppressed and most of the copies destroyed. General Scanlon commented that—

"(1) Close air support of infantry—'close' means within 200 yards of front-line troops—is very effective and desirable as executed by naval air.

"(2) Support as rendered by Army Air Force is not effective in assisting the advance of the infantry and may be detrimental."

In effect, many of the comments in this report are still germane today since they epitomize the major differences between the services about air support.

These differences have been accentuated by experience of the Korean war, and the Army has made a major shift in its position, as formerly expressed in Field Manual 100-20, during the last year.

COMMAND FROM THE GROUND

The record of Marine and Navy pilots in support of the Tenth Corps in the Inchon operation so impressed Maj. Gen. Edward N. Almond, then corps commander, that he had the Marines stage a close-out support demonstration for the Seventh (Army) Division, the same type of maneuver that had been planned for Fort Bragg.

In the Inchon operation and later on the Korean east coast in the fighting centered around Hamhung the Tenth Corps was operating independently and Marines and Navy fliers provided direct support for ground Marines with what the Army thought was excellent results. Marine pilots, trained in ground tactics, as well as in air tactics, were assigned to the division as air controllers—down to battalion level—for about a year of duty.

Control was exercised from the ground, and the controllers knew the pilots and had trained with them. Command over ground and air was exercised by one man from the ground; ground and air had trained together, and close support was a primary mission for the Marine fliers, not a third priority one.

Since the Tenth Corps was merged into the Eighth Army last January, Marine air in Korea has been pooled with Air Force air, and Marine planes today may or may not support the Marine ground aviation.

The Marine ground troops have been far from satisfied with the results. There have been longer delays, reports from Korea indicate, in getting "air strikes," and there has been a constant problem in adjusting the Marine concept of close air support to the Air Force system.

As a result of Korea, Army opinion, which had been worried during recent years about the type of air support it was receiving, has crystallized and is urging a fundamental change in concepts.

Nearly all Army observers who have studied Korea are unanimous in their praise of the Air Force for the high type of air support, but the system usually is compared unfavorably with the Marine and Navy system. Although the Korean air support has been excellent, the Army admits, it has not been excellent enough.

ARMY SEEKS CONTROL

The Army wants more ground-air training, a greater voice in the design of planes intended for close-ground support—which, it feels, should be designed primarily for this mission—air controllers better trained in ground tactics, and above all, operational control of planes assigned to close ground

support. Although it never has been officially announced, the Army has been urging officially ever since last fall that operational control, that is command, of close-support air units be exercised on an army and corps level—a major departure from coordination and cooperation.

Such a concept frankly recognizes the subordination of the air units assigned to close support to the ground mission, and would mean a tacit recognition of the controversial principle—long debated between the services—that each commander should get the tools he needs to do his job.

The Air Force has not agreed to any such major change, as yet, and the agreement to disagree about the Navy-Marine participation in the Fort Bragg maneuvers indicates it is not likely to do so quickly.

There have been, however, some changes in the World War II attitude of the Air Force since it achieved its autonomy under the Unification Act. It is no longer so sensitive about terminology; it now uses the term "close support," instead of insisting upon such terms as "air-ground coordination," or "combined operations." It still feels, however, that its concept of cooperation with the ground forces instead of command by the ground forces is sound.

The Air Force holds the Marine-Navy method may be suitable for small units, like divisions, and for the specialized circumstances of an amphibious landing, but is not suitable for support of large land armies. Such a system would parcel out air power and destroy its mass impact, and would be inordinately expensive in numbers of planes required, the Air Force holds. Concentration and flexibility would be lost, the Air Force believes.

High-ranking Army opinion, while disagreeing with the Air Force on other points, contends that the Marines have too many planes in proportion to the number of their ground troops.

A FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE

Thus, many of the differences between the services about air support are differences in degree and in training. Fundamental, however, is the Air Force belief—not shared by the other services—that close air support is the least effective and most wasteful way of using air power, and the Air Force contention—never shared by the Navy or Marines and now challenged by the Army—that its close-support planes must cooperate and coordinate with the ground troops and not be subordinated to them.

These differing concepts obviously are far broader than their byproducts—the failure to reach a meeting of minds that would permit Navy-Marine participation in the Fort Bragg maneuvers. They must be settled at the Joint Chiefs of Staff level, all services agree, and not in the field.

The command relationships between the Army and Air Force in the field have been, in general, governed by the philosophy of the wartime field manual—the now famous FM 100-20—and in more detail recently by explicit agreements between the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army, began urging a change in some of these agreements last year, the net effect of which would be to give the Army far greater control and authority over aviation assigned to its support. His requests, including the assignment in combat of air units to Army operational command, are still under study, and no final decision has been achieved. They represent some of the large number of unfinished interservice problems still pending in the Pentagon.

In the meantime, "Exercise Southern Pine," as the Fort Bragg maneuvers are called, will be held on schedule in the Fort Bragg-Camp Mackall area of North Carolina from August 13 to 28. Emphasis will

be placed on large-scale offensive and defensive operations, on night tactics, on airborne operations and on close tactical air support, the Defense Department announced.

A CLIMAX TO TRAINING

For two divisions involved, the Twenty-eighth (Pennsylvania National Guard), and Forty-third (New England National Guard), the maneuvers will be a climax to their training prior to their scheduled departure for Germany in the fall.

The Eighty-second Airborne Division, the Five Hundred and Eleventh Airborne Regimental Combat Team and the Third Cavalry Regiment are other ground units participating. The Ninth Air Force with four fighter-bomber wings, a tactical reconnaissance wing and a bombardment squadron, and a troop-carrier command with six troop-carrier wings are included in the Air Force components.

The troops will be divided into United States forces, composed of the three divisions; the VII Corps, commanded by Maj. Gen. W. A. Burress; the Third Field Army, Lieut. Gen. John W. Leonard; and Three Hundred and First Logistical Command, Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, and an "Aggressor Force" of "enemy," headed by Maj. Gen. Henry J. D. Meyer.

The maneuver director is Lieut. Gen. John R. Hodge, commanding general of the Third Army, with Maj. Gen. W. R. Wolfenbarger, commanding general of the Ninth Air Force as his deputy.

The supervising headquarters, which made the general plans for the war games, were: Army Field Forces, Gen. Mark W. Clark; and Headquarters, Tactical Air Command, Lieut. Gen. John K. Cannon. The Navy's Atlantic Fleet, commanded by Admiral William M. Fechteler, was planning Navy-Marine participation until the cancellation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that approximately half of the strikes that are being flown in the Korean war are flown by Marine and Navy pilots?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the information which I have.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Has that fact been reflected in the budgetary considerations involving money to be made available for naval aviation and the Marine Corps?

Mr. COLE of New York. From the reports I have read in the press and otherwise, naval aviation is being denied its full share of public funds for air power.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. May I ask the gentleman where he got those figures of 50 percent?

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not at liberty to tell the gentleman where I got the figures.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have seen figures myself indicating it is more like 15 percent, provided by the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. COLE of New York. That may be so if the Air Force takes credit for Marine aviation. I have seen those figures which cut naval aviation down to 15 percent, but in those figures the Air Force takes credit for the Marine strikes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. May I say that last December in North Korea, if it were not for the First Marine Air Wing, we never would have gotten out, and I will state further, it was the consensus of opinion of the ground officers that you need one fighter per infantry battalion if you are going to do a job against the personnel of the Reds.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman's observation on this problem carries special weight in view of his experience in that field.

(Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to include in his remarks an article to which he referred.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I followed very closely the remarks of my colleague who sits with me on the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], relative to some of the difficulties now existing within the Department of Defense in relation to unification effort. I would like to call to the attention of the House an AP release dated yesterday. I desire to quote exactly what came over the wire. This is information I feel the House should have in view of the fact that I believe we should all know how confused things are within the Department of Defense:

WASHINGTON.—The link between the State Department and the Pentagon's military chiefs appears to have become so direct it even bypasses some of the civilian secretaries of the armed services.

This situation differs considerably from that during the pre-Korean war days of sharp policy wrangles.

The reason for the change seems to be in the unique position held by George C. Marshall, a five-star general in mufti. He is Secretary of Defense. He was Secretary of State. Congress made special dispensation to allow Marshall, a soldier, to be named to the post of Defense Secretary. The National Security Act says the Defense Secretary must be a civilian and must have been one for 10 years preceding appointment. Marshall doffed his uniform in 1945, but under terms of the law creating five-star rank he remains a general of the Army.

Marshall gives major attention to the military side of Pentagon affairs. The house-keeping duties fall chiefly to Deputy Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett, a financier who has become something of the business manager for the Defense Department, and to the civilian heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Against this background, the Pentagon learned of this incident:

The first word Air Secretary Thomas K. Finletter had of the late Admiral Forrest Sherman's mission to Spain to negotiate for air and naval bases was when he read newspaper accounts on the day Sherman arrived in Madrid.

The explanation given to a reporter who made inquiry in the Department of the Air Force was that Sherman's was a military mission and therefore there was no urgent reason why Finletter, the civilian head of the Department, should have been informed in advance. Sherman, it was explained, was on a mission for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was a statesman and a man skilled in geopolitics.

Members, I wonder who knows what is really going on in the Pentagon. If the civilian heads of the various departments of defense are not aware of what the Joint Chiefs of Staff are doing, how can Congress possibly know the truth on vital matters of defense.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S RECORD DISPROVES ADMINISTRATION BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY CLAIMS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in his address at Tullahoma, Tenn., June 25, President Truman asserted that "we have had a bipartisan foreign policy in this country since Pearl Harbor."

The President added: "I would like to keep it that way. I know a great many Republicans who want to keep it that way, too." But, Mr. Truman charged, there are some people in this country who are engaging in "sordid efforts to make political gains by stirring up fear and distrust about our foreign policy."

Subsequently, an administration follower recently appointed to a high position in Government, in an article entitled "We Miss Vandenberg," published in the July 191, United Nations World, had this to say:

The impact of Senator Vandenberg's death on the basic political alignment in the United States, especially as it relates to foreign policy, is more profound than appears to be generally realized.

The wreck of the unpartisan approach, which Michigan's Republican statesman fashioned with Democratic Presidents, is all but complete. Politics no longer stops at the water's edge.

The internationalist wing of the GOP has able men, but they are submerged. The group in his party whose instincts were not in harmony with what Vandenberg was trying to do, but who were cautious in resisting because of his great personal prestige, are now dominant and almost unchallenged in Capitol Hill's minority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is talking about a Member of the other body in violation of the rules.

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

The SPEAKER. There are two points of order pending. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SHAFER. I will withdraw the objectionable words and take care of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order. His

correction should take care of the situation.

Mr. SHAFER. I will try to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

Of course, the gentleman from Michigan knows the kind of feelings the present occupant of the chair has for him. However, we must be very careful now and in the future, as we have in the past, not to refer to actions in the other body or to the membership of the other body or what was said in the other body, for it is clearly a violation of the rules.

The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the rules, is it improper to refer to a former Member of the other body?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, as the Chair understood it, was referring to a present Member of the Senate.

Mr. SHAFER. I will withdraw the objectionable statements.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. SHAFER. However, I do feel that I am entitled to talk about a former Member, a very distinguished Senator from the State of Michigan.

Although this statement, and that of President Truman in his Tullahoma address, differ on the significant detail of whether the so-called bipartisan foreign policy is still alive and operative, the comments of Mr. Truman and the appointed junior Senator from Michigan have certain fundamental characteristics in common.

The statements reflect a studied administration effort to conjure up in the public mind an idealized, mythical picture of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

The statements involve claims, stated and implied, with respect to that so-called bipartisan foreign policy, administration adherence and devotion to that policy, and Senator Vandenberg's concept of the policy and estimate of its scope and success—which claims are not substantiated by the facts or the record.

It is all too obvious that the administration is seeking to use for its own purposes the aura attached in the public mind to the so-called bipartisan foreign policy and to the sincere efforts of the lamented Michigan Senator. It is obvious that the administration is seeking to use its fictionalized, idealized version of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy as a defense for its own blunders in the field of foreign policy, as a weapon of attack upon the criticism and the critics of those blunderings, and as a sales argument for acceptance, with minimum questioning and debate, of its demands for more money and more power.

Aside from the not unimportant consideration of historical accuracy, there

are present and very practical needs for setting and keeping the record straight.

It is imperative that the administration record on foreign policy be required to face the bar of public opinion and judgment without the false cloak of alleged bipartisanism where no bipartisanism existed.

It is imperative that current issues and proposals relating to foreign policy, and particularly relating to further demands upon American resources, be weighed strictly on their merits and by the standards of enlightened American self-interest, and not by an arbitrary administration definition of loyalty to the country and to alleged bipartisanism.

It is imperative that certain basic principles and basic warnings repeatedly offered by Senator Vandenberg be vigorously reaffirmed—principles and warnings totally ignored by those who so glibly invoke his name and his supposed blessing.

Finally, it is imperative that there be asserted and maintained, against administration demands for bipartisanism by acquiescence, the selfsame right and duty of vigorous debate and controversy and outspoken criticism with respect to foreign-policy issues which Senator Vandenberg himself proclaimed and practiced as an integral part of his conception of bipartisan foreign policy.

Apparently the administration has forgotten that Senator Vandenberg, though unhappily no longer with us, is still able to defend himself through the record of what he said and did in connection with the so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

Now administration followers in Michigan are seeking to claim the "bipartisan role and mantle" of the late Senator Vandenberg. They are attempting to distort the Vandenberg record on that subject and to espouse bipartisanism in the hope of capturing the vote of independents and Vandenberg admirers in Michigan.

Senator Vandenberg has left his own clear record on that subject, and I am going to insist that this record—the full record—be made known to the Nation and to the voters of Michigan.

First of all, the record as left us by Senator Vandenberg flatly contradicts the claims, stated and implied, that we have at any time had anything approaching an inclusive bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I shall draw on the addresses and public statements of Senator Vandenberg to show that he repeatedly asserted the very limited scope of the so-called bipartisan policy, that he repeatedly asserted it did not apply to China and far-eastern policy, that he repeatedly repudiated the administration's far-eastern policies—the policies which contributed so largely to the very foreign relations debacle which the President and his adherents now attempt sanctimoniously to cloak in the folds of Senator Vandenberg's bipartisanism.

In an address before the Cleveland Foreign Affairs Forum at Cleveland, Ohio, January 11, 1947, Senator Vandenberg clearly indicated that bipartisanism, up to that point, had been lim-

ited to United Nations affairs and the European peace settlement, and he as clearly invited its extension to far-eastern matters. He said, in part:

As a junior partner I have worked with Secretary Byrnes on what is called a bipartisan foreign policy in the United Nations and in planning European peace. It would be more significant to say we have sought a united American foreign policy so that, despite some inevitable dissidence at home, America could enjoy abroad the enhanced authority of a substantially united front. I dare to believe that, despite some distressing domestic interludes, it has borne rich fruits.

After extensive discussion of accomplishments in the field of United Nations affairs and European peace planning under this so-called bipartisan foreign policy, Senator Vandenberg turned to the Far East and to the question of China policy in particular, saying of the latter that "there will never be a minute when China's destiny is not of acute concern to the United States and to a healthy world."

Then commenting on recent developments in China, Senator Vandenberg said:

While recognizing the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek, we have—through a year's mission headed by our distinguished General Marshall—been impartially urging that it produce unity with a rival armed party—the Chinese Communists. Under the determined leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, a national assembly has just produced a new constitution and the government has been reorganized with a coalition of non-Communist parties. We can hope that this Nanking charter, with its first great national election promised before next Christmas, will weld together a strong and competent China. It is my own view that our far eastern policy might well now shift its emphasis. While still recommending unity, it might well encourage those who have so heroically set their feet upon this road, and discourage those who make the road precarious. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 1, pp. 272, 274.)

Neither the implications of this counsel nor the clear character of this invitation to extend the policy of bipartisan consultation and treatment to the Chinese problem can be missed. Senator Vandenberg's subsequent statements, cited hereafter, show with equal clarity how completely the counsel and the invitation were spurned by an administration which now hypocritically and falsely alleges that "we have had a bipartisan foreign policy in this country since Pearl Harbor," and that professes so greatly to "miss Vandenberg."

The administration's partisan efforts to invoke the name and prestige of Arthur Vandenberg in the hope of accomplishing its ends are not new.

Speaking on the floor of the Senate on March 18, 1947, Senator Vandenberg vigorously protested what he described as "the letter and statement released last night by the executive director of the Democratic National Committee, calling upon the chairman of the Republican National Committee to join in a party statement endorsing the so-called Truman policy in Greece and Turkey. Senator Vandenberg charged that "the Democratic chairman repeatedly used my name in his letter and statement without my knowledge."

Continuing, Senator Vandenberg said:

It is unavoidable that I should speak plainly as a result. * * *

Bipartisan foreign policy is not the result of political coercion but of nonpolitical conviction. I never have even pretended to speak for my party in my foreign-policy activities. I have relied upon the validity of my actions to command whatever support they may deserve. * * *

It also is necessary, now, to get the record straight.

That necessity, obviously, did not originate with President Truman's claims in his Tullahoma, Tenn., address on June 25, 1951, or with the outgivings of the junior Senator from Michigan.

This bipartisan foreign policy has been confined within relatively narrow limits. It has applied to the United Nations. It has applied to peace treaties in Europe. It has applied to nothing else. I have had nothing to do, for example, with China policies or pan-American policies except within the United Nations, and at times I have been satisfied with neither. The first I heard of the Greco-Turkish policy was when the President disclosed his thoughts 10 days ago at the White House. I do not complain. But I do not propose to be misunderstood.

I have said that we have no safe alternative but to uphold the President's hands in this dangerous hour. But I have also said that total information must be made available to Congress and the country, and that Congress must completely explore and approve the means by which the President's policy is to be implemented. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 2, p. 2167.)

During subsequent debate in the Senate on the Greco-Turkish aid program, Senator Vandenberg said on April 16, 1947:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] knows perfectly well that I have stated publicly that I have been highly critical of the State Department's policy heretofore in China, because it has looked toward the creation of a coalition with Communists, and in my opinion no Communist ever entered a coalition with any purpose except to destroy it. Therefore, in that aspect, I have not been in step with some phases of the China policy during the last year or two.

Bear in mind, if you please, that for saying as much in 1951 about the tragic, blundering, catastrophic China policy—which in 1947 was in the hands of the present Secretary of State—for saying as much in 1951 about the China policy as Senator Vandenberg said in 1947, Americans are denounced by President Truman in his Tullahoma speech for engaging in "sordid efforts to make political gains by stirring up fear and distrust about our foreign policy."

Was not Senator Vandenberg, in 1947 and in the year or two preceding, trying to stir up fear and distrust about our China policy because he believed it wrong and because he believed that it jeopardized American interests?

No such denunciation of Senator Vandenberg was forthcoming from Mr. Truman in 1947. Mr. Truman was finding Senator Vandenberg and Senator Vandenberg's sincere bipartisanism most useful to him in support of his Greco-Turkish aid program. So instead of denouncing Senator Vandenberg for his criticism of the China policy, President Truman merely ignored the criticism and ignored the tremendously important counsel which Senator Vandenberg

offered—at what cost we are now beginning to understand. President Truman ignored Senator Vandenberg's criticism and counsel and left the China policy in the area of foreign policy decisions and operations outside the scope of bipartisanism.

In this instance, how much better it might have been for this Nation and for the nations now jeopardized by Red China if Senator Vandenberg had been damned rather than ignored by the President—even at the peril of jeopardizing the fragmentary bipartisanism then existing. At least there might have been a showdown before it was too late.

In this same debate, on April 16, 1947, Senator Vandenberg went on to repeat what he had previously said about the limited character of bipartisanism.

After commenting on the Marshall mission to China and adding that "the answer apparently is that General Marshall's errand did not succeed," Senator Vandenberg expressed the view that "our great hope in China would be for success for the Generalissimo in enlarging and liberalizing his own nationalist government against the armed Communists." He then continued:

What the policy of the State Department is I am unable to testify. There is a considerable amount of misunderstanding about the so-called bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I have tried to make that plain on several occasions. It is very narrowly channelled within very specific things; namely, the minor peace treaties in Europe and the activities of the United Nations.

I have never been consulted about the Chinese policy or the pan-American policy or many other policies, and I am not in a position to be an expert witness. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, p. 3474.)

On November 24, 1947, during debate on the interim European aid program, Senator Vandenberg said:

I have had many conversations on the subject (the importance of China in our consideration) with the Secretary of State.

But he added:

I do not believe that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been consulted in any substantial degree regarding Asiatic policy during the past year or two. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 9, p. 10708.)

On December 15, 1947, during debate on the conference report on interim aid to Europe, Senator Vandenberg said:

The Senator from Michigan has for some time been out of harmony with our official attitude toward China. He has repeatedly urged a different attitude. He welcomed the fact that the Secretary of State, in presenting his plan for interim relief, added a prospectus in behalf of China. A prospectus is at least something more encouraging than what we have had up to date. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 9, p. 11351.)

In the debate on the aid to China bill, March 30, 1948, Senator Vandenberg recognized the handicap placed on the Nationalist Government by the Communist rebellion and emphasized that China's independence must be maintained as a prerequisite to reforms within China, however urgently those reforms were needed, a view contradictory to that of the State Department and the administration, which held that the reforms must be a prerequisite to

American aid. Senator Vandenberg said:

The victory against the Axis, however, did not end her (China's) grueling jeopardy. The fruits of victory turned to ashes on her lips. She has since been riven by civil war in which her government has been under constant and powerful attack by armed Chinese Communists—a major victim of that conspiracy of aggression which undermines the peace of this unhappy earth. * * * But it would be a cruel distortion of paramount facts to subordinate the central purpose of this legislation to an over-emphasis upon the difficulties and the handicaps which the Nationalist Government must overcome in these respects. * * * The preservation of China's independence is prerequisite to the preservation or attainment of everything else. Liberty is prerequisite to progress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 3, pp. 3667, 3668.)

Subsequent comments by Senator Vandenberg on the China policy clearly shows that by his own estimate this counsel was not heeded. Bipartisanism, invited over and over again by Senator Vandenberg in this crucial area of foreign policy, was not extended to that area. And, as Senator Vandenberg himself pointed out, the initiative for such an extension of bipartisanism rested with the administration since "the Constitution places in the President the primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs."—Senator Vandenberg, June 11, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7800.

But let us continue Senator Vandenberg's testimony on the matter of the absence of bipartisanism in the very geographical and foreign policy area which finally yielded outright Communist aggression.

On June 24, 1949, Senator Vandenberg rose on the floor of the Senate to explain why he had answered "present" in the Committee on Foreign Relations when the vote was taken on confirmation of W. Walton Butterworth as Assistant Secretary of State. He said:

The senior Senator from Michigan did not wish, by his vote on the confirmation, to register any sort of a black mark against Mr. Butterworth himself.

On the other hand, the senior Senator from Michigan thought it was a very great mistake in public policy, in the appointment of a new assistant secretary in charge of far eastern affairs, in general, and in China in particular, not to bring a fresh point of view to the assignment, rather than simply to continue the regime which, for one reason or another, is inevitably connected with a very tragic failure of our policies in the Far East.

I interrupt myself at this point to observe that in these words Senator Vandenberg offers a guiding principle which ought to apply—and does apply—with infinitely greater force to the present Secretary of State. If there were a scintilla of sincerity in President Truman's professed desire for national unity in foreign policy and for anything approaching bipartisan consultation on foreign policy, he would recognize the urgent need for bringing to the administration and the Nation "a fresh point of view rather than simply—and stubbornly—to continue the regime which, for one reason or another, is inevitably connected with a very tragic failure of

our policies." In a word, if Mr. Truman had the respect for the counsel of Senator Vandenberg which he professes to have had he would remove Dean Gooderham Acheson as Secretary of State.

Continuing with Senator Vandenberg's statement regarding his stand on the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, I quote:

The senior Senator from Michigan continues to feel very deeply that our attitudes during the last few years in connection with the China policy have been often unfortunate, and certainly in net result unsuccessful. It seems to me the course of wisdom would have been to cut the string, so to speak, in the continuity of a policy that has failed; and without any reflection whatever on Mr. Butterworth himself, to have established a new and a fresh point of view to indicate at least that we are proposing an independent assessment of the new situation which we confront. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8293.)

The counsel, needless to say, was disregarded. Bipartisanship extended only as far as Mr. Truman wanted it to extend—only as far as it served his desires. That, in any respect, it served larger national interests, was only coincidental.

On that same day—June 24, 1949—during general debate on foreign policy, Senator Vandenberg engaged in the following colloquy with Senator BREWSTER:

MR. VANDENBERG. * * * During the past 8 years, certainly, there has been a clear disposition on the part of the Executive to work in far more intimate cooperation and liaison with his constitutional partners in the Congress in respect to foreign policy. From my point of view, it has paid very large dividends in the resultant relative unity with which the Voice of America could be heard abroad. * * *

The extent to which it can be pursued is largely dependent upon the initiative of the Executive because of the primary constitutional prerogative which he enjoys under the Constitution. But I feel that the record which I have recited, and the record to which the able Senator from Maine has referred, should recommend to the Executive the closest possible liaison in respect to foreign affairs.

MR. BREWSTER. Is it not necessary also to document the statement of the Senator from Michigan with the statement which he has previously made on the floor of the Senate, that, unfortunately—and perhaps tragically in the case of China—that same degree of consultation has not prevailed in the past few years?

MR. VANDENBERG. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. He has asked it before. On previous occasions I have categorically replied that there was no such liaison with respect to China policy. I wish to reiterate it, because I dissociate myself, as I have publicly done upon previous occasions, from the China policy which we pursued.

* * * Pursuing the theme which the Senator presents today in respect to China, I am quite willing to testify that I think the President and the State Department would do extremely well to continue the attitudes they have displayed so generously in other directions by making very sure that any evolution of a new policy in the Far East and China comes completely into contact and review, at least with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, before any commitments are concluded, because in this area we obviously face the conundrum of the ages. Yet it is a conundrum which has implications and repercussions of very dreadful importance to our country and our own people.

I say quite frankly that I hope, for example, that there will be no consideration of a recognition of a Communist government in China without complete preliminary contact and exploration of the subject with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8294.)

Here was not merely an invitation for an extension and broadening of bipartisan foreign policy, as Senator Vandenberg believed in and practice it, to include a heretofore neglected area; here was a plea for such an extension, a warning, and a virtual demand.

Here was a warning that the administration was dealing with "the conundrum of the ages"; that it was dealing with a conundrum which "has implications and repercussions of very dreadful importance to our own country and our own people." In the light of Korea, that is terribly prescient, ominously prophetic.

There was a warning to consult "before any commitments are concluded."

How completely the invitation, the plea, the warning, and the demand—made in the name and the spirit of bipartisanship—were disregarded, is all on the record in the State Department falsifications about Formosa; in the Acheson speech putting Korea outside the American defense perimeter; in the unconstitutional commitment of this Nation to war in Korea.

Yet the President of the United States dares to say, in the face of that record, and in the face of the invitations, pleas, and warnings of Arthur Vandenberg that "we have had a bipartisan foreign policy in this country since Pearl Harbor." And administration supporters now say, unctuously, that "we miss Vandenberg." Do they mean that the administration misses the opportunity to disregard further wise counsel—as it flagrantly disregarded that wise counsel when it was being offered in earnest, pleading eloquence? Do they mean that the administration misses the opportunity to capitalize on the so-called bipartisanship and on the prestige of Arthur Vandenberg when it served the administration's purposes to do so—otherwise ignoring or brushing aside both the bipartisanship and the prestige when it likewise served the administration's purposes to do so?

At the risk of tedium I quote two or three more statements by Senator Vandenberg regarding this yawning gap in bipartisan consultation through which the administration blundered to major disaster. Still quoting from the debate on June 24, 1949:

I have never felt, and I have always said that I did not feel, that the bipartisan foreign policy had been extended to China in any such degree or spirit as that in which it had been applied to the United Nations or to the operations under the United Nations, or to the Rio treaty, and in respect to similar matters. In other words, while we were given the very frank reports to which the Senator refers, I do not feel that the directives which controlled our China policy were ever the result of the type of consultation and cooperation which we were permitted to contribute and to exercise in connection with other policies. I feel the same way about the policies in Jerusalem. I do not feel that those policies were developed in the same bipartisan degree of consultation and cooperation, from their inception, that applied to

these other very great episodes and incidents in which we have had such complete, mutual bipartisan activity. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8296.)

In that connection I recall his caustic remark, on an earlier occasion, in connection with the fragmentary character of the bipartisanship sought or tolerated by the administration—a bipartisanship cut and tailored to administration desires—that "if we cannot be in on the take-off, we would just as soon not be present at the crash landing"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7800.

It was inevitable that this abridged form of bipartisanship, practiced by the administration despite the pleas and protests of the architect of bipartisanship they then—and now—profess to so greatly honor, should lead to major lapses as the situation worsened in the Far East. Such a major lapse occurred in connection with President Truman's announcement on January 5, 1950, that no military aid would be given to Nationalist China or Formosa. In one of his last public statements before he was incapacitated by the illness which terminated in his untimely death, Senator Vandenberg made plain his disappointment at the further brushing aside of bipartisanship by the administration:

I regret that the administration has found it necessary to announce conclusions regarding Formosa ahead of a realistic consultation on the subject with the appropriate committees of Congress. Like Yalta and Potsdam, and like many other unhappy chapters in China policy, congressional advice is precluded.

Never fail to recall that bitter indictment from the chief architect of bipartisanship—that indictment of the precluding of any congressional advice—whenever the present administration pontifically pays its hypocritical lip-service to bipartisanship or professes to grieve over the absence of Arthur Vandenberg's wise counsel and effective prestige in support of bipartisanship.

The truth is that there never was more than a fragmentary adherence to bipartisanship by the administration.

There was adherence to it by the administration only where and when it served the ends and objectives of the administration.

But I continue to read from Arthur Vandenberg's indictment of the crucial administration policy announcement regarding Formosa:

I regret that these conclusions also preclude the factual reports which have been anticipated from the Jessup mission and particularly from the Far East conference between our Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur. It is at least useful that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will explore the subject with Secretary Acheson next week because many critical decisions remain to be made.

Even this expectation was disappointed, as we shall presently see. I continue with Senator Vandenberg's statement on the January 5, 1950, Presidential pronouncement regarding Formosa:

Every practical discouragement to Communist conquest, short of active American military participation, should be pursued in

China and throughout the Far East, which must be totally encompassed in our comprehensive view.

Again, parenthetically, let it be noted how seriously this wise counsel was taken. It was exactly one week later that Secretary of State Acheson delivered his National Press Club speech, defining America's perimeter of defense in the Pacific and pointedly omitting Formosa. I am still reading from Senator Vandenberg's statement:

The rights of Formosans themselves must be consulted. The permanent status of Formosa must be recognized as dependent on the ultimate Japanese peace treaty. The vital interest of the United Nations must be recognized.

The Formosan question is presently clarified but it is not settled by today's executive statements. I withhold my discussion until the belated hearings next week. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 5, 1950.)

On January 11, after the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee with Secretary Acheson, Senator Vandenberg said on the Senate floor:

As I have said before, Mr. President, I do not wish to enter this debate until all the facts are available. My interest has been in the development of the facts.

In view of the now professed devotion of the administration to the bipartisan foreign policy, it is surprising to find that policy's principal exponent complaining for lack of information—information at the administration's command. But so the record stands for anyone to read. Senator Vandenberg continued:

I know nothing about the authenticity of the statement read by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

This was a reference to a press report that the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees had turned down a Republican request that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be called to give Senators a report on the strategic value of Formosa to America's far eastern defenses. Senator Vandenberg continued:

But in view of its purport, I must say, with the greatest respect to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, that so far as I am concerned, I cannot feel that I have obtained adequate information in respect to the facts, without the testimony of the Defense Establishment in general, and of the Secretary and of the Chiefs of Staff in particular. So far as I am concerned, I would consider that testimony to be not only pertinent but indispensable. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 11, 1950.)

That information, as we now know, was not forthcoming. Arthur Vandenberg, striving to secure facts, striving to secure consultation, striving, even at this late date—as he had done consistently for years—to give substance to bipartisanism in this critical area of foreign policy, fell victim to mortal illness.

And the administration, already involved in its official prevarication regarding the strategic importance of Formosa, determined to trust South Korea to the tender mercies of the Communists, smugly satisfied to keep its own counsels and go it alone in its decisions, spurning the wise advice and admonitions to caution from its best friend on the Republican side, went its nonbipar-

tisan, willful way down the road that led to unconstitutional involvement in war in Korea and to all of the other bitter developments and consequences that have left this Nation more completely confused and disunited on foreign policy than it ever was before the concept or term "bipartisan" were devised.

Yet the President of the United States, in this bitter and tragic year of 1951, has the unabashed boldness to proclaim that "We have had a bipartisan foreign policy in this country since Pearl Harbor" and to profess that "I would like to keep it that way."

And administration spokesmen now offer the maudlin observation, "We miss Vandenberg."

My second point regarding Senator Vandenberg's interpretation and concept of bipartisanism is almost superfluous. But it should be clearly stated that he always affirmed the proposition that bipartisanism did not preclude the right and the duty of debate, dissent, or even major controversy, as circumstances might warrant, so far as foreign policy is concerned. Senator Vandenberg's own record of valiant—though futile—protest, already so fulsomely quoted, thoroughly documents that premise and his faithful adherence to it.

Yet I offer a few more exhibits in support of that proposition.

In his January 11, 1947, address before the Cleveland Foreign Affairs Forum, he said:

In any event, partisan politics, for most of us, stopped at the water's edge. I hope they stay stopped—for the sake of America—regardless of what party is in power. This does not mean that we cannot have earnest, honest, even vehement domestic differences of opinion on foreign policy. It is no curb on free opinion or free speech. But it does mean that they should not root themselves in partisanship.

That was a noble concept. It involved the earnest conviction that foreign policy issues ought not to be exploited for partisan ends which put party interests ahead of the national interest. But this is a concept which required mutuality and reciprocity as between the two major parties. It is difficult, indeed, to believe that Arthur Vandenberg would insist, on the other hand, that when crucial issues of foreign policy and of competence in the administration of foreign policy have been created by the present administration's repudiation of bipartisanism, Americans or the Republican Party should refuse to be the medium for bringing those issues before the people for resolution and decision. Indeed, Arthur Vandenberg clearly stated his position on this point in an address at the University of Michigan on November 3, 1947, an address that neither Mr. Truman nor his followers quote with any degree of frequency:

Foreign policy is a legitimate subject of frank debate by our citizens. Foreign policy belongs to the people. It is a legitimate subject of partisan contest if there is deep division. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 13, p. A4176.)

Moreover, Senator Vandenberg insisted that the right of discussion of foreign policy was retained by Congress, even

under his concept of bipartisanism. In his colloquy with Senator BREWSTER on June 24, 1949, already quoted, he said:

In conclusion, I say to the Senator that I think any Senator who wishes to rise on the floor of the Senate and discuss any phase of foreign policy at any time is not only well within his own rights but he is entirely within a correct estimate of public duty. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8294.)

Moreover, Senator Vandenberg's own exercise of the right of debate and dissent was by no means limited to the far eastern area of foreign policy. It is important in these days when the President is intemperately and shrilly charging critics of administration foreign policy with sordid efforts to make political gains by stirring up fear and distrust about our foreign policy, when he is charging that people are being told that they cannot trust their Government—as though a political administration which has shown that it cannot be trusted were actually synonymous with the Government—it is important to recall how bitterly Senator Vandenberg condemned the administration when he felt that condemnation was merited.

It would be difficult, even for a conscience-smitten and hypersensitive administration, to find in the current denunciations any more damning indictment than that brought by Senator Vandenberg in a speech on the Senate floor September 20, 1949. Referring to a provision in the original State Department draft of the military assistance program bill, which was struck out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Senator Vandenberg said:

In other words, that proposal would have authorized the President to decide for himself what nations should be assisted, when that should be done, and how it should be done. It called for the virtual creation of a total world-wide war-lord power in the White House. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 10, p. 13044.)

Or consider his statement in the course of debate on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, June 14, 1948:

I have been shocked . . . to hear the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance assert that his committee was denied access to the hearings of the interdepartmental committee, upon whose recommendations the recent Geneva tariff agreements were written. If we have reached a point where Congress not only cannot ask for information, but is denied existing official information upon which final action is taken, the time certainly has come to look around for some new light-letting device. We cannot proceed indefinitely with our economy at the mercy of an iron curtain. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 6, p. 8050.)

Apparently the bipartisanism of Arthur Vandenberg was not without some distrust of what Mr. Truman arrogantly and incorrectly terms "the Government." His bipartisanism did not blind him to a grasp for "total world-wide war-lord power" for the White House, or to the administration habit of imposing "iron curtains"—both of which tendencies have been far more brazenly displayed in the unconstitutional involvement in the Korean war and in subsequent developments.

In the third place, let the President's current pious professions of devotion to bipartisanship, so far as foreign policy is concerned, be measured against the grossly partisan conduct of the President and of his associates in Congress during the 1948 presidential campaign and in the organization of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress.

I shall not assume to pass judgment on the discrepancy between profession and performance. I will leave that judgment and the justly stinging rebuke to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

You will recall that it was in this campaign that the President denounced the Republican Eightieth Congress as a "do-nothing" Congress and as the worst in history. And you will recall that, inflated by his victory gained through deception and basest ingratitude for administration foreign policy objectives gained in the Eightieth Congress, thanks to Senator Vandenberg, President Truman permitted a sharp juggling of party ratios on the vital Foreign Relations Committee of the other body.

Through this action by the Democratic conference of the other body, the ratio of seven Republicans to six Democrats maintained on the committee during the Republican Eightieth Congress, in the interest of bipartisanship, was changed to eight Democrats to five Republicans. Let Senator Vandenberg's unavailing denunciation of this sordid partisanship tell the rest of the story:

I cannot allow this occasion to pass without stating for the RECORD my very great disappointment that the Democratic conference has seen fit in this connection to take the first partisan action in opposition to the theory and spirit of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs which has prevailed in the past 2 years.

I do not question the right of my friends across the aisle to apply their percentage of membership, as they see fit, to any committee in the Senate. They had to make a voluntary choice as between committees in selecting those to which the more drastic penalty of curtailed minority membership should be applied, the penalty of reducing the minority membership to five members. I merely wish to express my profound regret that in the exercise of that discretion and in the operation of that purely voluntary will they choose the Committee on Foreign Relations as one of those upon which the minority side of the committee should be reduced to the maximum possible.

Mr. President, I repeat, I do not question their right to make this order . . . but I do question the wisdom of an act which is implicit with hostility, as it will be interpreted by this country, to the maintenance in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of an atmosphere in which partisan politics has not entered for one single second during the past 2 years.

When the maximum reduction in the Republican membership is deliberately applied to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, what is the implication? The implication must be that in connection with the Administration's foreign program for this year, Republican Senators are not quite trustworthy, and that there must be faithful partisan Democrats, to the maximum, put upon the committee for the sake of the national welfare. . . .

I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that upon 47 critical occasions in the Eightieth Congress, which in this aspect was not the worst Congress in history, the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding,

but was the best Congress in history, this committee voted 13 to 0 in behalf of the national welfare. Thus we denied any possibility that an alien enemy might think they could divide and conquer us.

Mr. President, I submit that that sort of a record invites and deserves a different treatment, a far different acknowledgment, than is accorded to the Republican side of the Chamber in the Democratic proposal to reduce the Republican membership upon this committee to the utter minimum. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 1, p. 61.)

The appeal fell on deaf ears. Drunk with victory and power, the majority party pushed its will through ruthlessly. That was a payoff for loyalty which would even have made a Boss Pendergast blush with shame. Yet even this bitter disillusionment could not persuade Arthur H. Vandenberg to deviate one degree from his conception of his duty to a principle which he regarded as serving the national interest in priority to partisan interest.

It is no petty vindictiveness which prompts me to urge that the American people—and the Republican Party—dissemble completely with the phony concept of bipartisanship in foreign policy which the President now so piously proclaims. Nor is it even righteous indignation, justified by the cheap and cruel treatment accorded Arthur Vandenberg that impels me to do so. The consideration which prompts me to urge that we disclaim completely the false pretense of bipartisanship is twofold: The demonstration, by the record, that this administration sees in the concept of bipartisan foreign policy only a device for partisan exploitation, and the further, and more compelling consideration that the blunderings, stupidity, confusion, and hopelessness of the so-called foreign policy of this administration require that it be made a major issue before the American people.

A final aspect of Arthur Vandenberg's adherence to the concept of bipartisanship has a special timeliness and a critical importance in view of the foreign aid projects which the administration is now pressing upon Congress.

I observe, in this connection, the false, glib, and characteristically ungracious comments made by the President in his Detroit address last Saturday:

There are a lot of people in this country, however, who are trying to shake our confidence in ourselves. . . . These people tell us we can't afford to build our defenses because it will cost too much. They say we will go bankrupt if we carry out our program. They say we will ruin our economy.

Of course, all these howls about bankruptcy are old stuff. We have heard them time and time again. Those who are saying we cannot afford our peace program and aid to our allies abroad are the very same ones who have been saying all along that we couldn't afford to do anything for the American people at home.

Well, Mr. President, "howls about bankruptcy" may be old stuff. Warnings about the danger of ruining our economy may be old stuff. You may have heard them, Mr. President, time and time again. It is obvious that you have not heeded them, and do not intend to heed them. But have you forgotten,

Mr. President, that these "howls about bankruptcy" came as frequently and insistently and persistently from Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg—the man who is "so greatly missed"—as from any one source? The President's words are rendered doubly ungracious by having been spoken in the State which Senator Vandenberg represented so long and in such distinguished fashion.

Let me cite the record—and these quotations are only a fraction of the warnings which Senator Vandenberg gave and reiterated during his vigorous espousal of bipartisanship.

In a statement June 13, 1947, relative to foreign aid, Senator Vandenberg said:

I endorse the importance of facing this problem on an over-all basis instead of dealing with unanticipated crises, one by one. I recognize that intelligent American self-interest demands that we meet the situation with vision and courage. But equally I recognize that intelligent American self-interest immediately requires a sound over-all inventory of our own resources to determine the latitudes within which we may consider these foreign needs. This comes first because if America ever sags, the world's hopes sag with her. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 6, pp. 7025-7026.)

In that connection Senator Vandenberg urged a bipartisan study to determine the Nation's resources and the Nation's capacities to assist. Compare that with the reckless and indiscriminate denunciations of those concerned for the Nation's economic stability spoken in Detroit Saturday.

In his address accepting the Freedom House award for 1948, Senator Vandenberg said:

I have spoken of the need for candor. This need equally exists at home. It also exists in dealing with our friends abroad.

* * * Our people need to confidently know that we use prudence—

What a strange, unfamiliar word these days—

that we use prudence in these matters as well as courage. There are limits to our resources. There are boundaries to our miracles. The fondest hope of our adversaries is that we shall defeat ourselves not only through disunity but through overexertion and through collapse from our own exhaustion. That suicide would be the greatest possible "disservice to a free world."

Those who count upon this sinister expectation are going to be disappointed. We shall match our ideals to our abilities. I remind you that Congress wrote this specific mandate into the Marshall plan.

It wrote another important mandate—and again candor, this time with our friends abroad, is elementary wisdom. It said that our cooperation under the Marshall plan shall be continuously contingent upon self-help and mutual aid among the 16 participating nations in Western Europe. That, too, means precisely what it says. Our overriding aim is not to contain Russia. Our purpose is not to Americanize Europe. Our objective is to return Europe to the Europeans—and take them off the dole. When this is done, our objective is to retire from a Europe which has reestablished itself. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 12, p. A75.)

What a mockery, I say it with no disrespect to the memory of Arthur Vandenberg, what a mockery administration projects of indefinitely extended aid to Europe and administration rebukes of

"howls about bankruptcy" make of this purpose and expectation expressed by Senator Vandenberg in 1948.

In his inaugural address on January 20, 1949, President Truman proposed his now-famous five-point international program. Following is Senator Vandenberg's comment:

I cannot pass judgment on the balance of his new aid programs until I know more concretely what he has in mind.

I suggest, however, that we perfect existing plans before starting any new ones. The President himself says there are limits to our resources. I underscore that warning. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 1, p. 1339.)

Obviously Mr. Truman, in Detroit, forgot even the professed admonition of caution he himself uttered in 1949.

In a Lincoln Day address in Detroit February 10, 1949, Senator Vandenberg had this to say:

The state of the Union is relatively good. But it could slide from pretty good to pretty bad if the administration should really try to do all the new things and raise all the new taxes necessary to meet all the new expenditures and to mobilize all the new bureaucrats required by all the new promises made in the recent Democratic blitz. You couldn't possibly pay for the recent Democratic national platform with a budget of less than \$60,000,000,000 a year; and you couldn't run that kind of a country except with all your economic freedoms in a strait-jacket. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 12, p. A733.)

Well?

During debate in the Senate on extension of the European recovery program, March 24, 1949, Senator Vandenberg said:

I think the Senator's [Mr. JENNER] very excellent statement is totally persuasive in its warning to every Member of the Congress that there is a limit to American resources, and that it is impossible for us to take on unlimited responsibilities and obligations. I remind . . . the Senator . . . that before ECA was ever projected, I happened to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I declined even to touch it until the President of the United States had appointed a special commission, representing the highest type of economic brains in the United States, to report upon what we could "wisely and safely"—those are the two quoted words—do in respect to a European recovery program, in view of the necessity for consulting our own permanent solvency.

To be sure, Senator Vandenberg warned of the infinitely greater price that we would pay if we failed to prevent a war when we could have prevented it. Yet, he did not offer this consideration as a justification for indifference to extravagance or to the dangers of insolvency. He said:

I have to agree with him [Senator JENNER] that this should be a time when we should undertake to cut every expenditure that can possibly be cut in the Government of the United States, for the sake of our own economy. . . .

Despite everything I have said in this colloquy, I would start with the proposition that an insolvent America would be the greatest disservice which we could render to the hopes of humankind for 20 centuries to come. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 3, pp. 3100, 3101.)

And to Senator JENNER's statement:

There is a limit to the bottom of the well of America's wealth and economic health—

Senator Vandenberg replied—

I underwrite that conclusion myself (p. 3101).

Addressing himself to foreign guests attending the dinner given by the Overseas Writers of Washington, September 15, 1949, Senator Vandenberg said in the principal speech of the evening:

No matter what our cooperative disposition or our self-interest, there are definite limits to the American resources which we can safely invest in foreign aid. Recognition of this fact is as important to you as it is to us because our unweakened strength is a common asset for us all. These limits must not and will not be overreached.

Even though this were not true, there are definite limits to the practical utility and wisdom of external aid because it must not drift into a permanent reliance. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 16, p. A5755.)

Finally, in his last communication on the subject of foreign aid, written March 24, 1950, to Economic Cooperation Administrator Paul G. Hoffman, in connection with the second anniversary of ECA, Senator Vandenberg offered this wise counsel in the light of the rapidly worsening far-eastern situation:

We confront increasingly obvious limitations upon the domestic resources which we can safely and wisely commit to over-all foreign aid. Furthermore, these resources can no longer ignore or minimize the impact of Communist aggression in the Far East. This is not your problem, but the problem of the Congress and the Executive. These are essential subjects for judicial congressional survey, in the same factual spirit which must continue to strive to put our country first in our considerations. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 27, 1950.)

Let me briefly sum up the facts and the record.

The hope which Senator Vandenberg entertained, and to which he devoted his energies, is expressed in these words from his address at the University of Michigan, November 3, 1947:

I raise the fervent prayer that we may ever strive for an unpartisan American foreign policy—not Republican, not Democratic, but American—which substantially unites our people at the water's edge in behalf of peace with justice and liberty under law. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 13, p. A4176.)

The record—based on Senator Vandenberg's own repeated testimony—discloses that the actual scope of this so-called bipartisan foreign policy was very limited, that it did not apply to China and far-eastern policy despite Vandenberg's persistent effort to secure its application to this area of foreign policy, and that Senator Vandenberg repeatedly repudiated administration policy in this area.

The record—based on Senator Vandenberg's own testimony—is that this administration failure to accept an inclusive application of bipartisanship applied to those issues and developments which led directly to our unconstitutional involvement in Korea.

The record—based on Senator Vandenberg's repeated testimony and actions—is that he clearly and insistently affirmed that bipartisanship did not negate the right and duty of debate, dissent or even major controversy, and that foreign policy, in his view, is a legitimate subject of partisan contest if there is deep division.

The record—based on Senator Vandenberg's own testimony and indictment—is that the President and the Democratic leadership in Congress, completely violated and repudiated the letter and spirit of bipartisanship by their conduct during and following the 1948 presidential campaign.

The record, based on Senator Vandenberg's own repeated testimony, is that the concern for national solvency in connection with foreign aid, which concern now provokes the abusive tirades of the President of the United States, was constant and fundamental in Senator Vandenberg's concept and practice of bipartisanship.

In view of this record, I cannot share the aspirations of those who urge a "return" to a bipartisan foreign policy. What they propose is, in reality, a return to what, by the record, never existed on a broad and inclusive basis.

I believe it is our responsibility, as Americans and Republicans, instead to clarify and sharpen the critical issues which have been created by the administration bungling and blundering—with a view to a resolution of those issues by the voters.

Of course the administration will continue its attempts to brand this as "sordid efforts to make political gains by stirring up fear and distrust of our foreign policy." I believe, however, that this clarifying and sharpening of issues is the way in which the Republican Party can most effectively serve the American people.

I believe that it is our responsibility to take the lead in formulating a foreign policy which will represent the intelligent and enlightened national self-interest to which Senator Vandenberg was so earnestly dedicated.

I subscribe, wholeheartedly, to the two propositions Arthur Vandenberg stated so forcefully and succinctly:

Foreign policy is a legitimate subject of frank debate by our citizens. Foreign policy belongs to the people. It is a legitimate subject of partisan contest if there is a deep division.

And:

These are essential subjects of judicial congressional—

And I add, public—

survey, in the same factual spirit which must continue to strive to put our country first in our considerations.

As Americans and Republicans we will best serve the Nation by acceptance and firm adherence to these principles.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. I compliment the gentleman on the research he has made which serves to bring back in true perspective the history and policies of a really great American. I think the gentleman is to be complimented on the research he has done.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to this bill that I know of, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 1227, to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object—I know that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], as well as the Members of the House share my unqualified support for H. R. 1227 and remind him a review, though it be in generalities, of the tremendous defensive and offensive job done by our submarines in the last war, over and under the seas, will amply bespeak our readiness to provide the requirements of this measure.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 96, chap. 69), as amended by the act of August 8, 1949 (63 Stat. 577, chap. 405), is further amended by deleting "\$41,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$45,600,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$45,600,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as has been previously stated, this bill is not controversial. It is a measure for the construction of two experimental submarines.

Under an act passed in 1947, the Congress authorized the construction of two submarines at a maximum cost of \$30,000,000. When it was before the committee at that time it was not in the advanced planning stage. It came to the committee with no limitation. An ar-

bitrary limit of \$30,000,000 was placed using wartime cost and lacking detailed design data.

When it came into the advanced planning stage, they found they had a wealth of information which had been accumulated during the last World War, as well as other scientific information, obtained from subsequent research and it was, therefore, found necessary to request the Congress to raise the authorization. At that time the limitation was raised to \$45,600,000, based upon an estimate prepared prior to the Korean war.

The Navy Department came back to the committee and asked that that sum be raised to some \$48,130,000. They stated that these two submarines were to be the most advanced prototypes. They were to include all of the study and advance that their scientific research had made in undersurface warfare including the latest devices, weapons and equipment. The committee was unanimous in the feeling that the bill should be passed, and placed the limitation at \$50,000,000, in case there should be some fluctuation.

The necessity for this last increase is due to the fact that the Navy has made additional design changes, costing approximately \$3,270,000. In order to accelerate the program, as time is a vital element, there will be an increase of \$2,140,000. Since April 1949 they have experienced a 12-percent increase in the cost of shipbuilding material and a 4.7 increase in the cost of shipbuilding labor. This has resulted in an increase in the estimated material and labor cost of approximately \$1,520,000, bringing the total to approximately \$48,130,000.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I want to congratulate the gentleman on having introduced this bill. I think he agrees with all of us that the money which we spend for research in this particular field pays dividends in lives saved.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman. That is particularly true in the submarine field. It is hoped that these two submarines coming out as prototypes will be of immeasurable help both as a contribution to immediate defense, but also as a basis for further development in this field.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would remind the gentleman that a great deal of the experimental work being carried on at this time is carried on in the district which I have the honor to represent. The job speaks well for the skill and the intelligence of all those who participated in this program.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I also want to congratulate my colleague from Maryland on the introduction of this bill and to state that in the years the gentle-

man from Maryland has served in this body, during which we have both served together, the people of the gentleman's district are justified in being proud not only of the ability and the constructive work he has done, but also of the courageous leadership and representation the gentleman has always given the people of his district and the country.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank my majority leader.

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

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the acting chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman also. This is a very important bill, in my judgment. We hope that out of this program of constructing these prototype submarines we can get a submarine far better than anything that at present exists in the world. Should that be accomplished it would be money well spent. I would like to compliment the gentleman for bringing the bill here to us today.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank my friend from Louisiana. As the gentleman from Louisiana just stated, that is the primary purpose of the bill. It is work in a very important field.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in the Japan peace-draft treaty that is liable to be extremely dangerous to the international security of the United States.

The State Department has announced that the peace conference with Japan will be held at San Francisco beginning on September 4. It will be attended by some 50 nations, most of whom were nominally only at war with Japan. China, which fought Japan even before the United States went in the war, is not invited to attend the San Francisco Peace Conference.

The draft of the peace treaty is the work of Mr. John Foster Dulles, special assistant to Secretary of State Dean Acheson. It has been submitted to different countries for comments and recommendations. So far the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, and India have sent in protests and proposals which would alter basically some of the outstanding features of the treaty.

Nationalist China, under President Chiang Kai-shek, protested against her noninvitation to the peace conference. Soviet Russia, as is her wont, although invited, is putting up all sorts of difficulties and technicalities against the treaty, but the conference will go on without Soviet Russia's presence.

The draft treaty is long and complicated. An able lawyer and experienced diplomat, Mr. Dulles, helped by his deputy, Mr. John M. Allison, has produced a generally satisfactory draft as the basis of discussion. They deserve commendation and congratulation.

A point was raised in an article which appeared in the Washington Post by Mr.

Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, writer, and economist, that deserves close study because it involves the strategic and political position of the United States in the entire Pacific Ocean area. The point revolves around the draft treaty provision which empowers Japan to select which China, Nationalist or Communist, with which to enter into her treaty of peace.

That provision looks simple and innocent enough, but if thought through to its logical conclusion will be found to have the most unexpected result that would be adverse to the best interests of the United States and other free countries in Asia.

Here is how the situation will shape up as depicted by Mr. Villamin. It is expected that Japan will select Communist China with which to negotiate her treaty of peace because she controls most of the Chinese territory and Japan wants to start trading with her. The countries like Britain, India, Russia, and her satellite countries which have recognized Communist China would want Japan to enter that treaty with Communist China. The United Nations still recognizes Nationalist China as the legitimate government of China.

What will happen when Japan negotiates her peace treaty with Communist China? The answer is it will put Nationalist China out of the picture. Communist China will gain more prestige and soon she will take the place of Nationalist China in the United Nations. When that happens, then Formosa, which is now occupied by Nationalist China under President Chiang Kai-shek, will have to be turned over to Communist China under the Cairo Declaration of 1943.

Now what will happen? We are helping Chiang now to keep Formosa from falling into the hands of the Communists. Gen. Douglas MacArthur stated that Formosa is strategically vital to us because if the Communists got it, eventually and soon our line of defense in the Pacific will be pushed back from the western shore of the Pacific Ocean to our own Pacific coast—Washington, Oregon, and California. The Joint Chiefs of Staff declared also that Formosa must be held against the Communists at any cost. And now even Secretary Acheson agrees with that. President Truman favors strongly holding Formosa. In other words, there is unanimity in the United States in favor of keeping Formosa off the clutches of the Communists.

And yet the draft treaty prepared by Mr. Dulles, unwittingly perhaps, will help powerfully to turn over Formosa to the Communists by operation of diplomacy and treaty.

When the Communists, once recognized by the United Nations as the legitimate government of China, ask for the return of Formosa under the Cairo declaration, would not that request make it most embarrassing for the United States to continue helping the Nationalists in holding that island? Would it not have the direct effect of stopping all United States aid, both military and economic, to Nationalist Formosa? And, finally, would it not mean the upsetting of our

strategic position in the whole Pacific area?

That is the tremendous meaning, in its last analysis, of the provision in the Japan draft treaty empowering Japan to decide with which China, Communist or Nationalist, to negotiate her treaty of peace. There must be a remedy for this. It must not be permitted to happen.

This whole matter concerns the vital interests of the United States first and foremost. But it will also concern the security and welfare of other countries which are allied with the United States in the fight against international communism.

If Formosa becomes Communist the Philippines, which we are committed to defend against external Communist aggression, will be exposed to Communist infiltration and invasion in the same way as it was invaded successfully by Japan from Formosa. And so will Indonesia be exposed.

Japan, which is expected to cooperate with the United States and other free nations in resistance to the Communists, will be isolated and cut off from the democratic nation front. And so will southeast Asia.

Today the western Pacific defense line of the United States extends from Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, to the Philippines. Cut out Formosa from that chain and the chain is broken to pieces. Our Pacific defense line will be pushed back eventually to our own Pacific coast.

This situation is very vital to the security of the United States. It cannot, it must not, be permitted to remain a danger to us. The draft treaty is capable of creating that danger. The American people will not permit that to take place when they come to know the meaning of giving Japan the power to select Communist China with which to make her treaty of peace.

When Japan, as she would be free to select Communist China, enters into a treaty with that China, the two countries might become closer to each other than Japan would be to the United States. That is both a possibility and a probability. The whole question needs canvassing closely and carefully. Mr. Villamin should be commended for bringing it up. His article in the Washington Post should be read and digested by all Members of Congress. The article follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of July 28, 1951]

JAPAN PEACE TREATY: GIMMICKS OVER CHINA (By Vicente Villamin)

After more than a year's preparatory work, Mr. John Foster Dulles, special assistant to Secretary of State Acheson, has presented a draft treaty of peace with Japan. It is not yet final and is still open to comments and suggestions by interested governments and presumably also by the public.

The 50 nations which declared war against Japan, including Russia but not China, have been invited by the United States to an international conference at San Francisco commencing on September 4 to end formally the state of war with Japan and to agree on the terms of peace.

To date only 3 countries have registered opposition to the draft treaty. They are Rus-

sia, the Philippines, and Nationalist China. Each of them has different grounds for opposition and they are acting separately. Their respective positions may be stated as follows:

1. Russia is against the whole treaty because it is not hard and restrictive enough on Japan and, further, it is not written by herself or jointly by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and Communist China. She is expected to boycott the peace conference. Communist China, following Russia's example, is opposed to the treaty. But if she comes out from under the Russian hypnosis long enough to study the draft treaty, she will find it to her interest not to oppose it, for she could enter into a bilateral agreement with Japan under its provisions if Japan consented, as she probably would.

Whether Russia signs the Japan peace treaty or not, she has already received valuable concessions for her 6-day war with Japan. Mr. Dulles said in a speech that after the Japanese surrender the Russians moved into Manchuria, Port Arthur, Dairen, North Korea, South Sakhalin and the Kurile and Habomai islands, thus cashing in on a formal belligerency that had lasted 6 days. In Manchuria they acquired not only Japanese industrial investments valued at \$1,800,000,000, but vast amounts of Japanese armaments and ammunition dumps. These latter were turned over to the Chinese Red armies in direct violation of the explicit agreement to give military supplies only to the Nationalist Government. The Red armies in China, thus immensely strengthened, then began to win victories over the Nationalist Government."

2. The Philippines is not opposed to the entire treaty, but chiefly to the inadequacy of its provisions regarding payment of monetary reparations by Japan. Article 14 of the draft treaty admits in principle Japan's obligation to pay reparations, but at the same time makes the categorical statement that she is not in a position to make any payment. This provision rules out the reasonable possibility that Japan in the years to come may acquire the capacity to pay reparations in amounts within reason.

What is the remedy? There should be some technical body like the Dawes Commission, which determined Germany's capacity to pay after World War I. Such a commission could resolve the question of Japan's capacity to pay episodically.

Under the treaty, technical service with compensation of Japanese technicians, advisers, and industrial facilities is offered to the Philippines. That cannot be considered as a concession on the part of Japan because Filipinos would prefer American and other foreign technicians and advisers. They would not ship raw materials to Japan for processing, but would try and process them locally themselves, thus carrying out their program of industrialization and avoiding the revival of the Japanese "coprosperity sphere" under which Japan would receive the lion's share of benefits.

The difference of the position of the Philippines from that of the United States on reparations should be noted. The separate, self-governing Philippine Commonwealth had no quarrel with Japan, but being under the sovereignty of the United States she was involved in the war when the latter was attacked by Japan. She made common cause with the United States and fought the Japanese enemy as best she could. She became a battleground, while the United States did not. She was devastated and many lives were lost.

The United States can afford to be generous and magnanimous to Japan, but the Philippines cannot. It is only proper and just that Japan should be made to pay both compensatory and punitive damages in the form of reparations.

3. There are two Chinas, Nationalist and Communist. The former is still recognized by the United States and many other nations as the legitimate government of China, while the latter has the recognition of Russia and her satellites, Great Britain, and India. Neither China has been invited to attend the peace conference.

Nationalist China naturally is humiliated over not being invited to the peace conference, for it was that China which fought the war against Japan and helped the Allies to whip her. She will be more humiliated when she realizes that under the draft treaty, Japan is in a position practically to put her out of legal existence. This result would have also the most adverse effect on the political and strategic position of the United States in the entire Pacific area.

This is how that astounding situation will come about. The draft treaty gives Japan the right to choose which China to negotiate her treaty of peace with. It is generally expected that she will choose Communist China, which now controls most of China territory, for she wants to revive her trade with that country. Those countries which have recognized Communist China would want Japan to deal with her.

If Japan concludes her treaty with that China such action would virtually mean (1) recognition of the Communist government, (2) the acquiescence of treaty signers to the position of Communist China as "legalized" by Japan, and (3) enhanced prestige and popularity for Communist China which will serve her well when the General Assembly of the United Nations decides which China should be represented in that world organization. In other words, the action of Japan is bound to have the tremendous actual and psychological effect of putting Communist China forward as the legitimate government of China. That would be the beginning of the end of Nationalist China.

Once Communist China is substituted for Nationalist China in the United Nations, she can rightly demand that Formosa be ceded to her as provided in the Cairo Declaration of 1943, which was signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and subsequently by Premier Stalin. It is certain that Chiang will not honor the demand to give up Formosa to the Communists and he will fight with his 500,000 men supported by the more than 7,000,000 people of Formosa. The United Nations would be embarrassed if it helped the Communists and it would be embarrassed if it did not.

But it is the United States that would be placed in the most disadvantageous position of all once it was determined that Formosa should go to Communist China. She would be morally and legally prevented from aiding Nationalist China in resisting Communist invasion of Formosa. If she did not aid Formosa sufficiently and that island fell in the hands of the Communists, the position of the United States in the entire Pacific area would be greatly weakened, her western Pacific defense perimeter extending from Alaska to the Philippines, with Formosa as a vital link, would be broken, the new Japan would be isolated from the democratic lineup, and the Philippines would be dangerously exposed to Communist infiltration and invasion.

What is the remedy? Several might be suggested, but if Nationalist China could not be admitted as a regular member of the peace conference for some overpowering reason, then one possible remedy is to have a provision putting off the negotiation of a Japan-China treaty until the status of Nationalist China is more specifically defined. After all, most of the expected trade of Japan with Communist China will fall under the ban of the United Nations embargo.

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 358 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 358 makes in order the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The bill was unanimously reported from the great Committee on Armed Services, and its very able and efficient chairman the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] so thoroughly convinced the membership of my Committee on Rules that it, too, voted to report this rule unanimously. And while there is 1 hour of debate allowed on this rule, I feel certain it will not be utilized. As for myself, realizing that Members have so many important matters to attend to, I shall not detain them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], a member of the Committee on Rules, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us now is important. I am sorry it is called up at a time when we have so few Members present, because it is of sufficient importance that we ought to have a thorough look at its contents. I am going to support the bill. I do want to point out that the bill does set up and let each one of the Secretaries in the departments have their own advisory committees as far as scientific developments are concerned. Each Secretary shall appoint an advisory committee. There is no limit to the number of committees; there is no limit to the number

of \$50-a-day men they may put on the payroll. I was under the impression that we had unification of the armed services. I have been under that impression for some time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The members of these advisory committees will not be on the payroll. They will be allowed so much per day when they are called upon to perform duties.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; let me quote from the bill:

Each of the Secretaries of the military departments is hereby authorized to establish such advisory committees or panels as may be necessary for the conduct of the research and development activities of his department.

And on page 2 it says that they may be paid up to \$50 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

I submit to you if we are going to have unification we do not need three separate advisory committees, one for each Secretary, with a large group of people, we do not know how many there will be, at \$50 a day advising upon scientific matters.

I am willing to support this bill, but I want to point these things out. I think it is bad procedure. If we are going to have unification of the armed services we ought to say that there shall be one advisory committee on scientific research. Of course, no advance is ever made in the country unless we do have research and examination of things. After all, research is nothing more than inquiring and asking questions of the unknown and seeking the answers. But here we are making it possible for the three Secretaries of the Armed Forces to use specialists and all working along the same lines without coordination.

In my own memory I do not know of any great scientific advance that has been made by the Government, certainly not in medicine and in any scientific field in which I am acquainted. The Government itself has never made one contribution to society in that respect and I doubt very much if they have in the military field. Your great advance in medicine comes in scientific performance when freemen with free minds can go out and explore into the unknown, find and come up with the answer. That is where the progress has been made. When freemen become fettered by Government regulations, as I am afraid they will under this bill, no progress is made. I think you have to have some scientific men, but you have to take them from private life, not from Government. Of course, these men who are on the Government payroll do not get extra pay. However, I am sure that advance in science, and scientific attainment, under this type of bill will come from industry, not by Government effort. It has always been true that every time the Government lays its cold and clammy hand on scientific development then progress stops. The great advance in the

past comes with the minimum of interference by the Government. The scientific mind does not perform when restricted by red tape.

I realize there are other things in the bill besides the matter of the appointment or the establishment of advisory committees, and I have no objection to them. I do hope that when the bill is adopted perhaps these three Secretaries can get together and will not have three advisory committees and a lot of people on the payroll at \$50 a day doing the same work. Do we have unification of the Armed Forces when you permit the three Secretaries, and probably we will have a fourth in the Marine Corps set-up, having advisory committees doing the same work? There ought to be unity and a complete exchange of ideas. Right now in Washington—England, Canada, France and the United States are trying to standardize their small arms. That is all to the good.

I would like this bill better if all the Secretaries had their scientific committees under one umbrella and their work coordinated—it would save the taxpayers money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader if he can at this time inform the House as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to.

On Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar. There will also be two suspensions. One is H. R. 4288, interstate compacts, Texas and Louisiana, and the other is H. R. 3830, geomagnetic station construction. I understand that that bill would have been considered by unanimous consent except for the fact that it slightly exceeded the amount that the screening committee felt should not be passed by unanimous consent.

On Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar.

Wednesday, and for the remainder of the week, we will take up the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952.

There are primaries in Mississippi and Virginia on Tuesday, and of course, we have an understanding that on those days no roll calls will be had. The only business on that day will be the call of the Private Calendar.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time, but none will be brought up on Monday or Tuesday. I make that statement so that the Members of the House can govern themselves accordingly.

Any further program or change in program, of course, for next week, will be announced as soon as possible later on.

Mr. ARENDS. Is it the hope to finish the Department of Defense appropriation bill next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes, because the week after next we expect to have the ECA authorization bill up. With the Department of Defense appropriation bill and the ECA appropriation bill, which ought to follow quickly, out of the way, daylight can be seen for some 3-day

recesses. I do not know how many, and I cannot make any promises, but I have been driving for it since last January.

Mr. ARENDS. That is the best ray of sunshine I have had for a long time, and I think that goes for all the Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to this bill, so I ask unanimous consent that we waive the terms of the resolution requiring us to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and that in lieu thereof the bill be printed at this point, and be considered in the House under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request to the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each of the Secretaries of the military departments is hereby authorized to establish such advisory committees or panels as may be necessary for the conduct of the research and development activities of his department, and to employ such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out such activities. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation, while serving as members of such committees, shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, United States Code, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department which such person is advising or in which such department is directly interested. The provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (Revised Statutes, 3679), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service of any member of any committee or panel authorized by this section.

SEC. 2. No provision of law prohibiting employment of or payment of compensation or expenses to any person not a citizen of the United States shall apply to any expert, scientific, technical, or professional person whose appointment or employment in connection with the research and development activities of the military departments is determined by the Secretary concerned to be necessary.

SEC. 3. Contracts of the military departments for services and use of facilities for research or development may be made for a term not to exceed 5 years, and may be extended for an additional period not to exceed 5 years, subject to the availability of appropriations therefor.

SEC. 4. Any contract to the military departments for research or development, or both,

may provide for the acquisition or construction by, or furnishing to, the contractor of such research, developmental, or test facilities and equipment as may be determined by the Secretary concerned to be necessary for the performance thereof. Such research, developmental, or test facilities and equipment, including specialized housing therefor, may be acquired or constructed at Government expense, and may be furnished to the contractor by lease, loan, or sale at fair value, and with or without reimbursement to the Government for the use thereof: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this subsection shall be deemed to authorize new construction or improvements having general utility: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize the installation or construction of facilities on property not owned by the Government which would not be readily removable or separable without unreasonable expense or unreasonable loss of value, unless adequate provision is made in the contract for (1) reimbursement to the Government of the fair value of such facilities upon the completion or termination of the contract, or within a reasonable time thereafter, or (2) an option in the Government to acquire the underlying land, or (3) such other provisions as will in the opinion of the Secretary concerned be adequate to protect the Government's interest in such facilities: *And provided further*, That all moneys arising from sales or reimbursement under this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except to the extent otherwise authorized by law with respect to contractor-acquired property.

SEC. 5. With the approval of the Secretary concerned, any contract of the military departments for research or development, or both, may provide that the Government will indemnify the contractor against either or both of the following, to the extent that they arise out of the direct performance of said contract and are not compensated by insurance or otherwise: (1) Liability on account of claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement of such claims) by third persons, including employees of the contractor, for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, arising as a result of a risk defined in the contract to be unusually hazardous: *Provided*, That any contract so providing shall also contain appropriate provisions for notice to the Government of suits or actions filed or claims made, against the contractor, with respect to any alleged liability for such death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, and for control of or assistance in the defense of any such suit, action, or claims, by the Government, at its election; and (2) loss of or damage to property of the contractor arising as a result of a risk defined in the contract to be unusually hazardous: *And provided further*, That no payment shall be made by the Government under authority of this section unless the amount thereof shall first have been certified to be just and reasonable by the Secretary concerned or by an official of the department designated for such purpose by the Secretary. Any such payment may be made, with the approval of the Secretary concerned, out of any funds obligated for the performance of such contract or out of funds available for research and development work and not otherwise obligated; or out of any funds appropriated by the Congress for the making of such payments.

SEC. 6. Each of the Secretaries of the military department is authorized to prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and of the Comptroller General of the United States, regulations for his department stating the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under any contract for research or development, or both, shall be

subject to itemization, substantiation, or certification prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

SEC. 7. Each of the Secretaries of the military departments is authorized to arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information resulting from the research and development activities of his department, so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 662), as amended, or of section 2 of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 762), as amended.

SEC. 8. Each of the Secretaries of the military departments is authorized to delegate any authority provided by this act to the Under Secretary or any Assistant Secretary of his department and, except the authority, under the second proviso in section 4 hereof, the said Secretaries may delegate any authority provided by this act to the chiefs of the technical services, bureaus, or offices and to one assistant to each such chief. The power to negotiate, execute, and administer contracts for research or development, or both, may be further delegated, subject to the provisions of any other applicable law.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to coordinate and unify the efforts of the Department of Defense in the field of research and development. It does four particular and important things: First of all, it gives to the several Secretaries of the Department of Defense the Power and the legal right to employ any individual skilled in the particular field of science in which there is a desired development.

In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, this bill accomplishes exactly and definitely what he obviously misunderstands in his reading of it. It means that the greatest scientists in any field, without limitation, can be employed as advisers by the Department of Defense in the development of that specific science. I think that is what the gentleman objected to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I am not objecting to that at all. I think that is a very fine part of the bill. The gentleman said in his opening statement that it was designed to unify the departments. I claim that when you have three Secretaries, each one with the right and power and authority to establish advisory committees or panels, and to set up advisory boards, there is no unification, even though you may say there is. When you have three men doing the same work, setting up the same panels, hiring the same experts, then I claim that that is not unification of the armed forces. I wish it were. Does the gentleman think it is? You have three bosses. How can you do it?

Mr. HÉBERT. What this bill does is to write into law that which is already the practice under the Unification Act. Let the gentleman not confuse himself in the idea that these three Secretaries will be duplicating their efforts. It means that the three Secretaries are able to obtain the services of the highest scientific skill known in this country, or foreign assistance, if necessary, and they are able to get it, to develop the weapons

necessary for each individual branch of the service. By the farthest stretch of the imagination the Secretary of the Navy could not be expected to draw on a scientist in a field that is related to the Army or the Air Force or the development of airplanes if he wanted to find out something about a battleship. This bill allows the Secretaries of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy to employ the specific specialists and experts and scientists in their particular fields. There is absolutely no duplication of effort. On the contrary, there is a concentration and a unification of effort.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I happen to have some information and knowledge about the so-called ABC program of the Defense Department, that is, the Atomic Energy, Bacterial, and Chemical Warfare Division. Under this each Secretary has a division working with that same lethal weapon, which I think is absolutely necessary. But I am very fearful, in fact, I know they are not coordinating their work. I raise the question that if you are going to have unification there ought to be some coordination of that one particular field. We can go into the field of medicine and cover the whole gamut. Men who are working in the Navy, the Air Force, and the Army tell me there is no coordination in their bone grafting, blood transfusions, and other technical things where there should be absolute coordination of the work. Here you are saying to the three Secretaries, "Set up your own division, your own division board, and go your own way." I would like to see just what the gentleman has mentioned, unification where you can bring these scientists all together under one tent, and not under three bosses.

Mr. HÉBERT. In reply to the gentleman from Nebraska may I point out the fact that I had the privilege of being present at the Eniwetok atomic experiments, and I have never seen such unification, such coordination, such cooperation, and such unity of purpose as I saw at Eniwetok between the three branches of the services, and added to that the inclusion of the civilian branch.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true. I am glad to know it. But I would feel much better if we would say that the Secretary of Defense, under whom these Secretaries work, might have the authority to set up an advisory committee, which he is already doing and should do, in which he could pool all of these scientists under one tent, under one umbrella, instead of having three sets, as I know they are doing today, going many times in opposite directions and not coordinating their work. That is the thing I objected to. I think it is not in the interest of the public.

Mr. HÉBERT. I feel certain this bill will tend toward accomplishing the purpose which both the gentleman and I have in common. I am confident of it.

The bill also provides that the Department of Defense shall be allowed to enter into long-term contracts in the field of research and development. The necessity for this becomes obvious when we realize that so many of the contracts in this field cannot be terminated in a short

time and it is necessary that they be spread over a longer period. In addition, the bill also provides that the Department of Defense shall be empowered to employ the services of other than citizens of the United States. I think it is generally recognized that some of the great scientists of this age and day come from other countries. This bill allows them to come into the Department of Defense in research and development. The most important feature of the bill is that section which in effect indemnifies private contractors who are contracted to the Government to conduct these experimental features. I may point out the necessity for this is pointed up perhaps in the development of the supersonic plane by the Bell Airplane Co. In that particular instance it was impossible to indemnify a civilian test pilot, and an Army lieutenant was used to fly that ship on its first flight.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I compliment the gentleman for doing a great job here in handling this bill and having it approved and brought to the House. It is an extremely important bill. I recall in the testimony it was stated that the authority to use scientists is presently in the law. What is wanted now is the authority to use them in committees. They told us at the time this was considered that this would not result in the employment of one single additional individual. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. The bill indicates no additional employment of individuals and no additional appropriations. It is merely unifying and codifying the law in connection with present practices. There is no indicated expansion of personnel.

Mr. BROOKS. I am impressed very much with the authority given under this bill to enter into long-term or long-range contracts for experimental work. In my judgment it will not only bring about greater results but will result in greater efficiency and at far less cost to the Government. If anything, I would call this bill a bill to save money and render more efficient service in research work. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman's interpretation of the bill is correct. This is a bill that unties the hands of the departments and expands them in the field of research and development which is so essential and necessary in this age of scientific warfare. It becomes very important that the Department of Defense be allowed without interference and without any hand-tying to continue to develop our weapons of war in the scientific field. Of course, No. 1 is the atomic bomb, recoilless weapons and infra-rays used in the front lines, and many many other weapons now on the drawing boards and in the scientific laboratories.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROLLING EXPORTS TO NATIONS THREATENING UNITED STATES SECURITY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 363) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Pending that, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution disclosed, this resolution provides for 1 hour general debate upon a bill sponsored by the distinguished, very earnest, and patriotic gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE]. I am not going to take the time of the House to go into an extended discussion of that bill. I am going to leave that to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who is the author of the bill, and those other members of the committee who have joined in its sponsorship, other than to point out that the purpose of the bill is to stop the shipment of arms and other aid to Russia and her satellites.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I wish to insert in the debate something the gentleman may not say. That is that the original step in the direction that is completed in this bill was taken by an amendment adopted on this floor, called the Mundt-Colmer amendment to the ECA bill in 1948. That was the first step attempting to control trade through the iron curtain. For fear the gentleman, in his modesty, forgets to mention where this idea started, I thought I would like to mention it.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman's contribution is very much appreciated.

With the hope that my remarks in response to the contribution of the gentleman from Ohio may not be misconstrued as self-serving, I would like to go a little further than that and say that the present bill under consideration embodies but one of a number of recommendations made by the Postwar Eco-

nomic Policy Committee, consisting of some 18 Members of this House, of which I had the honor to be chairman. The other members of the committee were Messrs. Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Francis Walter, Pennsylvania; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Jerry Voorhis, California; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Walter A. Lynch, New York; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Eugene Worley, Texas; Hamilton Fish, New York; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Richard J. Welch, California; Charles A. Wolvertson, New Jersey; Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; and Charles S. Dewey, Illinois. Seven of us made a 2 months' on-the-spot study of political and economic conditions in Europe and in the Middle East in the late summer of 1945 immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the European theater.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What does this resolution do with regard to aid to Czechoslovakia, something that should not happen? We ought not to help Czechoslovakia when Czechoslovakia is keeping in prison Mr. Oatis, a great writer, who was doing nothing that he was not supposed to do.

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the author of the bill to answer the lady from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATTLE. As far as the Oatis case is concerned, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has a resolution which will come up possibly later today or tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That has nothing to do with the treaty with Czechoslovakia; it just expresses the general sense of the Congress.

Mr. BATTLE. I would like to say that this bill is designed specifically to cut off trade with Czechoslovakia and Russia and other iron-curtain countries unless and until it is beneficial and helpful to the security of the United States, and it is to tighten up the shipments that would be beneficial to those countries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Certainly it is time we did, for Czechoslovakia is being extremely antagonistic and disrespectful to a nation and particularly one of its nationals.

Mr. BATTLE. That is exactly right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I congratulate the gentleman and the committee.

Mr. BATTLE. We think this is a good bill and certainly should stop some trade that should not go there.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as I was attempting to say, this group of 18 Members of the House constituting that committee, having made this on-the-spot study over there of conditions in Europe immediately following the war made a number of recommendations to the Congress and the country at that time.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. This was one of the recommendations. All of the recommendations were built about the necessity for a firm policy in dealing with Russia. Our committee at that time recognized what Russia was up to; and unfortunately, the things that we anticipated have been gradually materializing in the past 6 years.

It is indeed encouraging, Mr. Speaker, to see that now the country realizes the necessity for dealing firmly with the Soviet Republic. I should like, at the risk of being boresome, again to point out as I have repeatedly from the well of this House over this period of 6 years, that Russia does not want war any more than we in America want war. But Russia does not want peace. The last thing in the world that Russia wants is either peace or war. Communism thrives upon chaos and confusion. The policy of Russia is to place a hurdle here, a barrier there, and a road block yonder, always to bring about chaos and confusion. We see that happening today over at Kaesong with the truce efforts that are being made there. Anyone who feels that the Soviet representatives, and that is what they are there at Kaesong, are going to agree tomorrow or next day to a truce is certainly an optimist of the highest degree. That is not their policy; their policy is to confuse, to delay, to obstruct. I would indeed be presumptuous to attempt to say just what Russia did hope to accomplish there, what their ultimate objective there is, whether they expect eventually to have a truce or not; no one can say what is in the Russian mind; one can be guided only by their past actions, and if I were bold enough to make a prediction I would predict that they are going to continue those meetings there just as long as possible.

I want to say in that connection as one who has been critical of our administration's foreign policy that I am certainly in accord with the firmness of the attitude of the administration toward Russia now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be insincere if after harping for 5 years upon the necessity for firmness in dealing with the Soviet Republic and its satellites, now that the administration has seen fit to become firm with them, I should remain critical of that policy. In other words, we are now doing what we should have been doing for the past 5 or 6 years, namely, being firm in our foreign policy over there.

We are in a deadlock at Kaesong today. It is a question of who is going to yield. Are we going to yield further to them as we have yielded in these conferences heretofore? Somewhere there must be a stopping point. If we yield to them on the question of the thirty-eighth parallel, which they now propose, then who can say that they will not raise a new barrier?

When we deal with the Soviet masters or their stooges, whether it be in the Kremlin or in China or in Czechoslo-

vakia, wherever it may be, you must recognize one factor. They are going to do everything they can to bring about confusion and chaos. We might just as well call their hand upon the minor matters, as my committee insisted upon 5 years ago, rather than to call their hand farther down the line on the greater or major issues. Therefore, I feel heartened that those in charge of our diplomacy and our military are stiffening their collective backbones and finally recognize what the true objective of Russia is.

If we yield on the buffer zone, then we will have to yield farther down the line on an even greater and more major issue. There is only one way to deal with Russia and her satellites and that is to deal with them firmly, as this committee pointed out some 6 years ago. They respect only one thing, firmness and force.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATTLE. I would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi for his farsightedness in seeing this problem some years ago and for the work he initiated to the end we are trying to accomplish today. I appreciate the remarks he has made in the interest of this bill.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his statement. But it is not a question of what we did then, who was farsighted and who was shortsighted. The question is, What are we going to do with the issue as it exists today? And I am delighted to see the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the gentleman from Alabama who is the sponsor of this bill, taking the firm hand it is taking here today in this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. The bill it makes in order is one which I believe is entitled to the support and should receive the vote of every Member of the House. Certainly the time has come when we should take a very strong position in connection with restricting our aid of those countries which fail to cooperate with us in our great endeavor to obtain world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution to bring the Battle bill—H. R. 4550—up for consideration by the House this afternoon. I will support the bill. I think it is the type of bill that this country should have passed several years ago. Long before I came to Congress, as a private citizen, I supported the principles embodied in this bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] is to be commended in bringing this bill here for our consideration.

This bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to apply an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition,

and implements of war, petroleum, and atomic materials to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States. But it goes a step further, Mr. Speaker, and properly singles out Russia and all countries under its domination as being nations that we will not ship any strategic material to. In other words, when this bill becomes law it will be a further step in our "get tough" policy with Russia and her satellites.

The bill goes further and places an embargo on the shipment of transportation materials that have strategic value and important items used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Finally, the bill declares it to be the policy of this Government that no military assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies the same embargo against shipment of these same materials to Russia, and all her satellites, or any other nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States.

We seek allies in the great cause of peace and security. We have provided and are offering military assistance to those nations that are willing to embrace the cause of peace, security and the stopping of aggression. However, we say to these allies that if we furnish you military assistance, you will not be allowed to ship or transport, sell or trade strategic items to our enemies. So that there will be no mistake about it we specify Russia and the countries under her domination. This policy goes a step further: in this bill we say no more economic aid, no more financial assistance to those nations that desire to make Russia through their trade with her more capable of fighting a war against us.

We expect and hope that our allies will cooperate very fully with us in this policy. If they do, their strength and ours, individually and acting together will be increased. The ability of Russia and the nations that slavishly live in the orbit of her protection will be impeded to the extent that she cannot obtain materials that she needs from either us or our friends in the family of nations. And, we hope that this policy will be helpful, at least a beacon of hope, to those nations that have already lost their liberty to Russia and other aggressors.

This bill says no more Marshall plan aid to those countries that desire to trade in important and strategic materials with our enemies.

This bill provides a clear-cut statement of policy that we should have adopted in 1946, just as soon as it became apparent that Russia does not desire peace and security in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can take chances with Russia or her satellites. We cannot take chances with what she may do militarily. We cannot take chances with what she may do in an economic way. We must pursue the policy that she will understand strength and plain talk. We are building our military strength, and growing stronger with each passing day. That is something that the twisted minds of the Kremlin can understand. Our industrial capacity is growing at an un-

believable rate. That is something, likewise, that the schemers of the Kremlin can understand. A show of weakness on our part, whether it be in the field of the military, economics, or unity at home gives encouragement to those who would like to bring us to our knees.

Russia cries peace, peace, but there is no peace. Her propaganda is directed to poisoning the minds of her people, and all people that she can influence, against the United States. She is fearful of the system that has made this country great. When we pass this bill we go one step further in enunciating a policy that she will understand.

Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing trying days in the United States. Russian tactics and Russian objectives beset our citizens with a sense of insecurity and uncertainty. This is the time for bold and unmistakable action by our Government. This is the time for strength, strength of purpose in preparing ourselves against the menace that threatens the world, strength in the statement of our policy so that it will be known around the world, strength in our determination to sacrifice that freemen may live in good will and peace.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes.

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 consideration of the bill H. R. 4550, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor and a pleasure to have the opportunity this afternoon to present a piece of legislation that originated in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It may be that I will have to read my speech, because my wife just a few hours ago presented me with a baby girl.

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. And the gentleman has duly presented his colleagues with cigars, as the occasion demands.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I speak the sentiments of all the Members of the

House in extending our very kind felicitations and cordial congratulations to Mrs. Battle, and, incidentally, to the gentleman himself.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I want to add to what the distinguished majority leader said, since Mrs. Battle comes from my area. She and her family are well known to me and I join in felicitations to the gentleman and Mrs. Battle in her forthcoming battle.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to present my felicitations to the gentleman and tell him that he is not the only one on the floor today who can recite a personal incident. You will recall this morning that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] spoke about Myrna Loy and Mr. Sargeant, who spent their honeymoon while attending the conference in Paris. I spent my honeymoon in 1947 while attending a United Nations trade conference in Habana.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their congratulations to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman. Now we are getting down to business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the Members of the House unanimously offer their congratulations to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman.

A baby and a bill both in 24 hours make quite a day. So far I have not had a chance to be in conference with my wife long enough to get a name for our baby girl, partially because of the consideration of this bill H. R. 4550 and partially because the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has been meeting day and night irrespective of the sessions here. It has been suggested that I name her "H. R. 4550."

It seems to me, and every male member of this committee knows, I am sure, that it is much harder on the father than it is on the mother. I am thinking about working on a resolution to make the custom here what I have heard is the custom among the Eskimos, that in the last few weeks of pregnancy the husband goes to bed and moans and groans, and the wife spends her time waiting on him. At this time it seems to me that might be a pretty good system.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the result of an intensive study made by the subcommittee of the House Committee on

Foreign Affairs which began on March 5 of this year. It involved a long series of hearings and many meetings devoted to the preparation of a report and the drafting of this bill. The subcommittee was set up originally to consider H. R. 1621, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], and H. R. 1939, introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. Both of these bills provided for cutting off aid to any country which supplied Russia with any of the commodities on the list of prohibited items to be drawn up by an appropriate United States official. The subcommittee consisted of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and myself. I am greatly indebted to each member of the subcommittee not only for their cooperation but also for their contribution to this legislation. It is strictly a bill that was created by this subcommittee, and it could very well be called the Vorys-Kelly bill, because one afternoon we were meeting out on the porch when the House was in session, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] had an idea which became a very fundamental part of this legislation, and also the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] had an idea that likewise became a vital part of this legislation. Without the contribution of these Members I have named and the others on this subcommittee, we would not have had such a good and what I hope is a well-rounded piece of legislation as we present today.

The subcommittee found that at the very beginning of its work the problem with which it was dealing was very complex, and that there was no simple solution. It was very gratifying to me that the subcommittee was able to agree unanimously on its findings and that the work of the subcommittee was unanimously endorsed by the full committee after the full committee had given full consideration to the subcommittee's report and recommendation.

I would like at the beginning to point out the major provisions of this bill.

The first thing which it accomplishes is to define the policy of the United States with regard to the control of exports to the countries behind the iron curtain. This policy, as set forth in the bill, covers three main points:

(a) In the first place, it provides that the United States shall embargo all shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements if war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, transportation material of strategic value and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

(b) The second element of the policy is the further declaration that the United States shall give no military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation unless it applies a similar embargo.

(c) The third aspect of the policy set forth is that the United States shall

regulate the export of commodities other than those of the kinds just specified in order to oppose and offset by nonmilitary action acts which threaten the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Let me emphasize that up to the present time there has never been a clear official and public statement as to just what our objectives in this direction really are.

The second important thing to note about this bill is that, if enacted, it will provide us with permanent legislation for dealing with situations of this kind. It operates against any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States. It is not limited in its application to Communist China or to Russia, and it does not take effect only for the present emergency while we are fighting in Korea.

The third major contribution of this bill, and perhaps the most important one, is that it sets up a single administration to carry out the provisions of this bill and makes a single Administrator responsible for results. It is not intended to make any change in the administration of the control of exports from the United States. This control is and should be left with the Department of Commerce, where it now lies. The administrative provision, however, is intended to correct a major shortcoming of the present situation as found by the investigations of our subcommittee. Perhaps the best statement of the existing problem is presented in the report of the committee, which reads as follows:

At present no single agency, department, or organization in Washington is responsible for the job of initiating, planning, and administering an international program for regulating the flow of exports to the iron curtain area with the objective of retarding Russia's military build-up and advancing the defense effort of the free nations.

This does not mean that nothing is being done in this direction. A lot is being done and substantial progress has been made as has been outlined above. The point is, however, that while most of the executive departments, together with the ECA and other agencies, are taking an active part in the development and execution of such programs, it is a sort of byproduct for each of them. Representatives of the departments and agencies, meet in a number of interdepartmental committees to consider which items should be placed on the various control lists and recommend other action. Nevertheless, no individual, organization, or agency has been given this big job to do or can be held accountable for the results.

The bill provides for an Administrator who will have among his duties the following:

(a) To coordinate those activities of the various United States departments and agencies which are concerned with security controls over exports from other countries.

(b) To make a continuing study of the administration of export-control measures undertaken by foreign governments in accordance with the provisions of this act, and shall report to the Congress from time to time but not less than once every 6 months recommending action where appropriate.

(c) To make available technical advice and assistance on export control pro-

cedures to any nation desiring such cooperation.

The fourth important aspect of this bill is that it provides for dividing the commodities, the export of which is to be controlled, into three groups and for dealing with each of these groups in a different manner.

The first group includes arms, ammunition, implements of war and atomic energy materials. The bill provides that there can be no exception under any circumstances on the part of the United States or of any country receiving our aid to the enforcement of a strict embargo on these items.

Then, among those items of military significance, including petroleum, transportation materials and items of importance for the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war, the United States and all countries receiving our aid must follow a policy of embargoing shipments to Russia, although in unusual circumstances exceptions may be arranged when it is in the interest of the security of the United States to do so.

Finally, on all other commodities, that is those which are not of military significance, the United States is to work out agreements with other nations to employ export controls as a means of offsetting acts by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or any other country, which threaten our security or the peace of the world. The agreements for controlling these nonmilitary items are to be the result of negotiation with the various countries and are intended to be adapted to the special circumstances in which each country finds itself. Nevertheless, once an agreement has been reached, the country making it must live up to it; and military, economic or financial assistance from the United States has to be cut off if there is any violation. In the judgment of the committee this provides for a strict, comprehensive, and yet flexible, control.

The fifth major contribution of this bill to the solution of the problem which confronts us at the present time is that it invites the cooperation of other countries than those receiving aid from the United States in working out an effective policy of controlling exports, and provides a United States agency to take the initiative in and be responsible for this work. It is my belief that most of the countries of the world sincerely desire to be cooperative and that if we push vigorously ahead in the right spirit, substantial accomplishments will result.

The bill contains a provision which may be described as an escape clause. The committee felt that in view of the complexity of the situation and the changing circumstances with which we are confronted, it was necessary to grant to the President limited discretion to continue aid to countries which were exporting prohibited items under unusual circumstances.

Let me emphasize that no exception is permitted for any country in the case of shipments of arms, ammunition, implements of war and atomic energy materials. Before an exception is made for anything else, the President must take into account the contribution which the

country concerned is making to the security of the free world, the importance of the assistance being given to the security of the United States, the importance of the imports being received from the Soviet bloc and the adequacy of the export controls exercised by the country to be excepted. The bill provides further that exceptions can be given only in unusual circumstances.

It is necessary for us all to recognize that to apply the embargo provisions of this bill to a country like Austria—a substantial area of which is under the domination of a Russian army of occupation—would be impossible, and it is clearly not in our interests to cut off economic aid to Austria and permit the free zones of that country to fall under Russian domination. It is necessary to recognize also that from time to time it is possible and desirable to make specific barter transactions with countries behind the iron curtain under the terms of which our allies obtain important quantities of strategic materials of considerably greater significance to us than the exports they send to Russia of items appearing on one of our embargo lists.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the wisdom of the Committee and the House we can pass this legislation, because I think it is constructive and will be helpful in bringing under better control the trade that is taking place between the East and the West.

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to compliment the gentleman and his subcommittee on the recommendation of this legislation to the House. I think it is a very important matter. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what the difference is between this bill and the so-called Kem bill in the Senate, which is supposed to deal with the same problem.

Mr. BATTLE. I will be glad to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin. First, this is a permanent piece of legislation, in contrast to the Kem amendment, which could be termed temporary. The Kem amendment functions only when the Armed Forces of the United States are in actual hostilities, under the direction of the Security Council of the United Nations. Therefore, if we are fortunate enough to get a settlement in Korea, then, in my opinion, the Kem amendment will not be effective, and this bill will carry on at least the general purpose of the Kem amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BATTLE. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Chairman. In addition, whether or not we settle the situation in Korea, if hostilities break out in Europe or somewhere else, it depends upon Russia's staying out of the Security Council of the United Nations and not using her veto, in order for the Kem amendment to be operative. Therefore, we need this type of permanent legislation. Also this bill is broader than the Kem amendment, in the sense that it cuts off not only economic aid, as does the Kem amendment, but it cuts off mil-

itary, financial, and economic aid in cases of violation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. A further distinction between this and the machinery of the Kem amendment, the Kem amendment puts the different interests under the decision of the National Security Council of the United Nations; and up to date, according to the evidence presented to the subcommittee, the National Security Council has never cut off assistance to anybody.

Mr. BATTLE. I am afraid I will have to agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I want to congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], upon his able leadership in the hearings and deliberations leading up to this bill which is the result of our somewhat arduous labors, beginning on March 5 of this year, when we were ordered to consider the problem posed by the two bills that have already been mentioned dealing with this subject, which were referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The history of this sort of legislation goes back, as has been said, to the report of the Colmer committee and to the Mundt-Colmer amendment in the ECA bill which passed the House. I led the fight to preserve at least a portion of that amendment in the conference at that time. Then came the Wherry amendment, and this year came the Kem amendment where the other body participated in this battle, and we have one of the bills here presented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]; so this is peculiarly a creature of a bipartisan policy finally culminating in active support in the deliberations by those of both parties that resulted in the production of this bill.

During the days of appeasement it was extremely difficult to get any action from the administration, under any law, to prevent war materials from going behind the iron curtain. In the last year we have all been shocked to see war supplies from our allies, and sometimes American supplies, going to those who were killing Americans in Korea.

Our studies into this vast and complex situation revealed, however, that something more than mere embargoes against shipments to the iron curtain countries was needed. We found, and it is spelled out in our report, that there is east-west trade through the iron curtain which must continue for the benefit of our side in this world-wide struggle, and that to attempt to cut off all that trade would injure the free peoples. You will see the tables in our report that show the vast amount of this trade. It is to the interest of the free people of Europe and Asia to secure, let us say, lumber, and grain, and coal from behind the iron curtain if they can be

paid for with materials that are not of strategic importance. We therefore spell out on page 2 the purpose of this legislation in lines 11 to 16, and you will see that the purpose is "to, first, increase the national strength of the United States and of the cooperating nations; second, impede the ability of nations threatening the security of the United States to conduct military operations; and," note this carefully "third, to assist the people of the nations under the domination of foreign aggressors to reestablish their freedom." We not only want to strengthen our side and weaken the other side economically and militarily; we want to weaken communism politically, by helping oppressed peoples to become once more part of the free world. Our objectives are military, economic, and political. This legislation recognizes that we are in a state of economic warfare with world-wide communism and that it will not be over when hostilities may happen to stop in Korea but will go on and on until we hope, with God's help, there will be victory for the free.

We have set up machinery here which we hope will be effective. Our examination showed that there were half a dozen agencies that had something to do with it and that as in many situations what was everybody's business was nobody's business; so we determined to fix responsibility for the making of the lists and the shutting off of economic and material aid to noncooperating countries in one man, and he is to be the mutual defense assistance control officer. This machinery that has been provided we believe can be effective, but we have learned the hard way that merely passing a law will not make bad administration into good administration; there must be a will to carry out the law, instead of evading it, within this administration, because many agencies must still cooperate under this bill; there must be a will to engage in and win in economic warfare before this program can be successful.

Steps have been taken already in this direction; many steps are needed for the future. But this bill provides a substantial weapon for our Government in economic warfare with the Soviets.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to yield back the balance of my 5 minutes and yield 12 minutes to the distinguished author of H. R. 1939, one of the bills which came before our committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BATTLE. Before the distinguished gentleman from Kansas starts his speech, I would like to compliment him on the introduction of this bill. As one who used to serve under him when he was chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I want to thank him for bringing this to our attention and pointing out the great need that we have tried to alleviate in this legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement

and I want to say to him that we appreciate his efforts and the efforts of the members of his subcommittee as well as the full committee for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. Likewise, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may I say that I regret, as many others do, that the gentleman saw fit to leave our fine committee and join the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I can well understand his desire to render a greater service in a different field by joining this committee and while we are losing his services I am certain the Committee on Foreign Affairs has benefited because of his membership on that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the arduous labor and time it has expended in bringing this constructive legislation to the floor of the House. The thing that is extremely important with regard to this problem, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has just stated, is the fact that once and for all we are fixing responsibility in dealing with this question.

Since the conclusion of World War II, the United States has extended economic and financial aid amounting to billions of dollars to many countries of the world under UNRRA and the ECA.

During the past 6 months I have received many letters from people of Kansas and other parts of the country expressing amazement that the United States would permit countries receiving our military, economic, and financial aid to export strategic war materials to Russia, and especially to Communist China, as well as other Communist-dominated countries.

It is difficult to explain why we should furnish any goods to any country that would send war materials to the Communist Chinese who are presently destroying the lives of American boys.

Facts with which this committee is familiar have been developed by this committee and other committees of Congress that have received widespread publicity. A local newspaper reported several months ago that the managing director of the second largest tool manufacturing concern in Great Britain stated his organization was so taken up with orders for Russia that he could not furnish any materials, not even so much as a pin, to any British consumer for at least 2 years.

During 1949 Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Great Britain exported to Russia and her satellite nations, millions of dollars worth of arms, explosives, iron, steel, aluminum, brass, copper, lead, zinc, tin, electrical goods, machinery, motor vehicles, chemicals, and optical, surgical, scientific and photographic instruments and apparatus.

During the first half of 1950, Great Britain exported more than \$6,000,000 worth of electrical machinery to Russia, and several millions of dollars worth of machine tools. This is almost 10 times the amount exported by the British Empire to Russia during the same period in 1949.

I am hopeful that the developments in Korea have had the effect of diminish-

ing such activities on the part of countries whom we have helped under the ECA program.

I am advised that the Belgians, for example, will export this year 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals to Russia.

The people of the United States and our defense activities are feeling the shortage of rubber and rubber products. I am told that Britain today is transshipping Malayan rubber to Soviet ports and to Communist China. When the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1951 was under consideration in September 1950, an amendment was proposed in the Senate prohibiting economic or financial assistance to any country which exported to Russia or its satellites, arms, armaments, or other material, metals or commodities which were useful in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military materials. This amendment was rejected for a weaker substitute which is totally ineffective.

It is ridiculous for the United States to be spending billions of dollars in foreign aid which is being transformed or exchanged for military assistance to Russia through exports from certain foreign countries. Russia receives military assistance that is passed on to Communist China, which in turn is used for the destruction of the lives of American boys.

Our State Department's policy of appeasement ought to be revised. It should be a policy of firm determination to find out how the countries of the world are using the billions of dollars in economic and financial assistance furnished them by the people of America. The time has come when the countries of the world must decide whether they stand with the American people, who have been their benefactors and have given to them so generously, or whether they are selling out to Communist countries and their satellites.

The "fence straddling" position of some of our friends has caused a good many of us great concern. It is inconsistent for our friends to accept our help, and then export war materials to Communist countries who seek to destroy representative government wherever they find it.

The proposal I submitted would also make it unlawful for any person, partnership, company, corporation, cooperative, organization, or enterprise that is doing business under the laws of the United States, to export any war material to Communist-dominated countries. In my study of this matter, I find that today there is no law or administrative order which prohibits the United States Government or any person or business in the United States from shipping war materials to Communist countries or to any nation for transshipment to such countries.

I believe Congress should take the initiative with respect to this matter. It is true that the President is authorized to take action with respect to this important matter, but he has not done so. I think under the State Department's policy of appeasement toward China, such action has also unwittingly

been extended to Russia through countries in Europe and Asia that are supposed to be our friends. In any event, this is a matter that should be considered by Congress. A policy should be laid down by this Congress expressing its will with respect to a situation that is continually growing worse.

Last year our Government spent \$4,500,000,000 in military and economic assistance to foreign countries. The President's request calls for \$8,500,000,000 more for military and economic assistance to foreign countries.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is ridiculous to furnish financial assistance in this magnitude in an amount almost equivalent to the President's requested increase in taxes without sufficient control of the manner in which such funds are to be used by the countries who are recipients of these funds. Certainly we have a right, if we are going to spend this money, to know something about the purpose for which it is used.

If we are to believe that the international situation is as grave as it is pictured to be by the spokesmen for the administration, including the President, Secretary of State, and others, I think it is time for us to be more firm in our foreign policy. In extending our friendship, aid, and assistance to the free democracies of the world, and in helping them to rehabilitate their industries, economies, and their people following the devastation of World War II, we must not unwittingly furnish communism with the tools of war.

I would like to refer here to an expression of General Eisenhower wherein he suggested arms and equipment should be furnished the European countries who belong to the Atlantic Pact. He also suggested that the important thing was that these people have a will to defend themselves against the onrush of communism.

The international situation is extremely grave. We cannot have free trade as usual among all the nations of the world. The United States Government must take necessary steps to salvage what little is left from the mistakes and ridiculous commitments which have been made in the past 4 years by our State Department.

If our Government approves the expenditure of approximately \$12,000,000,000 for military and economic assistance abroad over a 2-year period, it is extremely important that this Congress enact legislation such as I have introduced today. This proposed legislation will, in my judgment, help protect our investments in democracy at home as well as abroad.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely wrong that the United States of America should pour billions of dollars in materials and funds to other countries who, in turn, furnish war materials to those who are destroying the lives of our boys and who would destroy our country if they could.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to overlook the Italian factories, equipped with ECA funds and

American machinery, that have been producing materials for the Russians.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with that question.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to compliment the gentleman for his effort in collating this information. There is no question that, next to the war itself, this is the most important item in the minds of the American people, this idea of our sending materials to countries that are and have been against us.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to a member of our committee whose revealing article in the Readers' Digest giving instances of shipments of war materials to the iron curtain helped to crystallize public opinion in America on the issue we attempt to meet today. I refer to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor passage of H. R. 4550 which provides for control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to Russia and her satellites.

In my judgment Congress and the American people want to make sure that we will not help our enemies build up their war machines by furnishing them strategic materials.

The United States was very slow in protecting our national security and did not begin controlling exports to Russia and her satellites until 1948; and not until 1950 were the same regulations applied to China. All exports were not completely cut off to China until December of that year.

The Marshall plan countries were even slower to adopt controls and do not even at this time have controls as strict as ours and they are much less effective.

There is also a bad trade situation between the west and east zones of Germany.

Conditions were so serious Congress has three times attempted to remedy it—in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948; by the Cannon amendment in 1950; and in May 1951 by the Kem amendment.

Our committee found that some of the delay in initiating such a program by the United States and supervising a joint program for our Government and other cooperating nations to control exports to countries behind the iron curtain has to a large extent been due to the fact that at the present time no single United States official is given this responsibility. This bill would remedy that situation as it places the responsibility for carrying out these controls in the hands of a single administrator.

Even the United Nations belatedly recognized that something should be done about this so-called East-West trade and passed a resolution on May 18, 1951, that every state apply an embargo on shipments to areas controlled by the Soviet, Chinese, and North Koreans of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items use-

ful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

We have adopted in this bill this same principle—that there should be an absolute embargo of this kind of strategic material. If any country receiving military, economic, or financial assistance from the United States continues to ship such strategic items to the areas just referred to, such aid will be terminated forthwith, under the provisions of this bill.

After the most careful study the committee determined there must be some flexibility so that some trade should be allowed on less strategic items if it was clearly to our best interest to do so. There are some strategic materials and other needed supplies which we can get from the iron-curtain countries in return for items which would not build up their war machine. This kind of trade would be to the advantage of ourselves and allies.

As to trade falling in these less important categories the bill provides that the United States shall negotiate with the countries receiving our aid, to undertake a program for controlling the export of items not subject to embargo but which the administrator of this legislation believes should be controlled to any nation threatening our security. It then gives the power to the President to terminate such assistance if any of the countries receiving aid do not effectively cooperate with the United States in this regard.

I believe, therefore, that this bill is better adapted to do the job we wish done than existing law and that it should pass; first, because it would place an absolute embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy material, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; and second, would control shipment of items of lesser importance but that still need to be controlled, without cutting off absolutely all trade with these areas.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee on bringing this legislation before the House. I also commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] on the fine, logical presentation he has made of the matter, and I also commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for their important contributions to this debate.

I have made an extensive examination into the subject of strategic materials being exported from this country to supposedly friendly allies and then later transferred from such countries to Russia or its satellites.

The information presented to me was of such a deplorable character that I introduced on August 29, 1950, House Resolution 831, for a complete investigation and study to determine the extent to which materials and instruments of war have been or are being exported from the United States, either directly or

through other countries, to countries whose possession of such materials and instruments of war is inimical to the national defense and security of the United States.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, undertook such an investigation. Evidence was produced that showed the truthfulness of the charges that had been made that such a nefarious trade was being conducted on a scale that was amazing. The investigation likewise showed that there had been great laxity on the part of our Government in preventing such practices.

There was no justification for such. The only excuse given to our committee was that we could not control or properly interfere with the trade practices of other countries. It was my opinion and still is that there was no substance or justice in such a claim. Our boys were dying on the battlefields of Korea. The very materials we permitted to reach Russia or its satellite countries could and undoubtedly were utilized in their destruction. The situation in this respect was no different than our experience in World War II. We had shipped scrap iron to Japan that was afterward used against us. We sent it as scrap. It was returned to us in the form of bullets that took the lives of our soldiers.

Even Britain, that had been an offender, finally under the leadership of Winston Churchill awakened to the injustice that was being done to the fighting men in Korea.

He put the spotlight on this senseless practice by the British Labor Government with his demand that shipments of machine tools to Russia be halted at once.

The Government of Great Britain saw the importance of the fight in Korea and authorized the sending of troops to augment the United Nations forces trying to turn back Communist aggression. It announced a new and costly speed-up in the arming of Great Britain against the growing Communist danger.

But at the same time, machine tools, including those vital in the manufacture of tanks, were sent to Russia under a trade agreement. Soviet inspectors were permitted to look through British factories filling the orders.

This, Mr. Churchill observed, indicated a disconnection between thought and action on the part of the British Government. With one hand the Government prepared to fight against Russian-made tanks; with the other they sent Russia the industrial tools to make the tanks. As opposition leader, Mr. Churchill blasted this ridiculous state of affairs.

It is encouraging to realize that at last our Government has recognized the necessity of a more realistic treatment of this matter. This bill comes before us from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in answer to the demand of the American people who want to make sure that our enemies are not assisted in building up their war machine by trade from the United States and our allies.

It is our duty to leave nothing undone to safeguard our fighting men. This bill seeks to do that. It is necessary to do so, and this bill should therefore have the support of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is many months overdue. I have already complimented the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of that committee. They have done an excellent job. However, I repeat, we are in here at a rather late date.

Certainly the American people have been fed up with the information they have received regarding this so-called East-West trade or doing business with the Communists. That feeling arises because our experience just prior to World War II, when we were doing a land-office business with Japan in oil and scrap metals, which commodities were later used extensively against our own men when we were fighting in the Pacific.

I call attention to two of the findings in this report because I think they are very important. The report fixes some responsibility on our own Government. We are not in here, as a matter of fact, with clean hands. The United States has been doing a considerable business with the Soviet satellite nations and also with Soviet Russia. In fact there is still some trade.

The committee on page 17 of its report and in the second point set forth call attention to the fact that the United States Government has been slow in determining what items shall be controlled. I think we ought to impress upon the administrative agency charged with the responsibility of administering this law that it get busy immediately. There can be no real excuse for not determining the critical categories.

Then there is another angle I think we ought to remember, that there are some of our allies in the western free nations who do not have the same concept about this matter that we do. When our committee was over in Europe just a few weeks ago we heard some complaints, especially while we were in Holland, against the so-called Kem amendment which had passed just a few days before we arrived. They said that some trade was absolutely necessary to maintain even a minimum amount of business and they hoped for a modification of the Kem amendment. Passage of the resolution before us will accomplish that end.

We know the people in Europe are living closer to the Soviet and satellite countries than we are. I think there can be an honest difference of opinion as between ourselves and our friends as to just what items ought to be excluded. The committee has made a definite finding and recommendation which is to be found on page 17, point 3. The report points out that some of the countries do not agree with us as to just what are strategic materials and strategic items. I think we ought to be fair about this—as we have been very frequently criticized. It is so easy as we consider this

whole problem of east-west trade to say that they are unfair in their approach when we know as a matter of fact it means a great deal where they live adjacent to so-called satellite countries.

To repeat, we ought to impress upon the Department of Commerce, which will have the responsibility for administering the law, that they cut shipments to a bare minimum because the people of this country are determined that this trade must be reduced to the minimum. It ought to stop at least as far as critical items are concerned.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if cotton is considered a commodity of war under the terms of the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. VORYS. As has been stated in the report I believe there are 300 items in the A list and 400 in the B list. Unfortunately, not to reveal to our enemies just what those are, there is no published list of what items are really absolutely strategic or those which are on the B list and are restricted in amounts.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. May I point out to the gentlewoman that in the case of what is called linter, which is a by-product of cotton or cottonseed residuals, the linter goes into the making of gunpowder. The gentlewoman can be assured that it is on the list in that respect. I might also add that this is one of the great difficulties in the consideration of this whole problem, of course, for our officials to determine what should go on the list; because a thing today might be critical and tomorrow it may not and vice versa. There may be materials that change from week to week according to the needs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to receive the gentleman's information. I happened to be next to the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a good many years. I remember I protested at that time very bitterly in the committee and on the floor of Congress against the shipment of cotton to Japan, as well as other commodities of war. All the time that we were shipping those commodities of war to Japan, Japan was arming against us, and then she stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor. We have exactly the same situation today. We are shipping commodities of war to enemy countries and they in turn are using these commodities to make powder and war material to use against our men.

I think it is time that the Congress pass this resolution; and do more than is contained in this resolution.

I heartily commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] and the members of the committee for bringing out this resolution but it does not go far enough.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will also bring up House Concurrent Resolution 140 for consideration later today. I

wish to read House Concurrent Resolution 140, which came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER]. I am very sorry that it is not stronger. It is as follows:

Whereas the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, correspondent for the Associated Press in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a shocking violation of fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas the Oatis case demonstrates anew that the iron curtain maintained by the Soviet Union and its satellites is the world's greatest menace to peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its profound indignation at the farcical arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, and that the sense of this resolution be conveyed by the proper officials of our Government to the United Nations and to the officials of the Czechoslovakian Government.

That resolution is little more than a mild reproach to Czechoslovakia. It is little short of a farce. My resolution provided that commercial trade should cease and that within 90 days our nationals should be taken out of Czechoslovakia. My resolution, House Resolution 344, is as follows, and I hoped the Foreign Affairs Committee would accept it:

Whereas William N. Oatis, a reporter for the Associated Press and a citizen of the United States, was arrested by officials of the Government of Czechoslovakia on April 23, 1951, summarily tried on July 2-3, 1951, and sentenced on July 4, 1951, to 10 years' imprisonment for alleged crimes against the Government of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas this persecution by the Government of Czechoslovakia of an American citizen is condemned and deplored by the people of the United States, and throughout the free world; and

Whereas the considerable and growing sentiment among our people against the tyrannies of the Communist dictatorships should be made unmistakably clear to the rulers and subjects of those countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia should be terminated immediately, and should be resumed only if and when the Government of Czechoslovakia restores to William N. Oatis his freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That if William N. Oatis is not restored to his freedom within 90 days that the Department of State take steps to evacuate all nationals of the United States in Czechoslovakia with the end in view of severing diplomatic relations with that Government.

The terrible thing, to my mind, is that we are not really a weak country, but we seem like a weak country. We hide our heads in the sand. We do not stand up for our own people. I find that no country respects us. Perhaps some of all implements of war are not being shipped to China, but many things are being shipped to China that are materials of war, and that should cease.

If I cannot secure the substitution of my resolution, I shall vote for this resolution, but it is very weak.

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

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

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

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

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] for introducing the first bill to control exports to satellite nations. We can endeavor to safeguard our fighting men so far as trade of war materials is concerned. I also want to compliment our chairman, Mr. BATTLE, for his untiring efforts in the solution of this complex problem.

The critical situation that the free world faces today is self-evident. We cannot live in peace in this world, much less survive in this world, where the enemies of a true and just peace are the leaders of a godless state—Russia.

For our very survival, we in the free world are mobilizing and are dedicating the lives of our children and our fortunes in hope and trust that true justice and true peace will prevail. We in this Congress are honor bound to augment the actions of our troops who are bearing our responsibilities to make this the world we hope for and pray for.

With these facts clear in my mind, I feel that the bill before us today is justified and that positive action is the only course to pursue.

Thus we consider the purpose of this bill, H. R. 4550, which is to control exports to any nation threatening the security of the United States at this time—Russia and its satellite nations. The important factor in this bill is that it is mandatory in time of peace or in war—whether that war be defined as a cold war, a subversive war or actual hostilities.

The objective is to embargo and control war potential exports by the United States and by the nations of the free world.

The control of United States exports by the United States Government through the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, although late, has been effective. This has been and is being accomplished by requiring export licenses. Last year 20 percent of the volume of the United States exports to all destinations required licenses.

Beginning January 1951 export licenses were required for all shipments destined to the Soviet orbit. Transshipment and in-transit shipment problems are the most difficult and are aggravated by the existence of free ports.

By this legislation free nations are invited to cooperate, but those nations who receive economic, military, and financial aid must cooperate. Responsibility for initiating, planning, and administering this international job for regulating the flow of exports to iron curtain countries is placed in the hands of the mutual defense assistance officer.

I would like to emphasize particularly the point that there is no easy or simple solution to the problem of controlling trade between the countries of the free world and the countries that lie behind

the iron curtain. Just consider, for example, the problems created by the commodities which are involved. Certain countries of Europe have built their economic structures upon a trade which provided them with coal, lumber, and grain from Eastern Europe. If these major commodities were denied to them, there would be the most serious interruption to the defense program in Western Europe, and to their very survival, not to mention the political consequences in certain of the most vulnerable countries of Europe, which would cause us very great concern.

Other countries in the world face a much more serious situation when they contemplate taking drastic action toward cutting off exports to Russia than we do in the United States. Many of them are small and are in geographically exposed positions. Most of them are in complete sympathy with the objectives of our policy and are glad to cooperate in a very effective manner, but at the same time are extremely reluctant to take action officially. Probably no other country is as nearly self-sufficient as we are. We would expect to get along pretty well even though there was an absolute stoppage of commerce between the United States and all countries under Russian domination. In the case of some of our major allies in Europe the situation is very different. They are primarily manufacturing nations. They depend upon imports of food and raw materials to keep their economies in operation. Under present conditions of world shortages, it would be impossible for the United States to provide these nations with the things that they are able to get from Russia today if action were taken which stopped Russian shipments to them.

I am sure that most of these countries of Europe are just as anxious as we are to keep commodities away from the iron curtain countries that will help Russian aggression. Nevertheless the consequences to them of enacting a sweeping embargo would be so serious that they cannot accept immediately and without question an ultimatum on this matter from the United States.

I want to make clear that nothing I have said should be interpreted as indicating that I favor the continuation of the present confusion with regard to the control of shipments to Russia by the countries in Europe. It seems to me to be absolutely essential that the United States adopt this firm and clear policy on this matter, that our position be made known to all other countries in the world, that we work out with each of them the course of action which it can best take in order to strengthen the nations of the free world and to handicap the efforts of the Soviet aggressors. I believe that the bill before us provides a firm foundation and a clear direction for action of this kind, and that it should have our support.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mr. Chairman, many of the citizens of this country, including myself, are shocked and embittered by the fact that several of the countries to whom we are

now, and have been, extending both military and economic aid to resist Communist aggression are still actively trading with the enemy by exporting strategic war materials to Russia, the Chinese Communists, and the satellite countries. In the hopes of correcting this situation, I introduced H. R. 1621 on January 17 of this year.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee, and in particular the subcommittee headed by Congressman BATTLE, for the exhaustive and painstaking study they have made of this problem and for their tireless efforts in bringing to the floor the measure now before us for consideration. I also want to commend my colleague from Florida, Congressman ROGERS, for the resolution which he introduced, and which this House adopted, calling on the United Nations to place an embargo on the shipment of arms to Communist China.

Prior to the so-called Kem amendment and the introduction of H. R. 1621 and H. R. 1939, an attempt was made to rationalize this trade on the theory that our allies must stockpile strategic materials which could be imported from Communist countries—or that we would have to supply our allies with fuel and grain which they are now importing from Communist countries.

It hardly makes sense, however, to barter, trade, and exchange strategic materials with our enemies so that we are better equipped to kill each other. I recognize that much has been done by the United States to curb the export of strategic materials to Russia and China, but our attempts to persuade our allies to follow the same action have met with little success.

The Belgians, it is reported, will export, this year, 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals to Russia, even though such metals are sorely needed in Western Europe. Steel, copper, brass products, tires, and much machinery were exported, during 1950, from Britain to both Hong Kong and Chinese ports. Even today Britain is transshipping Malayan rubber to Soviet ports.

Recently we were informed of a transaction whereby the French steel industry had negotiated to furnish 450 miles of steel rail to China, which in all probability would have been used to construct rail lines from the interior of China to Indochina where valiant French forces are bitterly engaged with the Communists. The French Government is to be commended for taking steps to stop this shipment.

In the past year, the countries of Western Europe have exported almost a billion dollars' worth of machinery and materials to the Soviet war potential.

The American people want to make sure that our enemies are not assisted in building up their war machine by trade from the United States and our allies. When we read in the newspapers that the steamship *Flying Cloud* under the American flag had been fired on while attempting to deliver a cargo of war materials to Communist China; when it was implied over the radio that

a west coast pier was piled high with tires awaiting shipment to the Chinese mainland to equip the vehicles of the Communist army; when it was reported that Italian factories which had received Marshall-plan materials and equipment are producing heavy machinery for Russia; and when information was received that a major industry in the United Kingdom was booked so far ahead with orders for Russia, under a trade agreement, that the plants could not produce equipment for British rearmament, it is apparent that immediate and drastic action must be taken.

If we expect the American public to fully support the mobilization effort, and to help other freedom-loving people resist communism; if we are to enjoy the confidence of our people, then we must put a stop to this unscrupulous trade.

Passage of the legislation before us today is imperative if we are to safeguard the fighting men and insure that the free nations of the world join with us to the fullest extent of their ability in our efforts to resist and deter Communist aggression.

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

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. BATTLE. I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida along with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas in introducing legislation and calling to the attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee the great need for a solution to this East-West trade problem. I remember one of the first times I met the gentleman from Florida after he became one of our colleagues, that we discussed this very problem, and I did not want the opportunity to go by without congratulating him for his farsightedness.

Mr. LANTAFF. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

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

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman mentioned the trade through Red China. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree that we need also to strengthen this with an absolute blockade on Red China and on any other country with which we are at war to carry out the defense of this country from a military standpoint? Would not the gentleman agree that it would help stop trade with Red China if we blockaded the China coast?

Mr. LANTAFF. I think we all have the same objective in mind. The objective of the committee is clear because on page 2 of the bill is this statement of policy:

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to congratulate the

gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], who is conducting this battle here. I also desire to commend the gentleman from Dade County, Fla., my colleague, BILL LANTAFF, for being the first to introduce a similar bill to this one. This bill, I believe, was the first bill he introduced after becoming a Member of Congress and is evidence to the fact that he has the making of an outstanding Congressman.

I rise in support of the pending bill. The membership of the House will recall that on May 7 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 101, and the same resolution was introduced in the Senate on May 15, by Senator HOLLAND, my colleague, calling upon the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes. The resolution is, as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

SEC. 2. Copies of this resolution shall be transmitted through the Secretary of State to the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the United States Representative in the United Nations, and the Deputy United States Representatives in the United Nations.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the House and Senate. Three days after that resolution was passed the United Nations General Assembly on May 18, 1951, passed the following recommendation: "That every state apply an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and of the North Korean authorities of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials,

petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

Now that is as far as it looked like the United Nations General Assembly could go at that time. Of course, it could have included Russia, but Russia, being a member of the United Nations, and irrespective of whether they were in that organization or not, would pay no attention to it.

We do have this as a result of the unanimous sentiment of both Houses of Congress and the United Nations did take action with respect to asking each state that was a member of the United Nations to place an embargo on the shipment of these materials to China or to Korea. We all recognize as expressed in the House concurrent resolution that "no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world."

That is what we are doing today. We are sending our boys over there in a United Nations undertaking, so to speak. Some of these nations that are members of the United Nations and that have troops over there have been shipping ammunition and war materials to this area that may be used to kill our soldiers.

I am glad to see this bill passed by the Congress. It is a belated one. It is something we should have done a long time ago. We should not endorse the principle of letting any nation that is a member of the United Nations, ship any arms, ammunition, or war material that can be used in battle against any of our soldiers or any of the soldiers of the United Nations fighting in this conflict. Each member of the United Nations should invoke an embargo on such materials.

We should insist and demand such an embargo as a condition precedent to rendering any economic aid to any Nation.

Sometimes I wonder why we continue to let Russia remain a member of the United Nations. She has opposed every action seeking peace since the United Nations has been formed. She has impeded every move looking toward peace. I sometimes think that Russia, together with her satellites, should be thrown out of an organization the purpose of which is peace.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time for a specific purpose. First, I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], as well as the subcommittee for having done an outstandingly fine job. I was not on that subcommittee, so perhaps I can say it with a certain objectivity and propriety.

There are two points I would like to leave with the House in this situation. First, this bill is an excellent bill because it fights economic warfare with a precision rifle and not with a blunderbuss. We have heard a lot of statements, well intentioned and sincere on the floor here

and on the floor in the other body about cutting off all trade with the Soviet bloc to bring them to their senses, cutting it off completely, isolating them from the world economically. I understand the ultimate objective and agree with it. Few seem to recognize, however, that for centuries Western Europe drew its very lifeblood—grain and timber and other materials—from Eastern Europe, and such relationships cannot be suddenly and completely broken by severing those ancient ties which existed for centuries with a sharp knife. It can be done and is done in this bill, of course, as to arms and materials strategic to war preparations. But that still leaves a broad area as to which cotton was just given as an example. In this third category economic warfare is a subtle proposition. You can get awfully hurt and you can get greatly benefited. It all depends on how the job is done and on that this bill does a fine job. The subcommittee is entitled to the thanks of the whole country for that beyond peradventure.

Second, we must understand that when we ask our friends to sever long standing economic relationships with parts of the world now in the Soviet bloc, as we are in the process of doing now, somebody has to help them to make up for that, during a transition stage. So, let us get an understanding that in dealing with the peoples of Western Europe that are breaking off long standing economic relationships that we have to help them to make up the deficits in the period which they are now going through, the transition period, while world economic relationships are realigned.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I first address myself to congratulating the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] and his committee and all those who have brought forth this legislation. Not to be critical of the gentleman from New York, who just spoke and whom I consider to be a very able man, but I admit that I am, by natural inclination, one of those who deals more or less with the blunderbuss approach to international affairs and I do not understand all of the subtleties of some of these pieces of legislation. I am ready to admit, however, that the Foreign Affairs Committee is an able committee and is better informed of the background of these matters than am I. So, I say, if we must not take the policy of removing Soviet Russia from the United Nations—which is the policy which I feel we should pursue, together with severing relationships with her and her satellites who are doing direct or indirect combat to ourselves—then I would say that this legislation is a well-drawn bill. It does not permit injury that might be done by a more drastic measure and it appears to be a workable bill; but I personally feel that we should have even a more vigorous and forthright approach than is indicated in this bill.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], particularly, for being the initiator of this legislation in the House, and I think it

might be an illustration of the type of thing that comes from the people themselves because the gentleman from Florida had only been in the House about 15 days, when he introduced this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951."

TITLE I—WAR MATERIALS

SEC. 101. The Congress of the United States, recognizing that in a world threatened by aggression the United States can best preserve and maintain peace by developing maximum national strength and by utilizing all of its resources in cooperation with other free nations, hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to apply an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic materials, petroleum, transportation material of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to (1) increase the national strength of the United States and of the cooperating nations; (2) impede the ability of nations threatening the security of the United States to conduct military operations; and (3) to assist the people of the nations under the domination of foreign aggressors to reestablish their freedom.

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 102. To carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Mutual Defense Assistance Officer at a rate of compensation not to exceed \$16,000 per annum. Until such appointment has been made the person occupying the senior position authorized by subsection (e) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (Public Law 329, 81st Cong.), as amended, shall be designated as Mutual Defense Assistance Officer in addition to his other duties.

SEC. 103. (a) The Mutual Defense Assistance Officer is hereby authorized and directed to determine within 30 days after enactment of this act after full and complete consideration of the views of the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce; the Economic Cooperation Administration; and any other appropriate agencies, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this act, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy material, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That such determinations shall be continuously adjusted to current conditions on the basis of investigation and consultation, and that all nations receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance shall be kept informed of such determination.

(b) All military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation shall, upon the recommendation of the Mutual Defense Assistance Officer, be terminated forthwith if such nation after 60 days from the date of

a determination under section 103 (a) knowingly permits the shipment to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, of any item which he has determined under section 103 (a) after a full and complete investigation to be included in any of the following categories: Arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war: *Provided*, That the President after receiving the advice of the Mutual Defense Assistance Officer and after taking into account the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance, may direct the continuance of such assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic-energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States: *Provided further*, That the President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to the first proviso of this section with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the President shall at least once each quarter review all determinations made previously and shall report his conclusions to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which determinations have been made.

SEC. 104. Whenever military, economic, or financial assistance has been terminated as provided in this act, such assistance can be resumed only upon determination by the President that adequate measures have been taken by the nation concerned to assure full compliance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 105. For the purposes of this act the term "assistance" does not include activities carried on for the purpose of facilitating the procurement of materials in which the United States is deficient.

TITLE II—OTHER MATERIALS

SEC. 201. The Congress of the United States further declares it to be the policy of the United States to regulate the export of commodities other than those specified in title I of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to strengthen the United States and other cooperating nations of the free world and to oppose and offset by nonmilitary action acts which threaten the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

SEC. 202. The United States shall negotiate with any country receiving military, economic, or financial assistance arrangements for the recipient country to undertake a program for controlling exports of items not subject to embargo under title I of this act, but which in the judgment of the mutual defense assistance officer should be controlled to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 203. All military, economic, and financial assistance shall be terminated when the President determines that the recipient

country (1) is not effectively cooperating with the United States pursuant to this title, or (2) is failing to furnish to the United States information sufficient for the President to determine that the recipient country is effectively cooperating with the United States.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. All other nations (those not receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance) shall be invited by the President to cooperate jointly in a group or groups or on an individual basis in controlling the export of the commodities referred to in title I and title II of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 302. The mutual defense assistance officer with regard to all titles of this act shall—

(a) coordinate those activities of the various United States departments and agencies which are concerned with security controls over exports from other countries;

(b) make a continuing study of the administration of export control measures undertaken by foreign governments in accordance with the provisions of this act, and shall report to the Congress from time to time but not less than once every 6 months recommending action where appropriate; and

(c) make available technical advice and assistance on export control procedures to any nation desiring such cooperation.

SEC. 303. The provisions of subsection (a) of section 403, of section 404, and of subsections (a), (c), and (d) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (Public Law 329, 81st Cong.), as amended, insofar as they are consistent with this act, shall be applicable to this act. Funds made available for the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, shall be available for carrying out this act in such amounts as the President shall direct.

SEC. 304. In every recipient country where local currency is made available for local currency expenses of the United States in connection with assistance furnished by the United States, the local currency administrative and operating expenses incurred in the administration of this act shall be charged to such local currency funds to the extent available.

SEC. 305. Subsection (d) of section 117 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), as amended, and subsection (a) of section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), are repealed.

Mr. BATTLE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record at this point, and be open to amendment at any point thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 6, strike out "forces" and insert "services."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question or two in connection with this measure.

As I understand, it embargoes arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic material, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

What about drugs and medicines?

Mr. BATTLE. I think that would depend upon the determination by the mutual-defense-assistance officer as to the inclusion of the items of other materials.

Mr. GROSS. But drugs and medicines do not come under this classification?

Mr. BATTLE. There are a great many other items which are very important in the prosecution of warfare and which are covered under title II, and as to which this bill specifically says there will be compulsory agreements between the recipient nations and the United States, so this goes much further than just dealing with arms, ammunition, implements of war, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Embracing more than the language contained here?

Mr. BATTLE. Title II covers those various points.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, I am sure, that the United States has participated in shipping tons of wonder drugs into Hong Kong which have been going into Communist China.

Mr. BATTLE. We were aware of that specific problem, and it is covered in title II.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask this further question: Is this bill approved by the State Department?

Mr. BATTLE. It would be hard to answer that directly. As far as I know, there are no overwhelming objections. I think maybe this legislation might be preferable to some others.

Mr. GROSS. But it does not have the approval of the State Department; is that correct?

Mr. BATTLE. We have letters from all departments in which there were objections raised as to specific points and in which they condone specific points, so as an over-all general thing we have both objections and condonations.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any indication of what reception this bill, if passed by both Houses, would receive at the White House?

Mr. BATTLE. I do not know, but I know that all the way through this has been an independent piece of legislation which we initiated, coming from the legislative body. What we are concerned with is initiating something that will work. We are not concerned so much with whether or not it is our own as we are in getting a workable piece of legislation that will do the job and help protect our boys on the fighting front.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman has made a start, but a feeble start; I do

not think this bill goes nearly far enough. I will support it only because it is in the right direction.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate his support.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 4, line 15, after the colon, strike all beginning with the word "Provided" down through line 14 on page 5.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the proviso beginning in line 15 on page 4. This is the proviso which permits the President to make special exceptions to the operation of this law in any cases where he feels the security of the United States would be injured more by cutting off our assistance than it would be aided. This in effect nullifies the bill.

I offer this amendment to point out what seems to me to be the basic fallacy in the legislation. This bill is aimed primarily at the countries of the North Atlantic Pact and all Western Europe generally, to wit: England, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, the Benelux countries, and the Scandinavian countries. It has been our fundamental policy and no doubt will continue to be to fight the spreading tide of communism by extending both economic and military aid to these countries.

The administration has clearly indicated by its actions in the past few months in connection with a policy similar to this which has been enunciated by the State Department to make an exception of every case that has come up. I think the committee has no reason to anticipate that if this bill becomes law they will do anything but make exceptions of every one of those countries which I have named.

May I ask if any member of the committee believes that any of those countries will be cut off from American assistance if this bill is enacted into law? I think the answer is obvious to all of us. None of them will be. Therefore, passing this law is nothing but an empty gesture.

I am offering this amendment primarily to emphasize this basic point: that you are not really accomplishing anything by adopting this bill. I feel it would not be consistent with the course this Nation has taken to cut off assistance to any of these nations. It would have been far more realistic for the committee to have reported out a joint resolution expressing it to be the policy of the Congress that these nations should discontinue their trade with the countries behind the iron curtain, rather than to have taken this course. As it is, all you are doing is passing a bill which if enacted into law will accomplish nothing further than to express such to be the policy of the Congress and also to create a new office which involves a salary of \$16,000 a year plus the cost of a staff. So, other than creating a new bureau and more bureaucrats this bill will do nothing further than express the policy of Congress which could have been done much more effectively through a joint resolution.

If it is impracticable, in view of general policy considerations, to cut off assistance to those countries as a penalty for their continuing to trade with the Red bloc of nations, it would be more forthright for the committee to openly admit this to be the case, rather than to go through the motions of adopting a bill which, on its face would cut off such assistance, but which, in fact, would not do so.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are inclined, I think, in these times to oversimplify considerably the tremendous difficulties faced by this Government in its world dealings with other nations, and in coping with this problem which, of course, is one which has given every department of the Government great concern over the last several years. I doubt if those who have spoken in a reflective way upon the departments of Government which have had this responsibility, really mean to say that they have been even slack in their duties. I appreciate very much the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in respect to the complexities and intricacies of world trade. There is nothing more complicated unless it is the monetary system. You know very well it is not an easy matter. This is not to defend all past actions of this Government in connection with its efforts to deny materials of war to potential enemies but it is to appreciate the difficulties involved. We are living in times which have no precedent and therefore new procedures and new approaches must be devised. It has been a cumbersome process and the purpose of this legislation is to provide more practical and workable machinery to accomplish that which we all desire.

There is one thing about this measure which I do not believe has been called to the attention of the Members, and that is the fact that responsibility is pin-pointed as strictly as the committee could possibly work out. Heretofore someone has referred to it as being a blunderbuss proposition of controlling trade between this country and the satellite nations of Russian and directly with Russia. The responsibility has been divided among a great many different departments. But they have made a tremendous effort, and in executive session we were told of some of those efforts, which we are not at liberty to discuss fully on the floor and which should not be discussed for security reasons. But it does give an appreciation of what they have been up against and what they are still up against. Consider the trade from Western Germany to Eastern Germany. Germany is an entity hard to divide. It alone is a tremendous problem and a place where many abuses have occurred. I mention this situation as an example. Historically, Western Europe has depended for about 45 percent of its food from Eastern Europe. The east is the bread basket of all Europe. You just cannot cut it off, or else we are going to have to furnish it to them. So there is a practical matter to consider. This is not defending past actions, because the least of it has been too much unless it is definitely shown the pre-

ponderance of benefits favors the west. The gentleman's amendment would bring about an intolerable condition and leave no room for the exercise of judgment as to benefits which may accrue to the west. The deficits which might occur would have to be made up by this country if we stay in Germany.

The gentleman talks about nullifying the bill should the provision which he wishes to amend remain in the bill. I fear his amendment would nullify the intent, and the thing we are trying to do is find a practical way to deal with this matter. There is a prohibition against the shipment of actual war material, such as guns, ammunition, and atomic materials, and so forth. There is no exception to that, but there has to be some elasticity in those items which are not implements of war per se. The responsibility, remember, is in one as directly as it can be placed and that has been a great weakness in past efforts. The only place he can go for appeal or final decision is to the President of the United States. You have to trust someone. You just cannot have authority dangling in the air without some compactness and some responsibility and without having one man to whom you can say, "Here, this is what has happened. Why has it happened and what is the answer to it?" That is what the committee hopes it has presented to you.

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

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the gentleman tell us for what specific items we need elasticity in this matter of East-West trade?

Mr. BURLESON. I will say to the gentleman that in an attempt to answer the question of the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] I gave an example. Today an item might be critical and tomorrow it might not. Or today it might not be critical and tomorrow it might be. An article might not be critical today and next week it will be because of its particular use at that time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman know that according to this bill if an item is no longer critical it would not apply to that item?

Mr. BURLESON. Someone must decide whether or not it does apply. That person has to be responsible for placing this particular item on the list. The Congress itself cannot draw up a list of critical materials. We could not possibly be experts along that line and know what is critical in one area and not in another or that which may be vital and critical one week and the next, by reason of numerous circumstances, it may be entirely a different situation.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would it not be one of the worst things for us to do to publish an item that had suddenly become critical and thereby let our enemies know that an item which they had not known was critical had suddenly become so?

Mr. BURLESON. Exactly so.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be an expert on foreign affairs. I know we have a splendid Committee on Foreign Affairs in this House. I know the members on both sides personally, and I know they are doing an excellent job. However, I do want to make an observation about this legislation. It may be only a pious hope or just so many words, but it is well that we have this legislation before us, because if we in the Congress express our views as to not doing business with Communist Russia or China or with the satellite countries of Communist Russia, I think it is all to the good.

Pretty generally throughout the country our people are not aware of the fact that the United States of America is trading with Communist Russia, directly and indirectly, and with the satellite countries. People are utterly amazed when they hear rumors of our Government using their money to implement our enemy. They ask, "What in the world is it all about?" They cannot quite understand it. The fact of the matter is we are doing business with Russia directly. Our Government, our industries, are doing business with Russia directly, and they are doing business with these satellite countries directly—not only indirectly but directly. Now it is perfectly amazing that our boys should be on the march, three and one-half million men in the armed services, young men being drafted and marching as to war, and yet our own Government is doing business with our potential enemies. We are not a bunch of morons here. We are the elected representatives of the people. I think it is well that we act on this legislation and I hope there is not a vote against this resolution.

We have a synthetic prosperity in this country, based entirely on the manufacture and sale of war materials. Our business is almost entirely conducted with borrowed money; and, as has been brought to the attention of this Congress on a number of occasions, this country owes more money than all of the other countries in the world combined.

Anyone who can figure out the incredible confusions of reasoning which currently pass for policy with respect to China belongs on the faculty of the Einstein Institute for International Relativity. Some of the very nations which are fighting alongside of Uncle Sam against the Chinese Reds in Korea are simultaneously engaged in sending merchandise of every description to the Chinese. In all the history of warfare, few situations to match this paradox can be found.

Apparently, the British regard this war as only a "little war." They are trying as hard as they can to play it down, so that they may go right on trading through Hong Kong just as if

no British Tommies were being shot at in Korea. You can hardly become too indignant at the British, when you realize that until recently our own occupation authorities in Japan itself were permitting the Japanese to trade with the Chinese on the amazing theory that the Japanese economy requires such trade for survival. This is amazing because one of the avowed objectives of Mao Tse-tung's Chinese Red Government is the ultimate domination of Japan itself.

Is it any wonder, in the light of these constant contradictions, that the world itself is confused? It is not difficult to understand why some of our allies refuse to commit larger numbers of troops to the Korean war when the two chief allies, the United States and Great Britain seem to be having trouble in arriving at a common understanding of the stakes involved and the size of the war they are fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and co-operating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 363, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND ON THE BILL H. R. 4550

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury-Post Office Departments for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in order to get information for the House, is that a unanimous report?

Mr. ROONEY. I understand that the conferees have not finally reached an agreement, but they expect to.

Mr. McCORMACK. In case of an agreement, when would the gentleman want it to be called up? I want the information for the House.

Mr. ROONEY. It is impossible to answer that question until the conferees have reached final agreement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can understand that. May I suggest to the gentleman that if an agreement is arrived at and in the event of any controversy he not ask me to program it before Wednesday?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe that that might be agreeable to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and to the ranking minority member.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 140, expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovak Government, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, correspondent for the Associated Press in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a shocking violation of fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas the Oatis case demonstrates anew that the iron curtain maintained by the Soviet Union and its satellites is the world's greatest menace to peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States expresses its profound indignation at the farcical arrest, and conviction of William N. Oatis; and that the sense of this resolution be conveyed by the proper officials of our Government to the United Nations and to the officials of the Czechoslovakian Government.

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs advise me what disposition has been made of the John Hvasta case, which has been before the committee and which involves an American citizen who has been incarcerated for approximately 3 years by the Czechoslovak Government?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, may I say this to the gentleman from New Jersey who introduced a resolution on the Hvasta case, and who has been working very hard on it, importuning the Foreign Affairs Committee to do something about it for some weeks. It was the desire of the Foreign Affairs Committee to consider the John Hvasta case with a good many other cases at the same time that the Oatis case was considered yesterday. However, in our discussions in committee, it became clear that the Hvasta case was from the standpoint of the Oatis case a far different situation. To act properly on the

Hvasta case would require considerable testimony; there was at present no time at the disposal of the Foreign Affairs Committee to deal adequately with a case of that kind. We were—and still are—deeply engaged in the task of writing the so-called mutual-security bill, which we hope will come before the House shortly. We came to the conclusion we had better handle the Oatis case on its own merits and have only Oatis mentioned in this resolution because the facts surrounding the Oatis case applied only to that particular case. The committee went ahead with the Oatis resolution and expressed the intention at the time that as soon as we can get to the Hvasta case and three or four other similar cases after the bill now under consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee is written, we will take up the Hvasta case at the first opportunity. I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts. Hvasta, as I understand it, is one of his constituents, but I do want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Hvasta is in a little different situation than Oatis due to dual citizenship.

Mr. RODINO. I am quite aware of that. I want to state that Mr. Hvasta is a resident of the congressional district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] had been here he would have raised the same point.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thought he was from the gentleman's district.

Mr. RODINO. He is from New Jersey.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to compliment a Member who works so hard for a man who does not live in his district.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it not fair to say that while this resolution is confined to the Oatis case, while not expressly but by implication the same principle is involved in the case that the gentleman from New Jersey referred to, even the persecution that has taken place of all people not only in Czechoslovakia on religious, political, or other grounds, and that this really symbolizes the feeling of the Congress of the United States and the people of our country?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no question about that. The majority leader has stated the case correctly. The thing I was concerned about is that here is a citizen who is not connected with the press or having any powerful friends, or anything like that, and that possibly some nation would get the idea that we would pay less attention to him, if his case was similar, than we would to an employee of a great organization.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that in the third "whereas" clause the committee put in "Whereas the persecution by the Government of Czechoslovakia of other American citizens is condemned and deplored by the people of the United States and throughout the free world" it was felt that we ought to put in language in

this resolution which would include cases like the Hvasta case, even though you did not mention him by name?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. We could not include his name, but we came as near to it as we could in the consideration of the Oatis case.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, notice by the State Department of its termination of special tariff concessions to Czechoslovakia though belated is at least commendable in principle. Although the effect of this decision will probably be trivial in the sense of economics, nonetheless, it does indicate that we do not countenance the high-handed treatment of our citizens by the Communist-dominated Czech Government. I would, personally, have preferred, and I have urged, sterner action be taken against these rapists of fundamental human rights. I had hoped, too, that our Committee on Foreign Affairs, in protesting the action of the Czech Government in the case of William Oatis, would have adopted a stronger resolution. However, I shall not challenge the wisdom of the committee, but I wish to cite the case of John Hvasta, as a warning of what we might expect from the Czech Government if our action is not firm.

John Hvasta, a Czechoslovak by birth, is a naturalized American citizen. As soon as he was able and of age, he enlisted in the United States Navy and served from September 1945 to August 1946. His parents, naturalized American citizens, reside in New Jersey.

John Hvasta following the war went to Czechoslovakia to study under the GI Bill of Rights in 1948. He was arrested on October 16, 1948, and 7 months later was tried on trumped-up charges of espionage. His trial was held in secret. On June 1, 1948, John Hvasta was sentenced to 3-years imprisonment. American officials tried, many times, without success to obtain a copy of the accusation, transcript of the proceedings and a statement of the verdict and sentence. The Czechoslovak Government officials merely ignored these requests. Then, as though in complete disdain, an appeal trial was held, again in secret on April 26, 1950, and Hvasta's sentence instead of being reduced was increased to 10 years. No official word of this increase was transmitted to any American official until August 1950, after repeated requests had been made to ascertain Hvasta's status. Since February 23, 1950, no American official has been permitted to see John Hvasta, and word has reached the family of Hvasta that the Czech fiancée whom he married in the presence of an American vice consul, has been unheard from for over 2 months now.

According to a letter from Mrs. Hvasta's mother in Czechoslovakia, all she knows is that Mrs. John Hvasta had been taken to a hospital for treatment

and when she went back the next day to visit her daughter no one had ever heard of her and the police do not seem to be interested. What will happen to John Hvasta? What has happened to his wife? This is the case of an American citizen who seeks our protection.

In a letter written some time ago to his mother, here in America, Hvasta says:

What is the matter with everyone in America? Why don't you people do something for me? Isn't there anybody over there who can help me? As God is my judge—I am not guilty of what I was charged with. Can't you go to Washington, mom, and tell them I am innocent—I am sure they will find some way to get me out of here.

It is now almost 3 years that Hvasta has spent in a Communist jail under trumped-up charges. How long are we to stand by while these Godless, unprincipled people visit abuse and indignities on our citizens? How long will we permit John Hvasta's plea to go unanswered?

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of House Concurrent Resolution 140 calling for action to effect the release of William Oatis. It is my hope that his release may soon be effected. But, we must not forget other American citizens who are imprisoned behind the iron curtain. It is time to remember John Hvasta—the forgotten man. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the Czechoslovak Government be made to realize that we will not tolerate their gangster treatment of our citizens.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendments: The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "farical."

Page 2, line 3, after "arrest", insert "sham trial."

Page 2, line 4, after "and", insert "unjust."

Page 2, line 4, after "Oatis", insert "that the executive agencies of the Government be requested to take all possible action to bring about his release."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The parliamentary situation now is that any Member desiring recognition may move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. Or to offer an amendment.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, a long time ago these words were spoken:

What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine and go after that which is lost, until he find it? * * * And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost.

I am prompted to use that beautifully expressive parable because I personally

feel that you, my friends and neighbors, are called together to rejoice in the realization that the true spirit of this Republic of ours has been found. The Foreign Affairs Committee has expressed this spirit in its cooperative and prompt consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 140 in an effort to secure the release of William Oatis who is unjustly imprisoned in Czechoslovakia.

William Oatis was a resident of Marion, Ind., which is in the district that I have the honor to represent. I never met William Oatis, but so many tributes have been paid to him and so many resolutions and letters from his church, the YMCA, and friends attesting to his character have been received that I know all of you must feel as I do that we know William Oatis. He is a man, a young man of promise, and he possesses a body that does not appear too strong. He is more than just a name in our country today. William Oatis is a symbol of the freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to fair trial—yes, even freedom of life.

This resolution calls upon the executive agencies of our Government to take all possible and positive action to bring about his release. This refers not alone to the State Department but to all departments and agencies of our Government. Czechoslovakia craves our American dollars to carry on propaganda in this country, perhaps even to furnish bail for those who would overthrow our Government, and we do not need her products that furnish unfair competition with our American labor. Our exports to Czechoslovakia have dwindled to an insignificant figure while her imports to this country have increased until the first 4 months of this year gave them an advantage of nearly 15 to 1. Immediate steps can be taken to suspend these trade relations and numerous other forceful measures can follow.

I pray all of the Members of this Congress to support this resolution—not because I introduced it, not entirely because it can be an implement to free William Oatis, but also because the world can see and hear that this United States of America has a determination and a spirit that reasserts itself. When this spirit thus expresses itself, then we, too, can say "Rejoice with me for I have found the sheep which I had lost."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has set forth a very serious situation and set it forth factually and very intelligently. I do not want to inject politics into this, but here is a thing that has been running through this Congress for years. We Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means have been trying to work this thing out so that Czechoslovakia does not get this great advantage she has been getting for years. Our watchmakers have lost their jobs, our potteries have been broken up, and our glassmen by the thousands have lost their jobs, simply because we have given the business to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, the boot and shoe industry has suffered most severely.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman has touched upon a very strong point.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the resolution he has introduced on the Oatis matter. As a newspaper publisher and also as an American I, too, introduced a resolution similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, who represents the district from which Mr. Oatis comes. I feel very strongly that the United States of America should use whatever implements may be necessary to compel the release of William Oatis from prison. Certainly it is our duty and our responsibility to protect American citizens anywhere in the world and protect the free press. I join with the gentleman in support of his resolution.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, if William Oatis is guilty, then every human being who has ever sought for truth is guilty.

I am going to support this resolution, but I do so with some feeling that it does not go far enough. I am somewhat disappointed. I had hoped that a more forceful declaration in this case would be made. I thought perhaps I would offer a substitute which would call for sanctions and breaking diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia unless William Oatis were released.

It seems to me we have come to a situation here in dealing with this sort of thing behind the iron curtain where we must take very clear and firm action if we are to have any assurance that American citizens are to be protected. Throughout our history we have had problems like this to face, and always in other cases stern and forceful action has been taken to the end that it has been a long time since anyone dared mistreat law-abiding American citizens going on legitimate business throughout the world. I think if we do not have anyone in the administrative branch of the Government who is willing to take the positive forceful action necessary to help this man, the Congress ought to do it. I think the time has come when we have to make known how this Nation feels. We have to let the people know that in this Congress we are not going to tolerate this sort of thing. These declarations of indignation are fine, but I think in dealing with the satellites behind the iron curtain and with Soviet Russia we ought to know by now that you never get any results until you get tough. The days that William Oatis spends in jail in Czechoslovakia wondering what his Nation and his Government is going to do for him are not going to be much comfort it seems to me when he knows that we are only indignant about it. I think he is entitled to know that the force and power of this great Nation is back of him and we are going to see

to it that he gets the justice that an American is entitled to.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad the gentleman is touching on the Czechoslovak matter. I do not believe there is any country in the world that has made so much money or has received so many concessions from our great country as Czechoslovakia. Their effrontery here in refusing to do anything and not recognizing this situation is really beyond comprehension.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman and for anyone to say that we are only indignant about it is a gross misstatement.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is exactly correct in my opinion so far as the Congress taking a hand in some of these matters. I remember when George Patton was pulled out of Czechoslovakia. He had tears in his eyes protesting against that action. I wish the Congress and this country then and there had stood by and protected the freedom of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and allowed that great American to remain there when he knew at that time and the great majority of the world at that time knew that we should have stood there. We would not be in this mess today if George Patton was not pulled out of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. STEED. I think the William Oatis case has forced the kind of solution we have to have. Action is justified. This will be an open invitation for other cases of this kind unless we take the kind of action that is necessary. I think it is only fair now to serve warning if this, in my opinion, rather mild resolution today does not get results that we are going to be back here demanding that next time Congress do something with our gloves off.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think a very practical question on this subject would be this question: On what basis can the United States through an act of Congress proceed against Czechoslovakia without the approval of the United Nations? I do not think there is a thing in the world that we can do.

Mr. STEED. I do not know, but I know that there are legislative steps that can be taken to enforce sanctions and break relations with nations that treat our nationals as Czechoslovakia is treating William Oatis.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan the Department of State is taking action on September 17 when the 40 nations comprising the trade agreements organization is going to take this matter up. You are absolutely right, we cannot do anything because the State Department has handcuffed us through that agreement with this international organiza-

tion. We will have to ask their permission.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly you will. There is no question about that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point on the pending resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, while I certainly believe that we should protest and protest vigorously against the imprisonment of Oatis, we must not forget other American citizens not so well known, who are also suffering over there. In any action which the State Department takes it must include a former sailor in the American Navy—a resident of New Jersey—named Hvasta who has languished in a Czechoslovakian prison for 2 years.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of this resolution and congratulate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] upon introducing this legislation. It has been with a great deal of interest that I have listened to the discussions concerning William Oatis, the American Associated Press reporter who was convicted by the Czechoslovak Government of spying and received a 10-year jail sentence.

Oatis is a Hoosier. Friends remember him as a quiet, unassuming young man, and cannot conceive of his engaging in unlawful acts in Czechoslovakia or anywhere else. For doing his duty in reporting the news, the Communists threw him into jail and proceeded to convict him. The American Government so far has done nothing about it. Although there is every reason to believe that Oatis is completely innocent of any wrongdoing. It seems to me that we would be much better off in our international relations if we would hark back to the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt was the originator of the so-called big-stick policy, and it worked.

Teddy Roosevelt felt America should always tread softly. He did not want to push any other nation around, but he would not permit America to be pushed around either.

I believe today we should adopt a firmer policy with Czechoslovakia—and I hope such legislation will be adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration H. Con. Res. 140. Among other things, the resolution recites that—

Whereas the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, correspondent for the Associated Press in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a shocking violation of the fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the United Nations Charter.

It concludes:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States express its profound indignation at the arrest, sham trial and unjust conviction of William N. Oatis; that the executive agencies of the Government

be requested to take all possible action to bring about his release; and that the sense of resolution be conveyed by the proper officials of our Government to the United Nations and to the officials of the Czechoslovakian Government.

The resolution has three basic faults (1) It assumes that William N. Oatis' right to freedom is based upon some provision of the United Nations Charter, thus ignoring the declaration by Congress on July 4, 1776 when it expressly declared that the right "to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were given us by the Creator," (2) It assumes that to protect the right to freedom given by the Creator and guaranteed by the Constitution, the United States of America is dependent upon action by United Nations. That assumption is an absurdity, (3) Instead of directing the executive agencies of the Government, which were created by and are dependent upon the Congress for their existence, to take certain action in line with long-established American policy, it "requests" those agencies to take action for the release of Oatis.

Mr. Speaker, I have three amendments. There is also a fourth amendment on the Clerk's desk which in effect calls for the substitution for this resolution of a resolution introduced by several Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that the first three amendments which are all directed toward the same objective may be read and considered together and under the rule which would allow me 5 minutes on each amendment, making 15 altogether, I ask unanimous consent instead that I may have 10 minutes instead of 15.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the unanimous-consent requests of the gentleman from Michigan one at a time.

Is there objection to the reading and consideration of the three amendments en bloc?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would we not be able to be more familiar with this if the gentleman's amendments were read and then we might understand just how he wants to handle them?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the three amendments which the gentleman from Michigan proposes to offer may be read for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "guaranteed", strike out the balance of the sentence and insert "by the Declaration adopted in Congress July 4, 1776."

Page 1, line 3, after the word "fundamental", strike out the word "human" and all of line 4 and insert "right of an American citizen and."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "Government", strike out the words "to the United Nations."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak for 10 minutes instead of the 15 minutes to which I would be entitled if the amendments were offered separately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, that the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, seems to be a very, very weak statement. It reads like an apology. It is a "beg your pardon" plea. It shows how far we have gone from the days of old when we adhered to a principle of protecting our citizens, our interests. Take the first paragraph:

Whereas the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, correspondent of the Associated Press in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a shocking violation of the fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the United Nations Charter.

I have been amazed, I say—I did not know this resolution was coming up today or what was in it until earlier in the day; otherwise, I would never have agreed that there be no quorum call, no opportunity for a record vote. I am amazed that our colleague from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, who preached the Gospel so effectively for so many years, should ever vote to bring out a resolution of this kind.

The reason for my first amendment is that it ignores the declaration of the Congress made July 4, 1776, and which among other principles stated:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

That was a long, long time before the United Nations was ever thought of. That was before George Washington and Thomas Jefferson told us to avoid entanglement in the affairs of other nations. I never knew, I do not know now, I never heard of anyone, certainly not our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], any time intimate that these inalienable rights, now referred to as "fundamental human freedoms," came through the Charter of United Nations. What an insult to the intelligence of even the school children of America. Did anyone ever hear such an absurdity before?

I have always thought, as undoubtedly did those who wrote the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, that the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness came from our Creator, that the statement in the Declaration of Independence was merely an acknowledgement of the source of that right and that our Constitution guaranteed to every citizen the protection of that right.

Some of us are so lacking in faith in the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, the principles that have made us great, that we think we are not able any more to get along in world affairs without hanging on the coattails, the apron strings, of some other nation while at the same time dealing out our dollars and resources—getting not even good will in return. We have so little confidence in the courage and fighting ability of our young men as to think that we must rely upon the United Nations to fight to defend us. The truth is the shoe is on the other foot. U. N. gets us into a war, then runs out and leaves it

for our men to fight. When a citizen of ours gets into trouble we just forget all our past history. We lack the courage of our forefathers, their willingness to sacrifice and suffer for a principle. We forget the eight long years of war carried on to establish our freedom. We forget the courage, determination, and suffering which defeated Great Britain. We forget the sending of a fleet across the seas, over into the Mediterranean to fight the pirates over there when they, like some of our so-called allies, demanded ransom.

Our action then gave rise to the statement: "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." We forget that that little Navy of ours, when just a few small ships, sailed out of American harbors to meet the mighty naval power of Great Britain, the "mistress of the seas," on the high seas in 1812. American skippers in American-built ships, manned by American men and boys, whipped the world's greatest sea power. We have forgotten all about that. We forget, as you are pleased to call it, the War Between the States, when brother fought brother, once again to establish the fact that men "are endowed by their Creator"—not by U. N.—"with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"; to establish the right of the black man to share with his white brother the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have forgotten all that. We look now to nations—we seek the favor of nations which deny all three blessings to their fellow men. What is the matter with us, anyway, that we are not able to rely upon our own Government, our own strength, our own way, and upon our own people to extricate this man, this fellow citizen, from the trouble and danger he is in?

Billions upon billions we have paid to lift other nations out of their bondage, keep them free of oppression by Communists; thousands of our men have been sacrificed to that sad end—at least so we have been told—yet when a citizen of this great Republic is thrown into jail by a second-rate nation we lack the courage to demand his release. We go hat in hand on bended knees, humble ourselves, and beg, not demand, that justice, just simple justice, be done.

What do we propose to do by this resolution? What do we propose to do?

That the executive agencies of the Government be requested—

"Be requested."

What is the use? What is gained by asking Dean Acheson, who turned China over to the Communists; what is the use of asking him to say a few pleasant words to one of those countries which is under the domination of Communist Russia? Did not the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] warn us of the folly of dealing with the Communists? Can you recall any time when Dean Acheson has taken effective action to protect American interests when they came in conflict with those of Red China or of England? I would be glad to have someone here on the floor tell me of such an act. I do not recall any. I hear no reply. Yet a "please will you let Oatis out" is all we do by the kind

of resolution we have here. We put more than 10,000,000 men and women into the armed services in World War I; other millions in World War II. We propose to put additional millions into world war III to establish freedom for men everywhere, but only a begging plea when the freedom of an American is at stake.

I leave the issue with you, you have it, and it is this: Are we from now on to be under the domination of the United Nations? Are we to continue, the people's Representatives, to conscript American boys to fight under an international flag in a war declared by United Nations, not by the Congress of the United States? And for a purpose which is not to protect the welfare of our people nor the security of the Republic, but to attain the objective of some other nation which is more interested in trade dollars than in the flesh and blood of our own people.

Oh, I have heard a lot about the free nations of the world. Who are they? And where is their freedom? Name and number the people who suffer under the domination of Britain, of France, of the Netherlands. And where is there a nation that has a government which guarantees and protects the rights of its citizens?

These three amendments are offered in good faith. I will not make the point of no quorum; I will not ask for a roll call. But I do want the Record to show that I for one am not in favor of hauling down the Stars and Stripes, of surrendering any part of our sovereignty to any other nation or any group of nations whatever may be their avowed purpose. I repeat, I do not challenge the motive, the good faith of anyone here or elsewhere because I think we all have the same objective in view, but I do question the judgment of those who support a program which will place our destiny, the lives of our men, under the control of an organization dominated by representatives of other countries every one of which when the issue comes, when the chips are down, will decide upon and follow a course designed for the protection of its own interests and its own people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman asked the question whether or not he had made his point; as far as I am concerned he has, and I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and associate myself with his statement.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Do I understand that the gentleman from Michigan is advocating a declaration of war against Czechoslovakia?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I am not. I believe as did Teddy Roosevelt: "Speak softly but carry a big stick." A few soft spoken words clear in their meaning—not threats but promises that if justice is not done, we will no longer deal with the jailer—will bring results. Their need for friendship is

greater than is ours. But I will tell you one thing, while I have been opposed to going to war in Korea, while I am opposed to sending men to Europe to fight for the interests of Great Britain and France—every one of these nations over there has been helping to arm Russia—make her strong. I am willing to vote for a declaration of war when the welfare of our people, when the security of our Nation is called in question, but that is not necessary here. All we need is an honest clear statement of what we demand, what we will do if that demand is not granted. I do not go along with this doctrine that we have to be afraid of everyone, afraid of Russia. Had we spent one-tenth of the billions that we have given to other peoples for their aid in the last few years, spent it in building our own national defense, I think we would be fully able to meet any nation or any group of nations.

No; I do not believe in war, and assuredly I do not believe in sending men who have no voice in declaring war to fight in a war when nobody yet has been able to tell them what they are fighting for, except that they are told it is for the maintenance of freedom in other nations, except when they say it is to stop communism—and right here in Washington the Communists have been in policy making positions on the Federal payroll for the last ten or more years. This resolution as written is a cowardly meaningless resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman from Michigan wants to do. He did not say whether he wants to go to war or not, but he was right on the verge of that. In any event, I know that he does not want the words "United Nations" in this resolution. That is plain. Maybe the United Nations is not doing all we expected it to do in maintaining the peace; but the fact remains that the United States was the leader and the main architect of the United Nations; the fact remains that the United Nations Charter was duly ratified by the regular constitutional process in the United States and is the law of the land—all of the Supreme Court decisions hold to that effect. The fact also remains that after the Charter was ratified this House passed a joint resolution authorizing and making effective our participation in the United Nations and provided money for that purpose.

Whether or not the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is adopted, I cannot accept an amendment that takes a gratuitous slap at the architect of the United Nations Charter, at the Senate of the United States, and this House for what it did some time ago. The gentleman wants to strike once and forever from this resolution the fact that the United Nations is an international or-

ganization intended to preserve and defend a just and lasting peace, and I am sure he would like to strike it from all other documents and from the minds of men.

No matter what any Member might think of the United Nations, do you in this resolution want to take a slap at it? As a matter of fact, the main reason that the United Nations is mentioned in this resolution is that the United Nations has a proper voice in this matter. Let me read from the Charter:

The United Nations shall promote universal respect for and observation of human rights and fundamental freedom.

That is article 55. Article 56 says:

All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55.

That is an obligation that we undertook. And so did Czechoslovakia. She has an obligation there that she has violated. We can call her to account in the United Nations; we cannot require Czechoslovakia to observe the Constitution of the United States.

We are obligated, Mr. Speaker, to take action in this matter. So far as action is concerned, we are taking it. A few days ago the State Department notified the 30 nations which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—that the United States intends to place on the agenda of the meeting scheduled soon in Geneva the question of striking Czechoslovakia from the roll of those having preferred-tariff benefits in trade with the United States.

By the terms of this resolution we intend to let the 60 member nations of the United Nations Organization know that we are saying, "We condemn this action against Oatis."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when this meeting is to take place in Geneva?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, September 17.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman feel that that is rather a long time for any free citizen of the United States to languish in a Soviet prison, to wait until the 17th of September?

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The man may come out insane. I do not think that is a laughing matter.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is no argument against including the name of the United Nations in this resolution or condemnation. The fact remains that the United States as a Nation, and the United Nations as an international organization, are both obligated to condemn what happened to William Oatis.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is it not rather supererogation for this House to pass

this resolution in view of the fact that the United Nations alone can take action in this matter?

Mr. RICHARDS. Not at all. There is nothing in the United Nations Charter that prevents any individual nation from taking action to preserve the rights of its own citizens anywhere in the world.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DONDERO. I think the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was this: A complaint not against Oatis, but against the Czechoslovakian Government, in proceeding to protect that citizen not under the laws of the United States but under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. RICHARDS. We are supposed to proceed to protect our citizens under the laws of the United States and also under the United Nations Charter that is also a part of the law of the United States. I think the State Department is going to take firm action in this thing, but I am not ready yet to declare war against Czechoslovakia and embroil this world in conflict with Russia right now. It may come, but not on this issue.

Mr. DONDERO. There comes to my mind a precedent in our own history, in referring back to the War Between the States. Not even England subordinated itself to the position that this country is subordinated under the Charter of the United Nations, with the demand for the release of Mason and Slidell. This Government under the control of the Lincoln administration released those two men because Lincoln felt they were unlawfully detained.

Mr. RICHARDS. Some of the gentlemen who rise on this floor demanding drastic—even warlike—action, have been the first to condemn the Government of the United States for taking similar action in the past. These gentlemen are the fire-eaters now. When did they come to that definite conclusion? If tomorrow we were to bring in a resolution of war against Czechoslovakia because of the Oatis case, would you vote for it? The fact is, and I have to admit it, and I am sorry to have to admit it, that in this battle against communism on the far-flung fronts of the world today, the United States Government has taken indignities all around the globe. Why? Because our enemies realize how weak our defense posture is. They realize we have to be strong before we go to war. They realize that the policy of Russia is to force us into a different position everywhere. We would not be wise and our State Department would not be wise if, in a case of this kind, they did not take the action, that in the long run would be in the best interest of the United States. The action the gentleman talks about may be harmful to the very man whose release we seek today.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEED. I am one who thinks we ought to declare ourselves more firmly than this resolution, but I do not think the gentleman has ever heard me say I was one of those critics against the things we are trying to do in coping with socialism throughout the world, has he?

Mr. RICHARDS. No. If anybody thought I was talking about any particular Member who has said anything here today, I am sorry. But I do want to say that the gentleman from Michigan has never been in love with the United Nations, he has never been in love with any international organization. He has not until today been in love with fighting or having a war with anybody. If he has, I do not know where he has said it. Since I have been in Congress, I do not remember, until today, ever hearing him advocate going to war with anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not advocating war now.

Mr. RICHARDS. What does the gentleman advocate?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think if we would deal with these people as the Yankee traders in the Northeast used to deal with the fellows they had to do business with, quit giving them things while fighting them, and quit backing them while sending our men to fight them, we would get along all right. We have an economic power if we wanted to use it to stop these nations right now.

Mr. RICHARDS. Would the gentleman object to using those powers and also the united power of the United Nations?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is right. I do not want any truck with the United Nations. I have no objection to using our other power.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Michigan in expressing perhaps the same attitude toward the United Nations that he has expressed. I still like to march behind the Stars and Stripes, and I did once upon a time. I think that today if permitted I would be glad to put on hobnails and fight for them again. But we have a situation here we must recognize. Czechoslovakia signed the United Nations Charter whether you like the United Nations or not, and Czechoslovakia has violated that Charter. Therefore, it is our chance. It is our opportunity, that we have today as a Congress, to say to the United Nations, "Let us do something about it. If you are going to be a force in this world, you United Nations, you really can function."

I mention that as a very important point. The fact of the matter is that the chairman of this very estimable committee made this statement, that it really was a slap at the United Nations. Perhaps this resolution as it was drawn can attempt to do just that very thing, to get them into action, to promote some activity, to really prove that they are or could be an effective instrument in this one particular instance.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to compliment the gentleman on the leadership he has given in this Oatis matter. The gentleman may recall I did the same thing in the Vogeler case. I have not heard the Vogeler case mentioned today. It should be mentioned.

What the Vogeler case proved, and we might just as well learn from our experience, is that these Communist satellites are susceptible to world opinion. The Hungarians released Vogeler because they got the reaction in the final analysis of world opinion. So in respect to this particular resolution, what we are trying to do is mobilize world opinion, and even more effectively because Czechoslovakia is a member of the United Nations and could be thrown out of the United Nations. We are trying to put the ball squarely where it belongs. We are trying to charge the responsibility, among other remedies, to the United Nations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from New York a question in regard to the Vogeler case? Is it not true that we virtually paid ransom to the Hungarian Government for the release of that man? May I ask the gentleman just what those conditions were?

Mr. JAVITS. As far as we know what the conditions were, they were the opening of two consulates in the United States and certain arrangements in regard to property in Western Germany that amounted to about \$100,000, which was the estimate I had. But I should like to call this to the gentleman's attention: Let us keep our eye on the ball here. Do you want to save Oatis or do you not? The point is that we did get Vogeler out and we want to get Oatis out.

Mr. BEAMER. I should like to proceed about Mr. Oatis. I think that is a very important point. Mr. Vogeler has been freed, whether you like the procedure or not. We are trying to follow a different procedure.

I have worked untiringly to help this man who comes from my district, and not because he comes from Indiana but because I would do it for any of you.

There is an arrangement which can be followed. I think if you will carefully study the general agreement on tariffs and trade you will understand it. I have been informed that that plan already is in prospect. I did introduce another resolution, House Resolution 332, and I know the committee studied that carefully. It was more drastic. It did call for a more effective attack. It did not call for action by the United Nations. However, I bowed to the superior judgment of the committee and was very happy to have them bring out something in order that we could get this thing started. I am not going to say this resolution is written in the exact words that I would like to give to you. I am

going to say it is a step, and I do want to compliment the committee because they did sidetrack some other legislation which was worthy of consideration in order to give the Congress a chance to work on the Oatis case. This is the first step. It is probably not as vigorous as I would desire but I call to your attention that caution is probably the better part of valor.

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

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Further emphasizing the statement the gentleman has just made about the committee considering this when it had other important legislation before it, this resolution has been reported out today and the House is considering it now by unanimous consent. That shows how important the House feels this resolution is.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman. I think that will prove to the world that the Congress is serious about this. This is not a slap on the wrist. We are demanding that something be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about the haste with which this resolution came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not think there was any great amount of haste. Have any of you seen Darkness at Dawn, the play in which Claude Rains is an actor? Have you seen the Soviet prison? If you have, I do not think you would want any one of our nationals in one of those Soviet prisons for one single day. Then the Members heard Mr. Vogeler who was imprisoned in an iron curtain prison. It was like the prison in the play. I hate to say this but I have been profoundly shocked at the way people push aside our disabled veterans, our boys who have given their arms and legs and their reason fighting for us in Korea. This is not a laughing matter to them, I assure you. They are frail. They were taken in very young. They were unprepared—some of them should never have been taken in. But they are pushed aside. They have even been pushed aside in this Capitol—I hate to say it. But would we rise and fight to defend more prisoners than Oatis? I sometimes wonder. Why do we not stand up and speak of what we have done for the nations of the world. Why do we talk about our losing their friendship instead of what it would mean to them to lose ours? What have they done for us? They have done nothing. Would they help us? No—and you know it and I know it. We are a kind people, a very generous people. We ask nothing for ourselves. I hope we will never lose that kindness and I hope we will never lose that love and honor in defending our own people. I believe if we take a strong position in Czechoslovakia, Mr. Oatis would be freed and freed at once.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her fine courageous statement. I would also like to tell her I heard recently from one who is well informed about Czechoslovakia that if the proper methods were used and a telephone taken up Oatis would be freed in 24 hours. Those people do not want to fight us. It is a crying shame that the Representatives of the American people should stand here cringing before Czechoslovakia.

We are a great and powerful Nation; let us behave like one.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree. As I said before we should tell the nations of the world what we have done for them and what it would mean to them to lose our friendship and our kindness. We should tell China what it would mean to them to lose the medicines we have sent them, medicines which have saved their lives and the lives of their soldiers in order to fight us. We are kind as we are generous. I hope we are loyal, too, to our own people.

Mr. Speaker, I have a similar resolution to the resolution that has already been presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] as a substitute for the Beamer resolution. As a matter of fact my resolution was sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee first and I spoke in its favor yesterday before that committee. It was introduced by me after a similar resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator MONROE. It contains exactly the same provisions with reference to withdrawing trade from Czechoslovakia, and also withdrawing our nationals if within 90 days Mr. Oatis is not freed. My resolution, if passed, would have fine support in the Senate.

I shall support the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] which is similar. I am sure if it is passed Czechoslovakia will give us a very different answer about Mr. Oatis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago this month 11 Members of this House, including the one who now occupies the well, were able to visit Moscow, Russia. That visit was made possible through the influence of General Eisenhower. While we were in Europe information came to us that General Eisenhower had visited the Russian capital and while he was there held a press conference with the American news correspondents connected with the American Embassy. After that press conference was held, we learned that the Russian news correspondents requested a similar conference with the general, and the general granted it. One of the questions which the Russian correspondents asked General Eisenhower was, "What difference do you see between our system of public press and your system in America?" The substance of the reply, as we obtained it, was that General Eisenhower stated he had come to Europe leading three and one-half million splendid young Americans who were fighting for—among other things—

freedom of the press back in his country, the United States, for the right of the press even to criticize General Eisenhower, in his actions if they saw fit, or to make any comment that they desired; that those young men were ready to die to preserve that principle of freedom in this country.

"Now," said the general, "you here in Russia will print and give to your people exactly what your Government wants them to know and nothing more. That is the difference between the Russian press and the American press."

As a sequel to that, we were informed that the Russian newspapers never printed one word of that conference between their correspondents and our general.

The question of the public press, freedom of speech, and the freedom of the press is involved in this resolution before the House this afternoon. I am not so sure but what this resolution bears the same earmarks as that contained in the Vogeler case. Anybody who even thinks will observe that if we knuckled down and granted the right of that Government which arrested Vogeler to establish consulates in this country, it was nothing more nor less than an act of appeasement. We have never gained anything by appeasement. In my judgment, our appeasement policy over the past few years has brought nothing but sorrow and sadness and grief to our people. One appeasement after another encourages greater aggression and greater acts against our Government and our people. We are winning nothing. We are losing everything when we agree to such a policy.

What are we doing in the Oatis case? We are simply saying to the Czechoslovak Government that they are violating a section of the United Nations Charter, but we are not saying anything about human freedom, guaranteed to our people, not under the United Nations Charter, but under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. But those two documents are being bypassed if we adopt a resolution of this kind. I think it would strengthen this resolution if we struck out all after the words "human freedoms guaranteed" and put a period there. It seems in that way we would not be submitting to what looks to me as a further act of appeasement. We must do everything we can to protect our country just as it was protected many years ago. Not even the great Government of England would subordinate herself as we have subordinated ourselves under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of freedom of the press, will the gentleman tell me what is the difference between freedom of the press in Czechoslovakia and Russia and freedom of the press in Argentina?

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly what General Eisenhower told the Russian press representatives in Moscow when he held a conference with them.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of Czechoslovakia will approve the action we take today. I am certain the people of Czechoslovakia are not in sympathy with the present Government of Czechoslovakia. The present government is not in control because the people willed that they should be in control; this is not the same government they had under Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and Eduard Benes whom we were privileged to hear on the floor of the House a number of years ago. As a matter of fact President Masaryk came to the United States of America during the First World War. Many years ago he married an American woman and his wife's name was Garrigue and he was so fond of her that he made her name a part of his. He came to this country during the First World War, and the Republic of Czechoslovakia was born in Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

Many of us have forgotten that the Czechoslovak Government was patterned after our own United States; and this little Government in the cockpit of Europe under Masaryk and Benes was the greatest experiment in democracy, in American democracy, in Europe. As a matter of fact, the main street in the city of Prague was named after President Woodrow Wilson. Those of you who ever visited Czechoslovakia have traveled down Wilson Boulevard in the city of Prague.

As has been pointed out by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], had General Patton been permitted to march into Prague as he wished, I am sure these poor people of Czechoslovakia would not be subjected to the kind of thing they are now having to live under, this government under Gottwald—Gottwald, the servant of Soviet Russia. Frankly, we cannot be too severe or too quick in our action here. We have got to act quickly, and I am sure the people over there will appreciate our action; in fact, I am surprised that we have waited as long as this, and I congratulate the committee for coming out even at this late hour with this resolution.

I am for voting the strongest kind of resolution, a resolution in keeping with what is desirable and what is proper. But in any event, I would like to emphasize the fact that this is not a rebuke, this is not a criticism of the people there. The people of Czechoslovakia had no more to do with the kind of government they have today than have the people of Hungary or the people in Germany who are under the Soviet rule. That was something that our statesmen, our politicians in this country and other countries determined; we wished this onto them. The conferences at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran sealed their fate. Before that the conference at Munich was the worst betrayal of a friendly and grateful people since the betrayal of the Master. I say that the sooner we take this action to stop doing business with official Czechoslovakia and all the other satellites of Soviet Russia, and Soviet Russia itself, the better off we will be. It is a crying shame that a newspaper-

man, representing an important news service like the Associated Press, should be treated in this way. The United Press, the Associated Press, the International News, and other press services are known throughout the world for their fairness.

Anybody who is likely to fall for the Communist hokum should be reading the Nation's papers this week. In Prague, Czechoslovakia, once the land of Masaryk and Benes, disciples of the free American way of life, Associated Press correspondent William N. Oatis is jailed. The Communist government which has seized Czechoslovakia declares that the entire AP organization in Prague has been an "espionage" center. From April 2 until he came to trial in July, Mr. Oatis was not permitted to see anyone in his cell, except his Communist keepers. He never had the privilege of seeing his colleagues, or legal counsel, or members of his family. There was a time when this was called tyranny, dictatorship, and worse in Czechoslovakia. Today no one dares to open his mouth in that unhappy country.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I approve of this resolution. It agrees entirely with my thinking. I think that has been the thought of several of those who have spoken here this afternoon. I do not think any such resolution as this will satisfy every one of us. Probably it should have gone beyond what it does. However, I want to be practical for just a minute, if I can.

As far as I have been able to find out during this day, and I have made several telephone calls, nothing in a practical way is contemplated beyond this resolution other than that the State Department intends to take action at the international trade and tariff meetings in Geneva on September 17 to do only one thing. There are 30 signatory countries to that pact. If they get 16 of those they will be able to have the consent of that body for the United States to withdraw from the pact. It will not be exactly a withdrawal, but will cut off relations with Czechoslovakia.

I want to direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Is that the only step that is contemplated at the present time by either the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the State Department?

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not get the question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the only thing contemplated now by the gentleman's committee or by the State Department or by Executive action an attempt to cut off trade between the United States and Czechoslovakia at the international trade meeting on September 17?

Mr. RICHARDS. The primary thing we had in mind was for the Congress of the United States to condemn the action of the Czechoslovak Government. The State Department has already taken action in regard to the tariff matter. The State Department has also stated that other actions that may be proper in the premise will be taken but have not said what they would be.

So far as what the Foreign Affairs Committee may do as to a more stringent resolution, I cannot say.

Mr. SPRINGER. As the gentleman from South Carolina probably knows, it is possible for the United Nations, and we are attempting to move through that body at the present time—at least you are bringing this resolution to their attention—to take some form of sanctions against a country like Czechoslovakia. It seems to me such a resolution should call to their attention the advisability of taking some form of sanction against this country, Czechoslovakia, which deliberately violates the principles of the United Nations Charter in the form of a violation of the freedom of the press. I think that is what we have involved here. I do not say that we by that sanction have to pursue the matter to where it is a declaration of war, but I think if sanctions can be taken by the United Nations certainly it would have a serious effect upon those satellite countries which are doing this type of thing, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia have done in the last 2 years.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICHARDS. May I call to the attention of the gentleman and also the other Members of the House it should be remembered that Czechoslovakia is not bound by our Constitution and by our laws, but Czechoslovakia is bound by the United Nations laws and its Charter because it is a part of it just as the United States is. That is the difference, and that is the reason it is essential to put the United Nations in this picture.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand that, and I approve of it. I have no objection, but I do think that it certainly ought to be called to the attention of the United Nations through the State Department, if that is the proper body, that they should consider sanctions on a country which violates the principles of the United Nations Charter, such as I believe they have in this case. And it is a violation, without any question. It is a violation of the principle of freedom of speech and of news coverage, and that is what you have involved in this case, I think. It seems to me that there should not be any hesitation in moving in this kind of a case. Somebody mentioned the Vogeler case. There was some indication to move firmly, and I approve of that, I will say that. But it seems to me that the United Nations is not going to be able to pass over these things from time to time, these violations that you are speaking about; but when you have a member of that body violating those principles, that has nothing to do with local laws, as I see it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these three amendments and all amendments there-to close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the objectives of this resolution and a score of other resolutions having similar intent as has been presented here are meritorious. They will not, however, secure the release of Mr. Oatis unless some economic sanctions are applied.

Now, how to go about applying those economic sanctions. The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1951 directed the President to cancel these trade agreements with countries behind the iron curtain. The State Department has recently proceeded to cancel the favored-nations clause with five nations, including Russia, but Czechoslovakia is in a different category. Czechoslovakia is one of the 38 countries that met at Geneva in 1947 and drew up what is known as GATT, which is a general agreement on trade and treaties. Section 23 of that general agreement drawn up in Geneva in 1947 requires the United States, in an effort to get out of the spot we find ourselves in, to reconvene all of those nations party to that agreement at Geneva, and that is what they propose to do on September 17, and get an agreement from those nations that will allow us to cancel our reciprocal trade agreements with Czechoslovakia. If the nations gathered at Geneva refuse to give us that authority, the only other alternative we have is a diplomatic break with Czechoslovakia.

The question is, Do we want to lose our reciprocal relations with 37 other countries in an effort to cancel our reciprocal relations with Czechoslovakia? I am one, if you will remember, who led the fight to liberalize the reciprocal trade agreements and that is one of the things I stood for. You will remember on the floor of this House I said, "In the name of common sense, let the Congress write these terms and do not let us attempt to write them again in a conference like they were written in Geneva." We even find the Senate in a position where they put on as an amendment to the reciprocal trade agreements an amendment disclaiming any responsibility for what happened at Geneva in 1947. The Senate has even abrogated its right, or somebody else has assumed that right to write a treaty binding the United States to a point where we cannot even get out of that treaty without the consent of the other 37 signatories at Geneva.

Now, we have no choice, except to go through with this 2 months' delay, other than if we want to break diplomatic relations which will bring us down to the point of declaring war. That is the situation. We were asleep back in 1947 when all of these rights were taken away from us over at Geneva, the right even to cancel a trade agreement.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to say that I approve of what the gentleman has said. I supported his position on reciprocal trade agreements some 3 months ago when this matter was up. Now, just one thing further. As I understand, in this meeting in September all they are going to do is to let the United States cancel its part of the agreement with Czechoslovakia. I want to say this, and this seems to be true every-

place, that wherever we have canceled our trade agreement that vacuum has been taken up by trade with other Western European nations. It is my point that we should go beyond that. When we meet there in September of this year we ought to try to induce the other countries who are a part of this general agreement of 30 nations to cut off trade with Czechoslovakia, because if all we do is drop our trade we are merely going to lose the trade we have with Czechoslovakia and that country will not be penalized one iota. The only effect of that would be to cut off our trade and that vacuum would be taken up by England, France, Italy, or somebody else.

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the gentleman's opinion very much. Not a Member of Congress is more concerned with cancellation of these Czechoslovak trade agreements than I, because 60 percent of the importations of pottery and glassware that are now causing trouble in my district in the State of West Virginia are coming from Czechoslovakia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the three amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMSTRONG: On page 2, after line 9, add the following:

"Be it further resolved, That it is the sense of the House that all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia should be terminated immediately, and should be resumed only if and when the Government of Czechoslovakia restores to William N. Oatis his freedom; and be it further

"Resolved, That if William N. Oatis is not restored to his freedom within 90 days that the Department of State take steps to evacuate all nationals of the United States in Czechoslovakia with the end in view of severing diplomatic relations with that Government."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to this resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wonder if the gentleman refers to the use of the word "House" instead of the word "Congress"? If so, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the word "Congress" for the word "House."

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not object to that, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, I do not, Mr. Speaker, except that I must say that this wording is not original with me but is offered at the suggestion of some other Members and certainly with my approval because I desire to strengthen the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I most respectfully submit this amendment is germane. It goes right along with the

language of the original resolution. It was in the bill offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] on the majority side, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDT], and I do not know how many others.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The resolution provides among other things that the executive agencies of the Government are requested to take all possible action to bring about the release of Mr. Oatis. The gentleman from Missouri is simply adding other conditions. Thus, the amendment is in order, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I agree with those who say it would be well to strengthen this resolution. I congratulate the author, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER], and the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this resolution. It seems to me it ought to pass and I will support it whether this amendment is agreed to. But I hope the amendment is adopted because it would permit those of us who feel we need stronger words to support something that has the strength which is needed.

The Vogeler case was mentioned here. Some serious questions have arisen with regard to the release of that businessman who was held captive in Hungary the same way as William Oatis, this newspaperman. It was pointed out repeatedly at the time that he was released because of certain agreements made with his government. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] called it appeasement. Without differing with him I would like to call it by a stronger word—it was nothing but blackmail. The action taken by our own Government should be repudiated. We must not be led into that sort of trap again. There should be no concessions made for the release of Mr. Oatis. Furthermore, if we adopt this amendment and then adopt the amended resolution, we will go on record as at least starting on the road in our dealings with Soviet countries. We would serve notice that we intend to demand from now on that our nationals be given reciprocal treatment by every country behind the iron curtain.

The gentleman from New York asked the question: Do you want Mr. Oatis released or not? I say to the gentleman I do not want him released—a thousand times no—if it means at the expense of the honor of this country, I say no—if it means any further appeasement or yielding to blackmail.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I congratulate the gentleman on this resolution and this amendment. In fact, if you will study the entire resolution which I have introduced, House Resolution 332, and also read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both in debate and in the Appendix thereof, I have expressed myself time and time again that we do need very positive

strong action. I feel this is going to strengthen a very worthy resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman heartily.

Mr. Speaker, in urging that we go ahead and take the course which will lead us to reciprocal treatment for our nationals I have in mind the fact that these representatives of countries behind the iron curtain, Soviet Russia, and the satellite countries, can come to this country freely. They can represent their businesses, their newspapers or anything else. Yet, everyone knows they are all spies for the Soviet regime. Right here in the District of Columbia, we are informed, 26 chauffeurs are permitted to drive the automobiles of the officials of Soviet Russia. How many American chauffeurs are permitted in Moscow, to drive the cars of our officials? How many in all of Russia? None at all. Every American car has to be driven by a Russian. Every American official knows that every Russian driving his car is a secret agent of the Soviet Government.

Shame upon us! Why do we not start right at the top and go down to the bottom and demand equal treatment for our nationals in every country behind the iron curtain. Why do not we demand the same treatment for our nationals that we give those of all other countries? The United Nations offices at Lake Success are infested with hundreds of these Soviet spies. Let us say to them, "We will give you exactly the same treatment that you give to our nationals. You do not permit our nationals to wander over your country. Neither will we permit your nationals to do so." Let us start with reciprocal treatment here and now by adding to this good resolution this strengthening amendment which will put them on notice that from now on we are going to stand up for our rights. Let us put them on notice that if William Oatis is not freed, then we will cut off our trade and our diplomatic relations with them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

The amendment incorporates the provisions which were contained in resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDT], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], members of our committee; the same provisions were in the resolution by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. We had 16 resolutions on the Oatis case before our committee and many of the authors now are saying how strong they were, but, as a matter of fact, these were the three that I felt had the punch in them. It is the punch that has been proposed here. This adds to what we have already done, two provisions—one, that it is the sense of Congress that all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia should be terminated immediately and should be resumed only if and when the Government of Czechoslovakia restores Oatis to his freedom; and, second, if Oatis is not restored to his freedom within 90 days, then the Department of State should take steps to evacuate all nationals of the United

States in Czechoslovakia, with the end in view of severing diplomatic relations with that government.

We considered this in executive session. I cannot reveal what transpired. It is sufficient to say that this does not appear in the resolution that came from the committee. Those two provisions were incorporated in a resolution adopted unanimously by the Ohio Republican delegation yesterday and sent by the chairman of our delegation [Mr. JENKINS] to the President, with the hope that he would give it immediate attention.

This does not propose breaking diplomatic relations. It proposes steps toward that; but let me point out that breaking diplomatic relations does not mean war. There was a time, back in 1931, when our Government and our State Department adopted the policy of nonrecognition of governments that obtained their power by force. We never recognized Manchukuo but we did not go to war with Manchukuo or Japan over that. In recent years, however, we have adopted what I consider to be a craven policy and one that has not paid off, of recognizing governments that seize power by force, for the purpose of having a lookout in that country, what I call the peephole policy. The peephole policy has not been very effective, either to uphold the prestige or honor of our country or safety for our citizens, or to obtain information, either. We have changed within the past few months, and after a resolution which passed both Houses, our Government has adhered to a policy of nonrecognition of Red China, a government that seized its power by force.

In a matter like this the Executive has the power and the authority and the responsibility, under the Constitution, with reference to recognition of other countries—diplomatic relations. But Congress has the right to say, after we urge that the executive agencies "take all possible action to bring about his release," what is the sense, the opinion, the view of Congress. This amendment says that it is the sense of Congress that we break off commercial relations unless Oatis is released, and unless he is released in 90 days we start taking steps toward breaking diplomatic relations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DONDERO. Why make it 90 days?

Mr. VORYS. Well, you could say 30 days, or anything else, but it seems to me there are problems about evacuating our nationals, which were called to the attention of our committee, and we recognize the seriousness of those problems. Time would be needed to protect other American nationals who are now in Czechoslovakia. That is why this proposal does not advocate haste that would injure Americans in the course of carrying it out.

Mr. DONDERO. It must become obvious to every American that the protection of our nationals in foreign lands today will depend upon the United

Nations Charter and not upon the laws of our own country.

Mr. VORYS. Well, I do not know that I would agree to that.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what we are saying in this resolution, if it is adopted as read.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has the advantage that a similar resolution was introduced in the Senate first by Senator MONRONEY, and I almost immediately afterward introduced it in the House.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I did not offer this amendment on the floor because the committee did not adopt it. I believe in standing with my committee wherever possible. I also felt it would be bad to have this amendment brought up on the floor and not adopted, because that might give the Executive an excuse for not taking all possible steps, as requested in our resolution. I now feel that since this amendment has been offered it would be, not tragic but unfortunate, if the House did not incorporate this into the resolution, but would turn it down. Therefore, I urge that this amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, everyone here agrees that the crime against Oatis is a crime against freedom and the free press everywhere. The fact remains that it is not the United Nations that is in jail; it is not the Constitution of the United States that is in jail. Oatis is in jail; and it is Oatis we want to get out of jail. The basic question is, "What is the best way to do it?" We must keep our feet firmly on the ground without prejudice against the United Nations.

What are the three points of the proposed amendment? First, it proposes that we should cut off commercial relations with Czechoslovakia. Next, we must get our citizens out of there. But the author of the amendment neglects to tell us what would happen to several hundred dual nationals—citizens of the United States formerly of Czech nationality who have gone back to Czechoslovakia and who have property, homes, friends, and relatives in that country. The only reason they are not back in the United States is because they know their friends and relatives would be punished if they left. Thirdly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] suggests that we sever diplomatic relations. He proposes that we announce to the world that we are going to get our citizens out of Czechoslovakia and following that we will get our diplomatic representatives out. Do you think that we are going to get our citizens out after the Congress of the United States has announced to the

world that following their removal we are going to withdraw our diplomatic representatives from Czechoslovakia? And if we withdraw our diplomatic representatives, how could that possibly help Mr. Oatis get out of jail? You remember the Vogeler case. How did we get him out? We secured his release through negotiations by diplomatic representatives of the United States in Hungary, where Vogeler was imprisoned. If it had not been for those diplomatic representatives, Vogeler would not be a free man today. Are you deliberately going to dare Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia to keep Oatis in jail by telling her that we are first going to cut off commercial relations with them and then that we will take our citizens out of that country? Are we so naive as to think they would permit us to do that after an assertion by the Congress of the United States that we are going to cut off diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia? If you think you are going to secure Oatis' release on that basis, then pass this resolution. But remember, Oatis is the man in jail, and Oatis is the man we want to get released. All this talk about foolish pride of the individual or pride of the United States does not protect a man's life. In this matter I am more concerned about Oatis than I am about pride.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and his last argument, it boils down to this: You would ask them to release Oatis but if they would not, you would go along; you would not do anything about it. You just say to them, "Will you please let him go? If you do not, we are not going to cut off aid, we are not going to refuse to give you any more dollars. We are just saying, 'Please.' We do not like it, but we will not do anything about it. We will continue to do business with you." With a tough nation, that means nothing at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I remember back, I believe it was in February 1948, that I happened to be at the Czechoslovak Embassy the very day when the Government of that country fell into the hands of a group of gangsters as vicious as any that ever wandered over this earth. We all know that. We all recognize that fact in our hearts. All of these countries are ruled by a group of gangsters who are in turn controlled by the gangsters of the Kremlin.

This so-called Czechoslovak Government does not represent the people of Czechoslovakia. It does not represent the Czechs, it does not represent the Slovaks. The great majority of those people are imprisoned as is Mr. William Oatis today.

Why we here treat this group of gangsters that have taken over this country as a government I cannot understand. Has our honor fallen so low? Have we abandoned principle so much that we will treat with these people who have criminally taken over this territory and are ruling an enslaved people? Should we treat with them as a legitimate government?

We have done that sort of thing up to now, but we must come eventually to the time when we will realize the actual facts of the situation. I certainly support the pending amendment. The quicker we get down to principles, the quicker we realize the facts in the case the sooner we will have more success in our foreign policy. Just imagine that if this country had been taken over by the Communists and we now were several years under Communist rule by a group headed by such men as William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, would we American people want any country in the world to recognize that gang as our Government? We certainly would not.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The proposal made here would put us at the mercy of international gangsters from now on. We tried coaxing. We were told we could not use strong measures, that Oatis and all the others are hostages there. We, therefore, did not attempt to even threaten to use strong measures. Our hands are tied and we merely have one recourse; that is to attempt to buy his way out. Then we will have opened the way to a form of international kidnaping that will go on and on until finally we stand firm, even though it may involve a threat to Americans abroad.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I heartily agree with the gentleman. I think we will be setting a very bad precedent. In other words, if we buy this package now we will be presented with other situations which would involve greater sacrifice on our part.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have the greatest respect for the chairman of this committee, and I know he is earnestly trying to bring about the very best he can to help solve this Oatis situation. In this particular situation I want to say I agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I said that when I was here in the well of the House a few minutes ago, but I do not think that his amendment goes far enough. I think there are two things involved. It is true that we want to get William Oatis out of jail, if we possibly can, but William Oatis stands for something more than a man who is incarcerated in jail. As a judge I tried a lot of people, but I think

the important thing in this case is that William Oatis stands for a principle, and I think that the principle is pretty important to fight for right here and to bring out the right kind of a resolution. I think we are going to take risks in adopting this resolution, such as the chairman of this committee pointed out. I realize there is some risk in it, but the question is whether or not you are going to get public opinion to the extent that they are going to back this resolution with all the strength that they have got in it by virtue of public opinion in this country. This man was incarcerated on the 23d of April. The date of this resolution is July 6. I do not know whether anything was done in the meantime, but I want to pay tribute to the press of the United States which has been unceasingly active in their efforts to release him, and I think that that is the reason this resolution is in the House today. The press is waiting to hear from this House on what kind of a resolution you are going to present. I think that the kind of a resolution that the gentleman from Missouri has offered here is the kind of a resolution that the press of this country wants to tell the people of the United States about in order to get the full weight of public opinion in this country behind it.

The second point is this. It has always been my feeling, when you deal with these satellite countries and Russia, that every time you make a show of strength they back down, but when you leave it to the State Department or some agency dealing over the counter or over the table, they never seem to get any place except after months and months of negotiation, such as the 17 months occupied in the Vogeler case. I think if you show that we intend to stand unanimously behind this resolution, with the show of strength of this country, that the people of Czechoslovakia will realize the position we take.

And, I want to say again, I do have a great deal of respect for the chairman. I think he is trying to give us the right kind of a resolution. If this resolution does not pass, I am going to vote for the amendment in the nature of a resolution which was introduced here by the gentleman from Missouri which I think is the kind of resolution that we ought to give to the press and the people of this country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 33, noes 35.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all action on this resolution go over until Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES BILL OF 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock Saturday night to file a report on the bill (S. 349) to assist in the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense.

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

There was no objection.

M. S. SZYMCAK

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to make the restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. C. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provision of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, which provides that members of the Board shall be ineligible for 2 years after the time they are in office to hold any office, position, or employment in any member bank, shall not apply to M. S. Szymczak, who has served as a member of the Board continuously since June 14, 1933, a period of more than 18 years.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was passed by the Senate and has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It makes inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak the provision that a member of the Board of Governors shall not receive employment from a member bank within 2 years after he retires as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Governor Szymczak has served with distinction and honor on that board for 18 years. At the expiration of his term he could have accepted this employment immediately as the provision is not applicable to one who serves his term and retires; but he has been reappointed and is now serving another term, and now it is necessary for this joint resolution to be passed in order that he may receive employment with a member bank.

The Federal Reserve Board is favorable to the joint resolution, I understand. There was no opposition to it in the committee. I am sure there can be no opposition, because Mr. Szymczak has served the Federal Reserve System with honor and ability during the many years he has been a member.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I remember Mr. Szymczak when he was in

Chicago as comptroller of the city of Chicago and as a member of the faculty of the College of Commerce of DePaul University and as one engaged in savings and loan, real estate, insurance, and banking business.

He left Chicago in June of 1933 and has been here in Washington since that time. He was the youngest member of the Board when he was appointed in 1933 and for a good many years he was the youngest member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Today he is the oldest in point of service.

He has asked time and again to return to Chicago, but each time he felt that he should remain in Washington because of matters that appeared pressing in the public interest.

He was abroad during the war and after the war, having been sent there to make a specific study of the monetary system of Europe. He is well known to bankers in Chicago and throughout Illinois, as well as other parts of the country. He is known at universities.

He must have a good reason for leaving the Board at this time, for I know it is his natural inclination to remain in public service. I do hope that when he leaves the Board he will engage in that particular business that would bring him the satisfaction and meet the need and satisfy the want for which he had to make the change. More than that, I hope he will return to Chicago.

The Federal Reserve System, and the Government, is losing a valuable and conscientious servant. He has demonstrated his ability, because of his broad knowledge of the entire banking enterprise, and his advice was sought from many sources. His 18 years of faithful service and outstanding ability leaves in the archives of the Federal Reserve System a momentous challenge to any future successors. His record speaks for itself.

I wish him continued success in any future endeavors.

Also I desire to include the following newspaper article regarding Governor Szymczak that appeared in the Polish American Journal:

M. S. SZYMCAK: FOREMOST PUBLIC SERVANT

There is no other American of Polish descent of whom Polonia is more proud than Mieczislaus Stephen Szymczak, our No. 1 public servant.

His career is truly an illustrious one. Born in Chicago on August 15, 1894, Mr. Szymczak, while himself a student in St. Mary's College, Kentucky, in 1914, served also as instructor at its prep school.

At the age of 22, Mr. Szymczak was at the same time chief clerk, general adjuster's office, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, and instructor at DePaul University in Chicago. He also was continuing his own education for bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees.

Several years later he was active in public, business and educational fields serving as secretary to the county judge of Cook County, Ill., being in insurance, real-estate, and building and loan business, and teaching English, philosophy, and business administration at DePaul University. Quite versatile.

From 1926 to 1928 Mr. Szymczak held the post of general superintendent, forest preserve district of Cook County, Ill., and a

director of Ridgemoor Building and Loan Association, and also served as educational director of the Illinois League of Building and Loan Associations.

In 1928 he was elected clerk of the superior court of Cook County, Ill., and while in that office he also served as vice president of two banks.

Three years later he was elected comptroller of the city of Chicago and in 1933 was appointed a member of the Federal Reserve Board. Today he is its senior Governor.

Upon his appointment to the Federal Reserve Board, the Chicago City Council honored him with a special resolution. The council congratulated the President on said appointment and congratulated the people of the Nation "on securing the services of so able a public servant who has demonstrated his fitness for the position which he is to occupy."

Over the years as FRB member, Mr. Szymczak, as occasion required, has served in various capacities, but he is primarily recognized as the Board's authority on international affairs.

Mr. Szymczak's wartime services are worth a story in themselves. His first postwar Pearl Harbor assignment was to safeguard property interests of Japanese evacuees with a minimum of general economic dislocation. His performance in this assignment won him commendation of the then Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, who said that "Governor Szymczak impressed all the Treasury people with his ability, earnestness, and drive."

In 1944 President Roosevelt requested the Federal Reserve Board to loan Governor Szymczak to the Foreign Economic Administration as its representative for Belgium, expressing the belief that he alone "would make a distinct contribution to the winning of the war in this assignment."

Governor Szymczak handled the task so effectively that he was subsequently selected by President Truman to go to Germany as chief of the trade and commerce branch of the office of military government.

While economic problems were Governor Szymczak's primary task, he devoted a lot of time, energy, and know-how to other things, especially to the Red Cross blood collection, for which the Red Cross commended him, stating that "your exceptional energy, tact, and experience, and your unusual talent for organization have achieved splendid results in the form that has meant most and that is in greatly increased amounts of blood plasma reaching the fighting fronts from this area."

Fordham University recognized Governor Szymczak's services to the country by awarding him in 1947 an honorary doctor of laws degree. The citation reads, in part, as follows: "Fortunate, indeed, is our country in these troublous times to have such a man as one of the guardians of our financial structure."

Incidentally, Wall Street considers Mr. Szymczak as one of the top economic policy makers in the Capital.

Governor Szymczak is a member of many organizations, including the Polish National Alliance, Polish Alma Mater, Polish Roman Catholic Union, and Knights of Columbus. He is a vice chairman and member of the board of trustees of Kosciuszko Foundation and director of Paderewski memorial fund.

He is a commander with star of Polonia Restituta and commander of the Belgian Order of the Crown.

For many years Mr. Szymczak has standing offers from banks and other institutions that represent in dollars two to five times his present salary—\$15,000. For reasons best known only to himself, he still stays with the Board, but there is a possibility that he may resign in the near future and accept one of the numerous tempting propositions.

Be that as is may, the fact remains that Governor Szymczak is a shining example of Polonia's best in public service.

We salute you, Governor Szymczak, for your herculean achievements.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COINAGE OF CERTAIN 50-CENT PIECES

MR. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3176) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

MR. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Kentucky will agree that this bill does not increase the number of 50-cent pieces but merely changes the manner in which they shall be issued from now on. It will include the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation with the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial.

MR. SPENCE. It merely extends an authority that has already been granted but which will expire on August 7, and adds to this memorial coin George Washington Carver, who was a very distinguished Negro scientist and did much not only for his race but for all the people of America.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946, is amended to read as follows: "That in order to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals and teaching of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver, two great Americans, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint (1) a number of silver 50-cent pieces equal to the number of 50-cent pieces authorized by the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 863), but not yet coined on the date of the enactment of this act, plus (2) an additional number of silver 50-cent pieces equal to the number of 50-cent pieces coined under such act of August 7, 1946, and returned to the Treasury in accordance with section 5 of this act. The silver 50-cent pieces authorized by this section shall be of standard size, weight, and fineness, and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for the coinage authorized by this section, or to the expense of making any changes in design which may be necessitated by reason of the enactment of this act.

"Sec. 2. The coins authorized by the first section of this act shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial (established at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation (established at the birthplace of George Washington Carver in Diamond, Mo.).

"Sec. 3. The coins authorized by the first section of this act shall be issued in such numbers, and at such times, as shall be requested by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins, except that none of such coins shall be issued after August 7, 1954.

"Sec. 4. The coins authorized by the first section of this act may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used, in the manner decided upon by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation to oppose the spread of communism among Negroes in the interest of the national defense.

"Sec. 5. (a) From and after the date of the enactment of this act, no 50-cent pieces shall be coined under the act of August 7, 1946.

"(b) At the request of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, any of the 50-cent pieces coined under the act of August 7, 1946, but on the date of the enactment of this act not yet disposed of in accordance with such act, shall be returned to or retained in the Treasury, and the Director of the Mint shall melt down such 50-cent pieces and use the resulting metal and material for the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces under the first section of this act.

"Sec. 6. All laws in force on the date of the enactment of this act, whether penal or otherwise, relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking thereof, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, providing for the prevention of debasement and counterfeiting and for the security of the coin, or otherwise relating to coinage, shall, insofar as they are applicable, apply to the coinage authorized by this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief showing that there will not be a saving in removing Veterans' Administration district offices to Philadelphia.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time the Veterans' Administration considers giving service to the disabled and the dependents instead of making it difficult for them. The removal of the various district offices along the east coast to Philadelphia is very unfair and will save no money. Imagine the plight of the widows and the orphans, the mothers and the fathers, in filing insurance claims. Time and time again we have tried to decentralize. We have decentralized, and then as soon as we have decentralized Washington causes the folders sorely needed in the local offices to be sent back to the central office. The removal of the office from the east coast to Philadelphia is just, in my opinion, a trial balloon, and that course will be followed all over the country. Those of you who have service cases in your regional offices will want to do something about this. Compensation cases and insurance holders cases should be kept together in one office.

Subject: Consolidation of district offices.

1. In the official release connected with the proposed consolidation of district offices at Boston, New York, and Richmond with the Philadelphia district office at Philadelphia, the argument was advanced that this move would result in economy. Certain figures were proposed indicating the extent of the savings to be affected, these figures are as follows:

New York district office:	
Savings in rental.....	\$488,000
Savings in salaries.....	478,000
Boston district office:	
Savings in rental.....	150,000
Savings in salaries.....	350,000
Richmond district office:	
Savings in rental.....	None.
Savings in salaries.....	290,000

2. The above figures are patently false. The New York district office currently occupies approximately 180,000 square feet at 346 Broadway, New York, N. Y. The rental on this building is paid by the Public Building Service. The rental for the space occupied by the New York district office comes to approximately \$230,000 per annum. The rental in this building is \$1.25 per square foot per annum. The figure given as a saving in rental on the New York district office is more than twice the actual rental for the space occupied by the New York district office. Furthermore, there was not offset against this rental the cost of the space to be occupied in Philadelphia. Information as to rentals for the Boston district office are not available, however, it is known that the Boston district office occupies space jointly with the Boston regional office and thus the removal of the Boston district office will not change the rental paid in Boston since the building will continue to be occupied by the Veterans' Administration. The Richmond district office pays no rental whatsoever. Thus the move of the Richmond district office to Philadelphia should have been scored as a loss, for whatever rental may be paid for

the space occupied by the Richmond district office in Philadelphia will be an additional expense. Very clearly the figures released as to proposed savings in rental are fictitious.

3. The release further stated that the available space in the Atwater-Kent Building in Philadelphia was 723,000 square feet and that of this space 500,000 square feet was currently occupied and that the remaining 223,000 square feet would be acquired for the purpose of consolidation. This leaves the impression that the additional space and cost in Philadelphia would be confined to the rental for only 223,000 square feet. This cannot be so.

4. The New York district office has a total personnel of approximately 1,400 employees. These employees are housed adequately, if not generously, within 180,000 square feet.

The Philadelphia district office has a total personnel of approximately 1,200 and would require for adequate housing approximately 165,000 square feet. The 500,000 square feet of the Atwater-Kent Building designated as occupied is most certainly not occupied by the Philadelphia district office. It is undoubtedly true that a great deal of this space is vacant and could be utilized by other agencies. On the basis of the central office approved specifications of 70 square feet per employee, the 3,000 employees in the district office moved would require a minimum of 210,000 square feet. Storage space for files and records would require a minimum equivalent amount. Thus, the three district offices to be moved would undoubtedly be moved into a space of approximately 400,000 square feet. This would include the 223,000 square feet to be acquired by the Veterans' Administration plus a minimum 200,000 square feet of the alleged "occupied 500,000 square feet" which is in fact available. If the cost of renting the space to house the additional employees and records were offset against the rentals currently being paid in Boston and New York, it may well be that the move would show an increase in rentals rather than a decrease.

5. Further figures are given showing the savings in salaries via the elimination of 292 jobs. However, here again the figures are misleading. There was currently under way reductions in force in the New York district office. These reductions in force were initiated and planned for prior to the consolidation and were independent of it. Thus, there would be a contraction in the salaries paid regardless of the consolidation. Savings in salaries must be restricted only to such savings as are actually brought about by the consolidation, those few jobs abolished directly as a result of the consolidation. The inclusion of jobs being abolished in any event serve to pad the estimated savings. If the figures were honest and showed only such savings in salary as were actually brought about by the consolidation, the result would be a fraction, and a very small fraction at that of the published figures.

6. No attention whatsoever was paid to costs brought about by the consolidation. The costs of moving three major offices will run into millions of dollars. So great is this cost that generations could elapse before the savings if any equalized the cost.

7. No consideration was given to the cost of training employees and the interruption of service, as only a fraction of the employees currently employed in the district offices to be moved will be in a position to transfer to Philadelphia. Thus, a mass of new employees will have to be hired and trained. All of you who were with the Veterans' Administration in 1945 and 1946 during a period when the agency grew at a terrific pace and was hiring people at a great speed are fully aware of the cost and difficulty involved. Turn-over of personnel is one of the major costs of government and private industries and organizations attempt to keep such turn-over to a minimum. In fact, the

Veterans' Administration has been severely criticized because of its high rate of personnel turn-over. We who were with the Veterans' Administration during those hectic moments are aware of the way in which work piled up as desperate efforts were made to instruct people in the work. During the period of this instruction, which varies from 6 months to a year, depending upon the work involved, we are aware that the new employees are useless until they have been trained, and the trained employees are occupied in the instruction rather than the actual work. These costs grow directly out of the proposed consolidation and run into many millions of dollars. There is no question but that service to the veteran and his dependents will be markedly interfered with.

Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., has ordered the consolidation of the Philadelphia, New York, Richmond, and Boston district offices at Philadelphia, Pa. The undersigned hereby appeal to you to exert all your influence through the appropriate channels to prevent execution of the order, for the following reasons:

1. The so-called economy is fictional and illusory, and in terms of real savings on a cost-accounting basis would prove to be nebulous, in view of the following:

- (a) Cost of transportation for employees and household goods.
- (b) Lump-sum payments for annual leave resulting from the resignation of persons unable to accept the transfer.
- (c) The shipment of files and office equipment and special machines, such as addressograph, etc.
- (d) Cost of replacing or overprinting office supplies.
- (e) Cost of training new employees.
- (f) Inability to recruit employees of the lower grades in Philadelphia, which is a highly competitive area for low-grade employees.
- (g) Delay of services occasioned by re-routing and increase of correspondence.
- (h) Cost of replacing resigning personnel to take other jobs pending transfer operations.

2. The loss of income to the city of New York as the result of the transfer of 1,400 jobs.

3. Lifelong residents of the city who wish to keep their employment will be compelled to give up their homes and apartments to move into a community (Philadelphia) which has a housing shortage much more serious than New York's, thereby creating a new class of displaced persons of 1,400 families.

4. One thousand four hundred families, including impressionable children, would be required to tear themselves from their roots in their community in moving to a strange city.

5. The transfer of office will result in a lowering of morale and will create hardships.

6. The employees involved do not earn enough to maintain two homes on even a temporary basis and the cost of traveling from New York to Philadelphia, if only on weekends, would put most families' budgets in the red.

7. The services to widows, orphans, and other beneficiaries would be curtailed. The bad public relations resulting therefrom would cause irreparable harm to the Veterans' Administration. Loss of personal contacts by widows, orphans, and other dependents, including personal insurance service to veterans, would result in a delay in processing claims and in validating insurance. There are in excess of 100,000 calls made annually by claimants and veterans in person or by phone inquiring as to the adjudication of their death and burial claims and service on their National Service Life Insurance.

8. The distress of sale of homes and cooperative apartments purchased under the GI bill.

9. The forced cancellations of existing household leases.

10. The disruption of present educational programs under the GI bill.

11. The problems of relocation in Philadelphia area. The housing situation in Philadelphia will not permit the moving of 3,000 families from New York City, Richmond, and Boston at rentals comparable to wages earned by Federal employees.

Subject: Claims Service, New York district office statistical information.

1. All of the figures given below are as of close of business June 30, 1951 which is the most recent report submitted:

A. Total number of XC-folders.....	127,591
Average monthly increase.....	1,000
B. Total number of XC-folders containing running awards:	
(1) Compensation and pension.....	53,000
World War I.....	31,000
World War II.....	21,000
Regular Establishment.....	1,000

(2) Insurance.....	40,000
--------------------	--------

2. The number of active accounts is considerably greater than the number of cases containing active awards since the same case may contain two or more awards of compensation or pension and two or more running awards of insurance. Hence the following figure is also given:

C. Total number of active payee accounts.....	115,500
(1) Compensation and pension.....	62,800
(2) Insurance.....	52,700

D. Average number of claims received monthly.....	1,750
---	-------

(1) Compensation and pension.....	600
(2) Insurance.....	200
(3) Claims for accrued pension and compensation.....	200
(4) Burial allowance.....	750

3. Personnel: The current authorized ceiling for the Claims Service is 108. Actually on the payroll in June 1951 were 106, as follows:

Total personnel on rolls.....	106
Director, Claims Service.....	1
Chairman, Dependents Pension Board.....	1
Members, Dependents Pension Board.....	5
Chief, Dependents and Beneficiaries Claims Division.....	1
Section chiefs.....	2
Attorney reviewers.....	10
Adjudicators.....	30
Reimbursement authorizers.....	2
Reimbursement adjudicators.....	5
Total.....	57

Balance of personnel composed of clerical grades ranging from GS-3 to GS-5 and typing and stenographic personnel ranging from grades GS-2 to GS-5.

4. It is currently estimated that fully 90 or 95 percent of personnel in the clerical, typing, and stenographic grades will not be able to transfer to the Philadelphia District Office. Thus, insofar as this personnel is concerned, a hiring and training program of the proportions of that which took place at the close of World War II will be necessary. Of the personnel in the professional grades no estimate is offered as to the number that will find it feasible to transfer to the Philadelphia District Office. However, in these grades it must also be assumed that a great many will find the transfer impossible. Those persons familiar with the situation which took place during the rapid expansion of the Veterans' Administration before

the close of World War II will have no difficulty in understanding the chaos which will inevitable result from the contemplated move.

QUESTIONS

1. What will be the cost of moving the three district offices and 3,000 families to Philadelphia?

2. What is the cost of the space used in Philadelphia on a square foot per annum basis? The cost of space at 346 Broadway, New York, N. Y., is \$1.25 per square foot per annum.

3. How much space is occupied by the Philadelphia District Office activities as distinguished from other activities?

4. How many jobs are being abolished as a direct result of the proposed consolidation as distinguished from reduction-in-force already planned for the various district offices?

5. What is the actual saving, if any, resulting from the consolidation?

6. Assuming that some savings will be effected in the Philadelphia District Office, is it likely to last long enough to pay for as much as one-half of the cost of consolidation?

7. What is the long-range plan of the Veterans' Administration with regard to the continuance of the consolidated district office at Philadelphia?

8. Is it the long range plan of the Veterans' Administration to abolish all district offices including the proposed consolidated Philadelphia District Office?

9. What survey has the Veterans' Administration made to ascertain the availability of suitable housing at reasonable rentals for approximately 3,000 additional families in Philadelphia?

10. What steps has the Veterans' Administration taken to procure or assist the families of transferred employees to procure suitable housing?

11. If the present Philadelphia District Office is occupying 75 percent of the Atwater Kent building, how do you propose to accommodate three additional district offices in the remaining 25 percent?

DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I discussed the tragic failure of our metal program for defense and strongly urged a centralized agency with full responsibility and authority for metal and mineral procurement and expansion.

Last night the President set up such an agency. The concentration of responsibility was not complete but the establishment of this agency is a step in the right direction. When I urged this action I stressed the importance of heading it with an able and competent man thoroughly familiar with the metal and minerals field.

The President has appointed a man for this most crucial position, a man with no appreciable experience in the metal and mineral field. This man has been largely responsible for the failure of the former program. Of 18 domestic contracts which have been approved for the expansion of our metal supply and have been sent to the General Services Administration for execution, only 5

have been executed in the last 9 months. Unless this new agency is staffed with able mining people we may well be worse off than we were before. I am deeply concerned with this. I hope it will not put our whole metal situation in the same sorry conditions as our stockpiles.

The article from the New York Times is as follows:

NEW UNIT CREATED TO BUILD STOCKPILE—TRUMAN DECREES AGENCY AIMED AT INCREASING THE SUPPLY OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

WASHINGTON, August 1.—President Truman created today a new independent agency charged with procuring and increasing the supply of critical and strategic materials at home and abroad.

The new unit will be called the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. The President said he intended to nominate as its administrator Jess Larson, who will be relieved of his present post as General Services Administrator. The nomination will be subject to Senate confirmation.

The reorganization will take place as soon as the necessary orders can be arranged by the Budget Director, the President directed.

Under the directive the various procurement and development functions now exercised by the General Services Administration, the Department of the Interior, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Defense Production Administration will be transferred to the new agency. The agency will operate "under the direction, control and coordination" of the Director of Defense Mobilization.

MUNITIONS BOARD REPORTS

The President's action followed by a few hours the presentation of a semiannual report by the Munitions Board on stockpiling, in which the Board said the progress of its stockpile program was "governed" by the determinations of civilian agencies created to promote imports and production of strategic materials and their distribution.

The Munitions Board, reporting a substantial increase in purchases in the first 6 months of this calendar year, warned that shortages here and abroad and competition from the defense-industry program here at home were posing problems in the stockpiling program.

In his directive creating the new agency President Truman explained:

"It is essential that we have ample supplies of basic and rare materials if we are to fulfill our mobilization goals during the coming months and if we are to maintain the expanding national economy which gives us some of the necessary elements of strength in international affairs."

The sweeping authority granted the new unit will make it the dominant nonagricultural materials procurement agency. It also will be vested with powers of development and execution of materials expansion programs.

The General Services Administration, it is stipulated, will continue its present responsibilities for stockpile procurement but generally it will purchase its stockpile materials from the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. General Services Administration will continue as the financial and custodial agency for the stockpile.

FUNCTIONS ARE OUTLINED

The new agency will take over the following functions from the Department of the Interior's Defense Minerals Administration: responsibility for materials supply expansion; responsibility for recommending tax amortization for materials expansion actions, and responsibility for certifying Defense Production Administration loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for materials expansion actions.

From the general services administration the new agency will take responsibility for materials procurement under the Defense Production Act.

It will serve as the agency to perform materials procurement actions for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The Munitions Board's report said this country's stockpile of strategic materials was increased by \$460,000,000 worth of purchases in the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1951.

The values of stocks on hand have increased from \$2,540,000,000 on January 1 to \$3,000,000,000 on June 30, the report stated. The total objective in purchases, as presently estimated, amounts to \$8,300,000,000 based on June 30 prices, according to the report.

The report warned of serious national and world-wide shortages developing in numerous materials. As a result of this, the Munitions Board, "due to circumstances beyond its control, is unable to acquire these materials at its target rates," the report stated.

SERIOUS PROBLEMS NOTED

The primary purpose of the legislation under which the stockpile is being built is to reduce or eliminate United States dependence on foreign supplies of raw strategic materials if war should close off these imports. The materials stockpiled are principally those from foreign sources and not those which can be produced in this country in sufficient quantities to meet wartime need.

In both foreign and domestic sources the stockpiling program is facing serious problems not only in shortages but in competition with the current military production program.

Materials purchased through Economic Cooperation Administration counterpart funds totaled \$2,673,837 in the 6-month period, the Munitions Board report stated. Counterpart funds are foreign currency deposited by participating countries to match Economic Cooperation Administration grants. The funds, with the exception of a minimum of 5 percent, are to be spent for projects within the participating nations or their territories.

The minimum of 5 percent is at the disposal of the Economic Cooperation Administration and it is from this money that it has made the outright stockpile purchases. From the inception of that agency, outright purchases have totaled \$69,367,230 of which actual deliveries up to April 1, 1951, represented about \$56,600,000.

Progress in the stockpile program has been slowed by diversion of deliveries from the stockpile to defense industries the report stated.

"In some cases," the report said, "materials to be delivered under stockpile contracts have been diverted to industrial users and the amounts diverted are not to be replaced by future deliveries but will require new contracts to fill the total objective."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of flood control in the Missouri River.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES IS DOING FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I remind the Members of the House that really the United Nations is the United States. We are bearing the expense almost entirely of the United Nations and the staffs of the other countries. So I remind you again of what we are doing for the other nations of the world. They should go along with us.

THE PUBLIC IS ENTITLED TO THE TRUTH ON THE O'DWYER STORY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Times-Herald of August 1, 1951, on the front page we find a story entitled "O'Dwyer Quiz Bares Huge Credit":

The crime committee is secretly investigating a \$1,000,000 letter of credit reportedly transferred from Mexico to a Manhattan bank a few days before Ambassador William O'Dwyer testified before the committee last March, it was learned yesterday.

The letter of credit was mysteriously canceled 5 days after O'Dwyer—who still is under committee subpoena—completed his New York testimony at the famous television show.

TIPPED OFF BY BANK

It was understood that the New York bank, because of the strangeness and size of the transaction and the coincidence in timing, tipped off committee investigators.

A member of the committee staff this week has been questioning O'Dwyer—who claims he is a poor man—in Mexico City. The investigator left here by plane several days ago.

Mr. Speaker, I find a similar item in the Philadelphia Inquirer with the title: "O'Dwyer Is Questioned on Mysterious Million."

Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Herald Tribune we find the following story:

O'DWYER CALLS STORY OF MILLION CREDIT A HOAX—IN MEXICO CITY, HE DENIES FUND TRANSFER TO NEW YORK, HITS "VICIOUS CAMPAIGN"

MEXICO CITY, August 1.—Commenting on published reports that he had transferred a \$1,000,000 letter of credit from Mexico to a New York City bank shortly before he appeared in March before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee in New York City, Ambassador William O'Dwyer today termed the reports a "cowardly and contemptible smear."

In a statement issued at the American Embassy tonight, Ambassador O'Dwyer, former mayor of New York, said the reports were "a diabolical hoax which ordinarily would be too fantastic to receive attention * * * except for the unfortunate fact that the reports appeared to have emanated from the Senate Crime Investigating Committee."

Mr. O'Dwyer's statement follows:

"Since I became Ambassador of the United States to Mexico I have been subjected to a vile and vicious campaign of slander. I thought the bottom had been reached until this morning when I learned of a published falsehood to the effect that I had transferred \$1,000,000 to the United States from Mexico in March of this year and canceled the transfer 5 days later.

"This abominable lie could only have been concocted and circulated by evil-minded men engaged in a conspiracy to destroy me by rumors, insinuations, and calumny.

"I denounce the perpetrators of this cowardly and contemptible smear. Whoever originated or is in any way responsible for this lie should be promptly exposed. I have worked day and night to better the relationship and cement the friendship of the people of the United States and the people of Mexico. Whoever is responsible for this latest piece of vicious work is neither a friend of Mexico nor the United States.

"I assure the people of the United States and Mexico that the circulation of these loathsome rumors will not prevent nor interfere with the performance of my duties in these critical times to promote good relations between the peoples of both countries."

Mr. Speaker, the Rules of this House do not permit me to give advice to or criticize a committee of the other body. However, we all know that mere unfounded rumor, when published, becomes an established fact.

The public is entitled to immediately know: Was this an official transaction, not to or with Ambassador O'Dwyer personally, but between the sovereign Governments of Mexico and the United States?

If it was, and if the investigators know how to investigate at all, they should have had all the facts, one way or another, for the American public and the people of Mexico long before now. They could telephone the able, fearless district attorney of New York County, Frank Hogan, or the commissioner of the greatest police department in the world, New York's finest, or the New York office of the FBI, and there would be a team of investigators or detectives or agents at the New York bank mentioned in the story within a matter of minutes. The New York bank records should tell the true story. The public should then have the facts. Why leave this matter up in the air?

In justice to everyone concerned I say: Let us have the true facts immediately.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN and to include a bill he introduced for the benefit of Korean veterans.

Mr. BUDGE (at the request of Mr. Wood of Idaho) and to include an article entitled "The Lead Miner and the Present Emergency," notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$191.34.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ADAIR and to include an article.

Mr. JUDD in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN and to include two editorials and a statement.

Mr. Bow on a resolution which he introduced today.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. MADDEN to include a statement together with Federal court citations by the Federal Security Administration regarding welfare funds in the State of Indiana, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$192.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include extraneous matter in remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, 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. 629. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4329. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenue of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood disaster emergency.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS, until August 16, 1951, on account of official business.

Mr. WELCH, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 6, 1951, 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:

674. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-eighth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

675. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its publication entitled "Typical Electric Bills for Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

676. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

677. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1951, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

678. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 140. Concurrent resolution expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 15. An act to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRUMPACKER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4109. A bill to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1005, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; without amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3436. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3209. A bill amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee of conference. H. R. 3282. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 789). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5037. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

gation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 5038. A bill to provide certain educational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5039. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 5040. A bill to provide certain educational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5041. A bill to prevent the taking of bail which originates with subversive individuals or organizations in criminal cases, and to prohibit bail, pending appeal or certiorari, after conviction of certain offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 5042. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 5043. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5044. A bill to transfer the Employment Service administration of the various States to the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend section 10 (e), subdivision (b), item (4), of the Administrative Procedure Act, Public Law 404, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5046. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5047. A bill to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5048. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 5049. A bill to amend section 601 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning August 19, 1951, as National Clay Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into agreements prior to construction to purchase mortgages on housing in disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5050. A bill for the relief of Stephen J. Gromczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 5052. A bill for the relief of Cyril Claude Andersen, Patricia Andersen Hill, and Thelma Andersen McNeill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; 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:

372. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Maine Federation of Women's Clubs, urging the leaders of both major political parties and Representatives in Congress to lay aside personal and partisan considerations and let their criticisms and actions be solely in the national interest and be tempered with wisdom and judgment; and urging upon its Members the need for examining and evaluating all factors in a given situation before coming to conclusions and giving voice thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

373. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Milton Grange, No. 670, Milton Junction, Wis., gravely concerned about the reduced value of the American dollar and the instability of our economy which may result if the inflationary trend continues; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

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

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

Eternal Spirit, who dost overarch our transiency with Thine everlastingness and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, make Thyself real to us as facing the toil of another week we turn unfilled to Thee. In a shaken world we seek stability. In a noisy world we need inner peace. In a fear-haunted world we crave confidence and courage, and in a world of rising and falling empires we would be held steady by a vision of Thy eternal kingdom whose sun never sets. With a devotion that holds nothing back may it be our ruling passion to serve the present age. Give us the inner strength—

"To be true to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes,
But faithful to the light within."
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KERR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 2, 1951:

S. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska.

On August 3, 1951:

S. 492. An act to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to make the restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

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

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1227. An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended;

H. R. 3176. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946; and

H. R. 4550. An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1227. An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3176. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4550. An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE
SESSION

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Foreign Relations and on the Armed Services were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, without making speeches, and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN WRITTEN NOTICES BY
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on notices in writing of contributions by the United States to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE
DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1950-51 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY
JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT
STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a printed copy of a report on agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CON-
TROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH
DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of June 1951 (with an accompanying report);