cess-profits tax returns for certain taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the General Court of Massachusetts, expressing disapproval of a proposal to close the district office of the Veterans' Administration at Boston; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to take the necessary steps to prevent the closing of the district office of the Veterans' Administration in Boston and the removal thereof to Philadelphia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, expressing disapproval of a proposal to close to district office of the Veterans' Administration at Boston; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to prevent the closing of the district office of the Veterans' Administration in Boston and removal thereof to Philadelphia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5205. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Geier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Gregg Ted Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Sor Teresa Gea Martinez, Sor Eufrasia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Geier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of Robert K. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 5211. A bill for the relief of Michael Kay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of Jon Sigurdur Gudmundsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada L. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5214. A bill for the relief of Hela Feder Sooaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

395. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Federation of Amami Associations, Tokyo, Japan, relative to a revision of the draft of Japanese Peace Treaty in respect of territorial questions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 17, 1951

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

Rev. A. Grady Hallonquist, minister, Grace Methodist Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who by Thy holy spirit did guide the fathers of our Nation into the ways of truth and righteousness as they labored together in laying the foundations of this great Republic, enlighten, we pray Thee, our minds and inspire our hearts that we may prove ourselves a people dedicated to those lofty ideals for which they so willingly gave their full measure of devotion.

Direct, we beseech Thee, this session of Congress. Endue with heavenly wisdom Thy servants who make up this body as they decide the issues of state. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Remove far from us the spirit of pride and every evil way. In times of prosperity may we be humbly grateful. In times of challenge grant us courage, and in times of adversity, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

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

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSIONS TO DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the bill (H. R. 3193) to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Your Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill, H. R. 3193, entitled "A bill to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended," together with the objections of the President thereto, having reconsidered said bill and the objections of the President thereto, reports the same back to the House with the unanimous recommendation that said bill do pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

This bill provides a pension of $120 a month for totally and permanently disabled, non-service-connected veterans of World Wars I and II, and of the present conflict, where aid and attendance of another person is required, based upon a disability involving blindness or helplessness. The Spanish-American and Civil War veterans already enjoy such a rate. However, there is a difference in eligibility requirements, since veterans covered by this bill may not receive this pension if their annual income exceeds $1,000 if single, or $2,500 if with dependents. Veterans of the Spanish-American War and Civil War, on the other hand, do not have to meet any income limitation. In addition, misconduct bars the receipt of pension by World War I and II veterans and this provision applies to the $120 herein provided.

The committee wishes to reiterate its belief that the veterans covered by this bill are by far the most meritorious of this disability class. All of these veterans are either helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person. In other words, the veterans covered by this legislation need another person in order to take care of their ordinary creature comforts.

This bill was carefully considered by the full committee after a hearing by a subcommittee. The committee, after again considering the subject in view of the President's veto message, is of the unanimous opinion that the bill should pass, despite the objections which have been raised against it.

The immediate cost is very small, inasmuch as the first-year cost would approximate $16,700,000. It has become the fashion in recent years apparently for the executive department to forecast all costs of veterans' legislation on a 50-year basis, or until the end of the present century. Why veterans' legislation should be singled out for this treatment is uncertain, but there seems to be no valid reason why, if we are to estimate the cost of veterans' legislation for the next 50 years, we should not apply the same standard to all long-range programs of the Government. Comparisons on this basis show the immediate cost of the present bill to be small, as well as the long-range cost.

An estimate of this type contained in the veto message is a guess at best and should not be given any greater weight than a simple guess.

For several years there has been a contention in the executive department of the Government that veterans' benefits should be merged into the social security system. The committee does not agree with this point of view, because it believes that veterans have made a particular contribution to the Nation in a time of peril and, based on this contribution, are entitled to special consideration above those who did not render such service.

For the above reasons, all of which appear to be valid, the committee recommends that the bill be enacted into law, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include letters which I have received from the American Legion, one from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, one from the Disabled American Veterans, and one from the AMVETS or the American Veterans of World War II, all supporting this measure and urging the Congress to override the veto.

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

There was no objection.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1951.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: On August 6, 1951, the President vetoed H. R. 3193, a bill to provide a pension of $120 a month for veterans of World Wars I and II and of the present conflict in those cases where an otherwise eligible veteran needs the regular aid and attendance of another person. The disability is of a non-service-connected type. Persons serving on and after June 27, 1950, and until such time as determined by the President or Congress, are covered by this proposal by virtue of Public Law 28 of the Eighty-second Congress.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

This rate is in line with the $120 rate provided under the service-pension laws now enjoyed by veterans of the Spanish-American War who have the same condition.

Both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in their respective reports on this legislation, stated:

"The committee is of the belief that the veterans covered by this bill are by far the most meritorious of the non-service-connected-disability class. All of these men are either helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need the regular assistance of another person."

Many of these blind and helpless veterans are presently being cared for in veterans' hospitals and domiciliary homes at costs greatly in excess of the increase proposed in the bill. The increase to $120 per month would have permitted many of these men now being cared for in Government hospitals and domiciliary homes to be taken into private homes by relatives or friends, resulting in a substantial savings to the Government. Under existing law and regulations, where a veteran is receiving the extra pension because he is so helpless or blind as to need constant attendance and must go to a veterans' hospital for treatment, his pension is reduced to the standard rate while he is confined to the hospital.

To qualify for this pension, veterans must be in that group whose annual income is not more than $1,000 if single, and $2,500 if married. Social-security benefits and retirement annuities are computed as a part of the income of such veterans in establishing this eligibility.

We submit the principles involved warrant passage of the legislation over the alleged objections, and furthermore, that the cost is a minor consideration when compared with the reasonable benefits provided for these disabled veterans.

The national organization of the American Legion joins with all of the major veterans' organizations in respectfully asking for your assistance to the end that the President's veto of H. R. 3193 may be overridden when the matter comes before the House for disposition, which I understand will be on Friday, August 17, 1951.

Thanking you for your earnest consideration of this request, and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN
WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1951.

A PLEA FOR SUPPORT OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO OVERRIDE THE VETO OF H. R. 3193

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: You are respectfully urged, in the name of common decency and justice, to support the recommendation of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the House of Representatives override the Presidential veto which was applied to H. R. 3193, a bill to authorize an extra pension allowance for those World War I and II veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need constant aid and attendance and who can otherwise meet the rigid eligibility requirements to receive a non-service-connected disability pension. It is understood this bill, with the report of the House Veterans Committee, will be brought up for action on Friday, August 17, 1951.

The President, in vetoing this bill, outlined three principal objections. First, the question of cost—present and future; second, that the disabilities for which the veteran would receive the extra pension allowance are not directly related to active service; and, third, that the bill would create a further spread between the treatment of veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government. In essence, the President indicates that he is opposed to the payment of non-service-connected pensions to veterans and that there should be no distinction between the treatment accorded veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government. What are the facts?

1. Costs: According to the veto message the President has estimated that the first year's cost of this bill would be approximately $16,700,000, and that a projection of the cost, on the basis of experience under similar pension legislation for Spanish-American War veterans, would approach $400,000,000 a year by the end of the century. The Veterans of Foreign Wars vigorously take issue with the accuracy of this cost estimate. In the first place, it is impossible to accurately project the cost of this bill on the basis of Spanish-American War veterans experience, because the eligibility requirements for the Spanish-American War veterans are more liberal than the eligibility requirements for World War I and II veterans. A Spanish-American War veteran needs only to establish proof that he is so helpless or blind as to require aid and attendance, regardless of misconduct or income. The World War I and II veteran, in addition to establishing proof that he is so helpless or blind as to need aid and attendance, also must show that his disabilities are not the result of misconduct and that he does not have an income in excess of $1,000 per year if no dependents, or $2,500 per year with dependents. It should be pointed out that the income limitation, along with the growth and extension of social security plus growing industrial pension systems, will serve to keep the number of World War I and II veterans eligible for this pension to the barest minimum.

The present average age of Spanish-American War veterans is 73 years plus. Only 8 percent of all Spanish-American War veterans now receiving age and disability service pensions are receiving the special allowance for the helpless or blind. Taking into consideration the income limitation affecting World War I and II veterans, is it not reasonable to believe that the percentage of said veterans eligible to receive this special allowance will be considerably less than the Spanish-American War veterans? Using the Spanish-American War experience and not taking into consideration the income limitation which applies in one case and does not apply in the other case, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has generously estimated that not more than 20,000 World War I and II veterans would be eligible to receive this special pension allowance the first year at a total cost of approximately $13,680,000. This is substantially less than the President estimated, using somewhat the same formula. It is our considered judgment that the President's projected estimates of costs did not take into consideration the stern requirements and income limitations which will strongly affect World War I and II eligibility to this particular pension.

In speaking of the costs of this special pension allowance it could well be pointed out that 1 week's cost of the current Marshall aid program (not including military assistance) for Europe would pay this pension cost for a period of 4 years, and that the appropriation which the President is now asking from Congress for 1 year's military and rehabilitation aid for Europe would more than pay the total cost of this pension increase throughout the entire life span of all World War I and II veterans, assuming that the pension legislation remained in effect for that period of time.

2. Pensions for disabilities not related to service: Pensions for aged and helpless veterans has been a tradition and policy in the United States beginning with the early Plymouth colony. Special pension allowances for helpless or blind veterans was first authorized for Civil War veterans and later extended to Spanish-American War veterans. On July 30, 1947, President Truman approved Public Law 270, Eightieth Congress, which increased the special pension for helpless or blind Spanish-American War veterans from $100 to $120 monthly. H. R. 3193, which was vetoed, is not something new or a departure from the traditional policy of the United States. If these helpless or blind World War I and II veterans are not worthy and deserving of the $120 monthly pensions because their disabilities are not directly related to their service, are they deserving and worthy of the present $60 or $72 monthly pension which they are now receiving under the same circumstances?

3. Discrimination between veterans and nonveterans: If there should be no discrimination between the treatment and care of veterans and nonveterans by the Federal Government, should there be discrimination between servicemen and civilians in time of war or national emergencies? Should the civilians or nonveterans be subjected to the same rates of pay, the same discipline, the same punishment, and the same loss of personal freedom and independent action as apply to servicemen who later become veterans? The whole theory of special assistance to aged and disabled veterans is based upon the measure of sacrifice, economic dislocation, and loss of personal freedom which applies to members of the Armed Forces on active duty in time of war or national emergencies. Please vote to override.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service, VFW.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington D. C., August 9, 1951.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: The Disabled American Veterans protests the veto by the President of the United States on August 6, 1951, of the bills H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549.

Historically, the Disabled American Veterans has always been a "single-purpose" organization dedicated to the welfare and rehabilitation of the service-connected wartime disabled. In protesting the Presidential veto of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549, we are cognizant that the provisions of these two bills are designed primarily for veterans, or their dependents, eligible for non-service-connected pensions. Our endorsement of these two bills, however, is justified by the knowledge that many veterans in receipt of part III benefits should actually be service-connected.

H. R. 3193 is applicable only to those who are blind or helpless because of physical or mental disability and require the regular aid and attendance of another person. To deny to this small segment of veterans of World War I and World War II sufficient pension to employ the services of an aide appears extremely inequitable. It must be borne in mind that veterans of the Spanish-American War have already been granted a pension equal to that provided by H. R. 3193. An additional factor that should be considered is that it is far more costly for the Veterans' Admiinstration to maintain these blind and helpless veterans in a hospital than it is to provide them with a pension of $120 a month.

With respect to H. R. 3549, its application is so limited that the Veterans' Administration was not requested to give an estimate of the cost when under consideration by the Congress.

It is understood that the bill would add a very limited number of widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian War and the Spanish-American War to the pension rolls and at an

age when their remaining life expectancy is of extremely short duration.

Your assistance in effectng the passage of H. R. 3193 and H. R. 3549, despite the veto of the President of the United States is sincerely solicited.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

AMVETS,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1951.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) urge the Congress to pass H. R. 3193 over the President's veto. The bill would increase pensions to certain disabled veterans. All of these men are either helpless or blind or so nearly so that they require the aid of another person.

AMVETS are of the belief that the veterans covered by this bill are by far the most meritorious of the non-service-connected-disability class. The suggestion that they should be provided for in other than veterans' legislation is unrealistic when such suggested legislation is not forthcoming. The suggestion that these veterans are dipping their hands in the public till is also unwarranted since a definite income limitation is placed upon them—veterans covered by this bill cannot have more than $1,000 annual income, if single, or $2,500, if with dependents, in order to get the benefits of this proposal.

To deny this increase to these disabled veterans to meet the admitted increase in the cost of living, solely on the wild estimate that this proposal will cost the American taxpayer $400,000,000 per year by the end of the century, is—we submit—to deny public responsibility to these disabled veterans who served their country in time of war and are now so badly incapacitated that they require the aid of another person.

AMVETS urge you to vote for H. R. 3193 over the President's veto.

Very respectfully yours,

CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, Jr.,
National Legislative Director.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the statement made in the report read by the Clerk a few moments ago contains all the information I have for the House, and I think, all that is necessary.

Several members of the committee wish to be heard and I now yield to the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] as much time as she desires.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of the House will vote to override the veto. In order to receive this pension, the veteran must be totally and permanently disabled, and in need of aid and attendance. There is an income limitation in the bill. In order to qualify, the veteran if single must have an income of less than $1,000 a year, and if he has dependents his income must be less than $2,500 a year. This is not a requirement in the case of Civil War, Indian War, and Spanish-American War veterans, who are now receiving $120 a month when they require the aid and attendance of another person. This bill is definitely more restrictive.

Another point I would like to bring out is that most of the veterans who would benefit from the enactment of this bill are already upon the pension rolls at $60 and $72 a month. Many of them are now in veterans' hospitals and a number have written me that they would be glad to go home if they could receive the $120 a month that the bill calls for. When you consider that it costs a little more than $12 a day to keep a patient in a Veterans' Administration hospital, there is sure to be some saving effected.

I have received universal approval of the measure, not alone from those who may be affected by its enactment but from all of the major veterans' organizations.

Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs approved the passage of this bill over the President's veto without a dissenting vote. I am sure that the membership of the House will do likewise.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, in talking with Members of the House about this bill, I feel there is a considerable misunderstanding in view of the publicity that has been given to this veto message. There seems to be a feeling among the Members that you are introducing new classes of veterans to be placed on the pension rolls. Let me say that under this bill not one single new class of veterans is placed on the roll. You already have these veterans on the roll at $60 and $72 a month, depending upon the class they fall into. Under this bill, you increase that particular group of people from $60 and $72 a month to $120 a month. The President has given you the impression here, I believe, in this veto message, that we are going to place upon the pension rolls a large number of new people. That just is not true. You are not putting any new people on the rolls except those that are already there.

Now what class of veterans are on the rolls in this bill. That is the second thing which I think is important to know. Every single one of these veterans is totally disabled—absolutely and totally disabled to such an extent that they are in need of an attendant. That is the only class of veterans you have who are covered by this particular bill. There is no other class of veterans at all—just that one class of totally and permanently disabled veterans.

If any of you have ever practiced before the Veterans' Bureau you have some idea of how difficult it is to prove a total disability case. I have had several of them in private practice and I know something of the difficulty a veteran is up against in making out such a case. It is a difficult proposition under any circumstance. The purpose of this law was to cover those veterans many of whom were morally worthy but just lacked the evidence required to make out a service-connected case.

Let me give you an example. During the last war I was on board a Dutch destroyer one evening and being unfamiliar with that ship I fell down a hatchway. Fortunately I was not badly hurt, but if I had become permanently disabled it would have been up to me to go before the Veterans' Administration and prove all of the circumstances. The burden of proof would have been upon me. My word would not have been sufficient to prove the case. I would have had to secure all of the evidence from people who probably now are scattered all over the world in the Dutch Navy. It is probable that I could never have proved the case because of my inability to gather enough evidence to prove it. However, under this law I would have been protected because of my total disability, even though I could not prove it to be strictly service-connected. This law covers large numbers of those particular kinds of cases.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the veterans covered by this bill had been Civil War veterans, Indian War veterans, or Spanish War veterans, they would not only get this $120 provided here, but they would not have any income limitation such as is imposed on these boys.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. Now, let me go to the point that the gentleman from Mississippi has just made. Take this man who is totally disabled. If he has any income which amounts to $1,100 in case he is single, or $2,500 in case he is married or has dependents to support, this bill does not even apply to him, and he cannot get anything under it. A person who will enjoy the benefits of this bill is the one who has hardly any income of any kind to help him in any way.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Does this also mean that the totally disabled individual must have someone taking care of him?

Mr. SPRINGER. It means that he must be totally disabled to the extent that it is necessary for him to have an attendant. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman tell us briefly what is the total figure involved?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will give that in just a minute.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. What veterans are these? Veterans of World Wars I and II?

Mr. SPRINGER. World War I will have about 25,000; World War II not more than a few hundred.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman from Arkansas asked a question as to how far back this bill extends. It goes back as far as there are veterans alive; does it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. It would, but there are not many of the older veterans, back of World War I.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does it include veterans of the Korean war?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am sure it does, but let me check that with the Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it does.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I am going to be for the bill, but I want to be clear on the question of how much money is involved here. All kinds of stories have been bandied around about this bill running into the billions. Of course, if it runs into the billions we will spend the money here in the United States instead of scattering it to the four corners of the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me say this, there will be involved here about $16,700,000 per year. That is all that is involved.

The President has raised the point here about how much it is going to cost in the future and all that. I just cannot see how that can be true. We have had only 400 veterans out of all the millions who served in World War II, out of something like 13,000,000—only 400 veterans have applied now in 5 years. That is about the situation at the present time.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman, I think, has not brought out the fact that Spanish-American War veterans already have this $120 a month pension and they do not have the income limitation that is applied to veterans of subsequent wars in this bill, no matter what their income is.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. Those veterans of those wars receiving these pensions do not have any income limitation put upon them. There are not very many, however, in that classification because they would have to be upwards of 70 years old.

Let me say this to you, that most of these people who might fall under this bill in the future I think will come under social security, because you are giving social security to people now who were not covered 25 years ago but are covered now in these situations of total disability. For that reason I do not think you are going to have any large number of future veterans who are going to go on the rolls, certainly not to the number the President indicates. As I have said a number of times, there are but 400 men in this category from World War II. I am not apprehensive as to the great number of veterans who might fall in this category in the future.

The President has talked about economy. I have voted for every economy measure that has been in this House, or amendment thereto. As far as I know this is the first time I can remember in the 7 months I have been in the House that the President has come here to the Capitol and asked us to economize—and now at the expense of the totally disabled veterans. If they want me to go back to my constituents in the next election on that issue I am perfectly willing to make my record right here. I cannot sustain the President's veto in this case. If anyone wants to raise that as a question of economy on me in the next election I am perfectly willing to stand on it. I do not intend to sacrifice the veterans of this country, especially that class of veterans who are totally disabled and are unable to take care of themselves and are in need of this kind of support.

Let me emphasize to you again you are not placing any new class of veterans on the rolls. The sole question is whether you are going to raise from $60 to $72 per month up to $120 per month the class of veterans that is set out in this bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state also that most of these men are in hospitals and it costs more to take care of these veterans in hospitals than it does to give them this pension. If they are not in hospitals they will have to be on relief and be taken care of. I do not want this considered as a matter of economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not an economy matter, and it should not be considered on those merits.

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

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the gentleman tell us the approximate number of veterans or the actual number of veterans involved in this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. About 27,000.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Do I understand the gentleman to say he is going to vote for this bill even if it defeats him for Congress?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Following up what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts said, the granting of this additional compensation to veterans who are now in hospitals might make it possible for them to be taken care of at home, thereby reducing the estimated cost of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. It will. Let me say to you that I think all of us who are acquainted with veterans' affairs know now that the veterans' hospitals are overcrowded. It is almost an impossibility to put 27,000 totally disabled veterans in the veterans' hospitals. A totally disabled veteran takes more time and care than one who is only partially disabled. It is impossible for the hospitals to take care of this number of totally disabled veterans. It is absolutely necessary that you keep these people at home. I think all of you realize that cannot be done adequately on such a little sum of money as $60 or $72 a month.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, most of the points that are of importance to all of us in this bill have been in the preceding few minutes adequately stressed; however, there are two or three other matters that might be brought to the attention of the House.

In the first place, it seems to me we should underscore the fact that no new people are being added to the pension rolls as a result of this act, if it does become law over the President's veto. These people are presently on the pension rolls drawing $60 to $72 per month. This simply provides them with an increased sum. To the best of my knowledge this increase will amount to about $53 per individual per month, which is certainly not a great deal.

All of us are completely aware of the fact that with rising costs of all kinds today people who are receiving wages or salaries have been asking and in most cases have been receiving increases. If they need additional money upon which to live, certainly our veterans likewise need additional income.

It seems to me that this increase is a very modest one to give them.

Objection has been raised that this increase goes to nonservice connected cases, which is true, but, nevertheless, they are people who have worn the uniform of our country, who have given years of their life to the service of their country, and they are entitled to our consideration. The House is now considering a bill which will give probably many billions of dollars to foreign nations. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the least we can do is to give a few million dollars to these worthy veterans; particularly in view of the fact that such proper safeguards as to income, and otherwise, are written into the act.

I urge that the House pass this bill over the President's veto.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote to override the veto of this bill which seeks to provide the same rate for World War I and II veterans and the men of the Korean conflict that the veterans of the Civil, Indian, and Spanish-American Wars have long enjoyed. To me this seems to be a simple matter of equity.

In addition, this bill is a step in the direction of uniformity in the pension structure and I believe that all Members will agree with me that uniformity of treatment to veterans of all wars is a goal toward which we should constantly strive.

This is not a question of economy. There are only 400 World War II veterans presently affected by this bill and 23,700 veterans of World War I. In addition to being helpless or blind, these men must each show that their disability

is not the result of their own misconduct and, further, that their annual income is less than $1,000 if single or $2,500 if with dependents. Neither of these two conditions must be met by the veterans of the Civil, Indian, and Spanish-American Wars. The President's veto completely fails to point out that this legislation is much "tighter" than the law which is already on the statute books for the veterans of our earlier wars.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held hearings on this proposal before it was presented to the full committee. Careful consideration was given to all points of this proposal before it was reported to the House and the House originally passed the bill without a dissenting vote and the Senate did likewise. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has again considered this subject and has reached the same conclusion that the bill is meritorious and deserves the support of the Members of the Congress and should be enacted into law and for these reasons I vote to override the veto of this important veterans' bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], has covered the situation thoroughly. However, I would like to point out one or two things.

First of all, there is a misconduct provision in this bill, so that we will not have the situation where men will go out and be injured due to misconduct and then be entitled to any of these benefits.

Another point that I would like to bring to your attention is this——

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to the fact that while there is a misconduct clause in this bill, there is no such clause in the law that applies to the Civil War veterans, the Spanish American War veterans, or the Indian war veterans; so this bill is more restrictive than the law that applies to those veterans.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Definitely it is more restrictive, and I think we are approaching the situation in a more sound manner than was approached previously.

Another point that I would like to bring to your attention, you will notice in the President's veto message he compared veterans to nonveterans and the disabilities that they may encounter. I urge upon you to consider this as possibly an opening wedge toward placing the veterans under socialized medicine, or perhaps placing all of the country under socialized medicine.

In conclusion I would like to bring this one thought to your attention. Here we have a group of veterans, men who have worn the uniform in the defense of their country. Whether they have been actually engaged in combat or not, makes little difference. They may have collected combat ribbons and decorations in the defense of their country but when they get in a destitute situation as envisioned in this bill, I bring to your attention that they will not be able to eat those combat ribbons and medals.

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And is it not a fact that a great many of their lives have been disrupted; they lost their homes; they lost their businesses, and they made great sacrifices? They had a great economic loss that the people of this country who did not fight did not have.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Well, I am not too much concerned about that, I will say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am primarily concerned about these men who are destitute and just what it means to them when they have less than $1,000 a year income. I earnestly believe that we must take care of them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this measure at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote to override this veto for one reason only. In a short time we are going to increase the compensation of the Federal employees because of the depreciation of the dollar insofar as buying power is concerned. These men, if they are entitled to a pension, are entitled to a pension to purchase as much as we originally intended them to purchase when we passed that measure. I hope that we will recognize the increased cost of living and give these men an adequate increase.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I, like many other Members of Congress, am very much interested in the passage of this bill, the President's veto notwithstanding.

It applies only to veterans of World War I and World War II who are totally and permanently disabled. These veterans are already receiving from $60 to $72 per month and the added cost is only about half of the sum reported in the Presidents veto.

I represent people that are loyal Americans and they are grateful to the veterans of all wars for their services to our country. These men, who are totally and permanently disabled, are not expected to live as long as men of the same age who are not afflicted with physical disabilities and, of course, the cost of this bill will decrease rapidly as these totally disabled veterans pass on. Their expectation of life is much shorter than that of normally healthy men of equal age.

This bill is safeguarded and is more restricted than the law as it now applies to Spanish War veterans because if a veteran of World War I or World War II, who is permanently and totally disabled and needs an attendant, if he has an income of as little as $1,000 per year, if single, he cannot qualify, and if they are men with families and their income exceeds $2,500 per year, they cannot qualify.

I am not willing to go along with the President's veto and attempt to economize at the expense of our veterans who have served their country in the last two world-wide wars. This is the first time that I have seen any effort made by the present Democratic administration to economize in governmental expenses. I think to deny the veterans this much-needed aid and assistance would be a bad place to begin a move toward economy. Many of us have voted steadfastly to economize on governmental expenditures. Sometimes we have succeeded, but many times we have been overridden by the present administration, and I think it comes with bad grace for the President of the United States to begin to talk economy at the expense of the veterans of the last two wars.

Those veterans of the Korean war, who qualify, should also be protected. Kentucky has always furnished its full share of fighting men when this country was in danger. We may need our fighting men again and it ought to be known to all the world that America takes care of her war heroes when they become totally and permanently disabled. There is slight difference, in my mind, when a man in good faith joins the armed services, endangers his life and all he has as a living sacrifice for his country whether he is stricken by a bullet in battle and wounded, or whether he becomes totally and permanently disabled from other causes. The country owes an eternal and everlasting debt of gratitude to him. If he is helpless financially, it would be a public disgrace to the people to see him suffer and die in poverty.

Relatively speaking, there are only a few men that are totally and permanently disabled and who need an attendant. I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. I do not agree with the President that these totally and permanently disabled veterans ought to be thrown into the general class where social security will take care of them. There is a distinction, the country owes a special debt to them and this legislation fulfills the obligation that our people owe to our totally and permanently disabled veterans. I urge the passage of the bill.

I am inserting as part of my remarks an article taken from the National Tribune, entitled "Principle Versus Dollars."

PRINCIPLE VERSUS DOLLARS

Mr. Congressman, on August 6 President Truman saw fit to veto two measures that relate to veterans and their dependents. We would discuss briefly with you the issues involved because they concern national policy.

H. R. 3549 relates admittedly to only a small handful of elderly widows—perhaps 100 of them—who married their soldier husbands in late years. The bill would remove the necessity of their proving "dependency" in order to receive modest monthly pensions of $48, but the Chief Executive believes the treatment suggested would constitute a "dangerous precedent" and that it would be a "departure from social policy."

It is your job, Mr. Congressman, to determine both precedent and social policy in this country. The few women concerned here must be 60 years of age, and most are much older. Theirs were not fly-by-night marriages for pension purposes, and they must have lived continuously with their soldiers for 10 or more years next preceding their deaths. They need help now, and we cannot believe fair treatment to them will endanger our social structure. We feel we can afford to be a little generous with these Civil War, Indian Wars, and Spanish-American War widows, and we think you will agree with us that it is a shame to make them subscribe to a pauper oath. Considering also the fact that the Veterans' Administration testified an administrative saving can be made by enacting this bill, we expect you will support it by your vote when the measure again comes to you for final action.

The other bill is H. R. 3193. The policy involved here is as old as the country itself, not new as Mr. Truman's advisers suggest. What is new is the idea advanced in the veto message that a man who serves his people in uniform in time of war should be accorded no different treatment than any other person whose security was defended by such as these. The bill would permit payment of a pension of $120 monthly to part III beneficiaries who are so badly disabled that they require the constant aid and attendance of another person. Although pending legislation suggests an increase of 10 cents a day to help them to meet present high living costs, and all payments are subject to income provisions, these veterans are confined to their homes or hospitals—many of them blind or bedridden—and they must have constant care. They are already pensioned, but they cannot eke out an existence and afford a nurse on their present small payments. Could you, Mr. Congressman, meet these obligations on $60 or $72 a month?

It is all very well to make scare headlines by saying that this bill might cost 400 millions a year a half century hence, but we can imagine nothing more cruel than to insult such badly disabled war veterans by doing so. That is inexcusable. It seems quite proper these days to spend billions on the countries whose soldiers fought these veterans, but we consider it dastardly to do so at the expense of former heroes who are now flat on their backs. The veterans of this Nation cannot subscribe to such a policy. This measure creates no hand-out, no give-away program, no racket—it simply comprises fair treatment to those who need it.

Mr. Congressman, so long as we must fight wars they must be paid for and those who suffer must have proper care. If President Truman and his advisers believe what they say in these messages, and if they feel that all veterans who become disabled in after years should be treated solely under social welfare laws, we challenge them to support legislation to draft all resources in time of stress, and subject all persons to the low pay, discipline, and punishment that is accorded to men in uniform. That would be more logical than the new and unproved ideas now being advanced by the White House. Of what purpose is it to fight communism abroad when such thoughts as are contained in these veto messages encourage discord at home?

If you, as a Member of Congress, believe that veterans of America's wars are to be treated only as human derelicts, to be included in welfare payments as are all others of the luckless poor, we shall expect you to vote to sustain the President's observations. If, on the other hand, you feel that war veterans and their loved ones have given more to the security of this Nation than those who were privileged to remain securely at home, we shall expect you to cast your vote to override the vetoes of these two bills. Somehow, we feel confident you will recognize the difference between principle and dollar decisions. This is not a case of political courage; it is one of morals and common decency.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman said a moment ago, I am unalterably opposed and have always been unalterably opposed, to balancing the budget on the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

Those in favor of passing the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, will, when their names are called, vote "aye," those opposed "no."

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 318, nays 45, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—318

Aandahl
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Arends
Armstrong
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Bakewell
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Beckworth
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bonner
Bosone
Bow
Boykin
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Bryson
Buchanan
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chelf
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clemente
Clevenger
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Crosser
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denny
Denton
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn
Doughton
Doyle
Eaton
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Frazier
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Granger
Grant
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Hunter
Jackson, Wash.
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lind
Lovre
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Moulder
Mumma
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Neill
Ostertag
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quinn
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
St. George
Sasscer
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Vail
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Weichel
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—45

Andrews
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Bennett, Fla.
Burton
Byrnes, Wis
Case
Celler
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Dollinger
Eberharter
Fernandez
Fine
Ford
Fugate
Gary
Hale
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Heffernan
Heller
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kennedy
Keogh
Kirwan
Klein
Multer
Norblad
Potter
Poulson
Powell
Reams
Robeson
Roosevelt
Sittler
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Widnall
Yates

NOT VOTING—69

Abbitt
Albert
Allen, La.
Andresen, August H.
Baring
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Breen
Brehm
Buckley
Buffett
Busbey
Chatham
Chenoweth
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Coudert
Cox
Davis, Tenn.
DeGraffenried
Durham
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle
Fisher
Gordon
Gore
Granahan
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Hess
Hinshaw
Howell
Irving
Jenison
Kearns
Lucas
McDonough
McGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Morrison
Morton
Murray, Wis.
O'Konski
Preston
Rivers
Sabath
Sadlak
Saylor
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Shelley
Smith, Kans.
Stockman
Taber
Talle
Thomas
Van Pelt
Vinson
Welch
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitaker
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess and Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. McGregor and Mr. Talle for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. McDonough and Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Until further notice:

Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. ADDONIZIO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 890), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. NORRELL (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this statement has been printed in the RECORD twice and is a resubmission of a report we have had heretofore, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas if the House will have an opportunity to vote on the item which authorizes an investigation and a survey of the power situation at Buggs Island in North Carolina?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes. It is reported in disagreement.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 888)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which not to exceed $8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "twenty-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,824,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$4,234,553"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$202,767,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$38,104,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$10,698,514"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,678,196"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line two of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "or", insert "by it"; and in line four of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "persons", insert "which"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines four and five of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one hundred and ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 305. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, operation and maintenance, soil and moisture, and forestry activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel not directly connected with the operation of any such specific activity;

"(e) to seasonal and casual workers: *Provided further*, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (b) through (e) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the Budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the Budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1: Expenses: Appropriates $158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed $137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Southeastern Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5: Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6: Operation and maintenance: Appropriates $200,000, instead of $275,000 as proposed by the House and $125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of four automobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Continuing fund: Reported in disagreement.

Construction, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appropriated the sum of $500,000 for miscellaneous construction, $250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and $810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed $586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed $900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Transfer of certain facilities, Denison Dam project

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of 8 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and resubmit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed $8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed $3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provision

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23: Management of lands and resources: Appropriates $7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed $4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of $6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of $1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24: Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the revested Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26: Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 29 automobiles, instead of 32 as proposed by the House and 25 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27: Salaries and expenses: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of $65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Health, education, and welfare services

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $41,824,750, instead of $43,600,000 as proposed by the House and $41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes $400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional $100,000 for placement services, making a total of $600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed $23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

Resources management

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed $6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed $2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Revolving fund for loans

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed $21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of 160 automobiles, instead of 191 as proposed by the House and 125 as proposed by the Senate.

Tribal funds

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $4,500,000, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving $100,000 for investigations of the Collbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed $4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of $3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that $3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $202,767,725, instead of $197,000,000 as proposed by the House and $208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicated in column 4 of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate Report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions: The managers on the part of the both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation $191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, as provided for in the Senate report; that $500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately $1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional $185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities:

Central Valley project, California

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line	$1,400,000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations	300,000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations	450,000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including $400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39	2,100,000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation	700,000
Tracy - Contra Costa - Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations	201,170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation	105,308
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard	150,000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed	5,406,478

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado

The $100,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line $100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

Minidoka project, American Falls power division, Idaho

	Amount of 1952 estimate
American Falls power plant	$1,067,000
American Falls switchyard	133,000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam)	100,000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed	1,300,000

Transmission division, Missouri River Basin

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation	$753,450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and substations	703,000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations	85,000
Yellowtail - Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations	810,000
Sioux City-Omaha line	207,463
Omaha substation	70,242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line	118,428
Storm Lake - Denison - Holland-Omaha line	30,624
Sioux City-Sibley line	467,643
Additional reduction	500,490
Total 1952 estimate disallowed	3,746,340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House committee report accompanying H. R. 3790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed interconnection of the Central Valley power system and the Bonneville power system. Reports have been received that work on the proposed intertie has continued despite the categoric denial of funds in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categoric injunction last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed $38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of $29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that $28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of $29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that $12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed $10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of $10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates $5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed $4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency fund

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Transfer of facilities, Fort Peck project, Montana

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed $50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of $30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to $100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitations inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83: Coachella distribution system: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed $2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates $21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed $13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates $16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved $356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two aforementioned activities: $91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and $545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartlettsville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed $10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates $1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of $350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods, whether patented or not, unless all royalty and other valuable rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed $113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates $1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed $1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed $6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates $7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed $4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates $11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed $945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates $1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed $1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates $6,678,196, instead of $6,870,000 as proposed by the House and $6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of $263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed $4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Investigations of resources

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates $3,858,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed $2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

Construction

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates $733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed $146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates $806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed $678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108: Administration of Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates $7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed $463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed $333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 112: Provides for not to exceed $2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates $2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Provides that not to exceed $1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions (Alaska Road Commission)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

Virgin Islands public works

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates $992,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed $63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St. Thomas and provides that the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Administration, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 119: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates $2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed $1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Rescission of unused contract authority

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands".

Transfers of property—Office of Territories

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

Virgin Islands Corporation

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates $2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Expenditures for informational and propaganda purposes

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

Limitation on employment of chauffeurs

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars, but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

Employees engaged in personnel work

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of 1 such employee to 115 employees to 1 such employee to 110 employees.

Antistrike provision

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

Expenditures during final quarter of fiscal year

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be pre-

vented so that accumulated last-quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

Limitation on filling vacancies

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out the House provision limiting the filling of vacancies and the Senate proposal enumerating reductions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill, and inserts a modified proposal for limiting the filling of vacancies. Section (d) of the modified proposal enumerates several categories of essential employment which are exempted from the inhibition on filling vacancies. In order to obviate questions as to the scope of such exempt categories it is intended that the following sums be exempted with respect to each:

Health and safety	$3,092,862
Law enforcement	630,835
Operation and maintenance	50,270,408
Soil and moisture	2,323,266
Forestry	1,976,379
Total	$58,293,750

It is intended that the exemptions not include supervisory, clerical, and related types of personnel, such as "white-collar" administrative personnel, not directly connected with the operation of any such specific field activity.

It is also intended that all savings effected pursuant to the modified restriction recommended with respect to filling vacancies are not to be expended for other purposes but that any such sums are to be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we submitted this conference report some 2 weeks ago. At that time there was a deep and concerned division of opinion regarding the so-called Ferguson amendment of the other body and the Jensen amendment of the House. So, at the instruction of the House, we went back to conference. I am glad to report to you today that the committee is submitting a conference report that has been signed without exception by all members of the conference committee of the House and of the other body, except the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who is out of town, but including the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to whom I shall yield shortly.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have given consideration to the general outline followed in the independent offices appropriation bill, which has been agreed to, making, of course, some exceptions which necessarily had to be made, and which the gentleman from Iowa understands thoroughly.

Regarding the other features of the report, I would like to say we considered in connection with this bill a total budget estimate of $559,286,000. The House allowed, when we passed the bill originally, $496,764,500. The other body passed the bill allowing a total amount of $518,065,353. The conference report, I believe, would provide for a total in agreement of $511,523,316. In addition to this we will move to insert $700,000 and $318,500 in connection with amendments in disagreement, and, if approved, this will make a final total of $511,841,816. We make one rescission regarding the transmission line which was originally authorized and appropriated for late last year from Buggs Island to Langley Field, the rescission being approximately $1,750,000, that will not be needed and a wheeling contract may be entered into between the Government and the private utilities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House further and now yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], has just explained a number of the essential points in this conference report.

I will not say that I am in complete agreement, as is my colleague of the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], as to all compromises reached by the conferees. Generally speaking, this is a good bill with a few exceptions which I did not agree to in committee, I am pleased to say that a fair compromise was reached in relation to the Jensen amendment. I signed the conference report due to the fact that we were in agreement on most items in the bill.

There is a little matter I feel I should mention at this time, and that is the position which the Congress has taken in respect to the buliding of transmission lines throughout the Nation.

Congress has set out a power policy which is very clear and concise; which in effect is that where either a private utility, the REA, municipal power, or a combination of any two of them or all of them combined are able, ready, and willing to build necessary transmission lines to wheel power from Federal hydro dams to preferred customers as set out in basic law at reasonable rates, shall be permitted to do so, instead of appropriating the taxpayers' money to build such unnecessary lines.

We have had some difficulty, for instance, in the Southwest Power Administration area. It seems that irrespective of what the Congress has directed, the administrator appears reluctant to obey or adhere to it. We have had that trouble in other areas in bygone days, but I am glad to say that the differences have been resolved and all concerned are now working in harmony to a very fine degree to the benefit of the power users. But I do want it to be known that the Congress has established the very definite power policy which I have just stated; and the Congress expects all Government employees to live up to that policy.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The Administrator is not living up to the clear intent of the Congress. My amendment which passed by an overwhelming vote here has been stricken by the conferees. It would have prohibited the expenditure of money for the construction of certain parallel lines in southwest Missouri. It is the policy, I think, of the Congress that these lines should not be built until the Administrator makes a sincere, serious, and earnest effort to negotiate contracts with private companies in order to wheel this power.

I want to say to the gentleman and this House that although Southwest Power has negotiated contracts in Texas and Oklahoma they stubbornly refuse to negotiate a contract with the Empire District Electric Co. at Joplin in southwest Missouri that is ready, willing, and able to supply this power. You ought to spank the Administrator and tell Mr. Douglas Wright where to head in.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention, nor do I know that any Member has any intention, of offering an amendment to this report with regard to the Southwest Power problem. But I felt obligated to speak about it today here on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States of America for the purpose of letting all Government employees know that Congress is still the law-making body of this Nation, that we want to give everybody a square deal, and that we expect the people who work for the Government to adhere to the directives of the elected representatives of the people.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. But, of course, these bureaucrats, drunk with power and hungry for more, ignore the Congress—have become bigger than the Congress of the United States.

I am not asking any favors for my district; all I am asking is equal treatment; all I want is justice. I am not only going to ask it—in fact, I am going to demand it and fight for it; and I think that the members of your committee, or you, can solve the problem yourselves, you and the Senators over there. If you speak to Mr. Wright in no uncertain terms, perhaps he will heed the admonition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like to get an over-all picture of this appropriation bill. As it passed the House it carried $498,000,000 in round figures; the other body raised that to $526,000,000 in round figures; the conferees reduced it to $511,000,000 in round figures. Is that the true picture of this appropriation bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; in round numbers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What was the budget estimate?

Mr. NORRELL. I stated that a while ago, but, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, I will restate it for the benefit of the gentleman from Virginia. The total budget estimate considered by the House was $559,286,000. As reported by the House committee, the bill contained $520,031,500; then, as passed by the House, it contained $496,765,500; as passed by the Senate, it contained $518,065,350; then, as agreed to by the conferees, the total amount is $511,865,336. Of course, there is involved in that the sum of $750,000.

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

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are 3,600 farm families in Missouri whose hope of having electric service and modern living conditions depend on the decision made on this amendment. I hardly think they would be willing to have the power policy of the Congress or of the United States determined by the remarks of someone here on the floor this afternoon who would condemn them to darkness and drudgery for the rest of their earthly life. What has been termed "unnecessary" and "duplicating" transmission lines here today are as a matter of fact all the lines the Government proposes in order to transmit power from hydro dams built with public money to the farmers, the REA cooperatives, the municipally owned electric systems, the public bodies generally.

This so-called wheeling policy may well be viewed with a high degree of suspicion by those who are looking to Congress for emancipation from serfdom and peonage in rural America and those who represent them here on the floor. The Congress certainly has not established any policy, definite or otherwise, to put the customers who are by law entitled to preference in purchasing power and energy from flood-control dams at the mercy of private monopolies. These private power companies and their spokesmen are trying to bore in with what they have come to call a wheeling policy. Actually, this is nothing but a policy to force the Government to let such private companies decide how Government power shall be transmitted, over whose lines it shall move, and ultimately who shall be able to buy it and at what rates.

The power policy of the Congress has been written into the law of the land. It is set forth in the reclamation law; it is in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the Bonneville Power Act, the Rural Electrification Act, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and other such statutes.

This statutory policy is not to be considered as changed by repeated, concerned, and patent efforts to alter it with speeches in Congress or elsewhere.

If contracts can be negotiated for using transmission lines of other Government agencies, of REA cooperatives, or of privately owned electric companies, thereby avoiding construction of lines by the Southwestern Power Administration, or by other Government agencies in other areas, that may be well and good, provided—and this is the important part—provided that all the emphasis is upon getting power to the customers preferred under the law at the lowest possible rates. The advocates of a mandatory "wheeling" policy do not emphasize those points, and it is obvious that they have in mind no such emphasis or results or objectives.

It is too clear and too well established by law and practice to be altered or amended by speech-making or adroit phrases that the power policy of the United States Government and the Congress is to get publicly generated power to the customers preferred by the law, to get it to them without delays, to get it to them in adequate volume for their needs and without burdensome restrictions on its use, and to get it to them at the cheapest possible rates consistent with self-liquidation of the Government's investment in power facilities.

Let the Administrator of the Southwest Power Administration, Douglas Wright, who was referred to a moment ago, the Secretary of the Interior, and all others in positions of responsibility relating to public power follow that policy and this so-called "wheeling" business will take care of itself.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senate amendments which are reported in disagreement be considered en bloc: Nos. 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108 and 129.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 17, line 24, after the word "appropriation", insert "or other tribal funds."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 20, line 1, strike out *"Provided"* and the balance of the line, also lines 2 to 5 and insert the following *": Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 20, line 17, insert *": Provided further,* That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 20, line 24, insert ": *Provided further,* That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 23, line 1, insert:

"TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50 kilovolt transmission line and substation."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 25, line 3, strike out "as authorized by law" and insert "and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the act of August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461–467)."

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 38, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46–50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed $50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; $7,020,000, of which not to exceed $811,865 shall be available for personal services: *Provided,* That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That appropriations available for the administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, one AK and six AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress."

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 49, line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Gov-

ernment of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the following amendments of the Senate and concur therein: Amendments Nos. 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108, and 129.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 5, insert "Construction, Southeastern Power Administration."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 7, insert:

"For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, $342,020."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert '$318,500.'"

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this motion puts in funds only for the construction of a line from Clark Hill Dam to Greenwood, S. C. It leaves out the money put in by the Senate for a survey from Buggs Island Dam to Kingston, N. C.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. It removes any provision or any funds for either survey or construction of the line from Buggs Island?

Mr. NORRELL. It does.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in the year 1933 a great engineer, Mr. Dan T. Duncan, surveyed the site and conceived the idea of building a dam and hydroelectric project on the Saluda River near Ninety Six, S. C., in Greenwood County. This idea appealed to the leading citizens of Greenwood County. On November 16, 1933, Greenwood County applied to the Public Works Administration for a loan and grant to construct this hydroelectric system. It was approved June 19, 1934.

Duke Power Co., however, filed an injunction in the Federal court against the construction of this dam in November 1934. From that time until January 1938, Duke Power Co. prevented the construction of this dam. The case was fought through the district court, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States. That Court ruled in favor of the Federal Government's constitutional right to make this loan and grant to construct the dam in Greenwood County.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the Republican Members of this House that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at that time was one of your great leaders, Charles Evans Hughes. Some other famous members of that renowned Court were Van Devanter, Brandeis and Harlan F. Stone. Greenwood County was ably represented during this period of litigation by the Honorable Jerome Frank, the present Justice of the Supreme Court Stanley Reed, State Senator W. H. Nicholson, from Greenwood County, and the late E. I. Davis.

Had Greenwood County been permitted to go ahead and begin the construction of this dam when it was first approved in 1934, we would have saved from $500,000 to $1,000,000. When construction was finally begun, in 1938, all construction costs had risen considerably since 1934.

The Greenwood system began operation during August 1940 and has furnished power for the rural areas of Greenwood, Laurens, Newberry and Abbeville Counties. Greenwood, Laurens, Ninety Six and Abbeville municipalities also have received power from the system. REA's municipals and industry saved approximately 20 percent when they started using Greenwood County power. Over a 10-year period this has meant a saving of approximately $500,000 in power bills to the people of that area. Duke Power Co. also decreased its rates in 1938 and 1939, during the period of the construction of this dam, and made this savings to the people much more pronounced.

At the very beginning, or during August 1938, Greenwood County requested terms and conditions under which Duke Power Co. would sell Greenwood County a 10,000-kilowatt stand-by connection and received a reply that a service of this character was not furnished. Two years later, in May 1940, Greenwood attempted to make arrangements with Duke to use their existing facilities between Newberry, Parr Shoals, and Lake Murray for interchange of power and to avoid a duplication of existing lines. Duke's answer to this was: "Our transmission facilities were constructed, and are operated, solely for the purpose of meeting the demands of our system in transmission of our power from the points of generation to the points of consumption." Times have certainly changed. In 1951, Duke's officials appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee and offered to transmit power to Greenwood from Clark Hill over a line they would construct without even approaching Greenwood County representatives.

Back during 1947, Greenwood tried to get a connection with Duke to relieve a serious power shortage in the Abbeville area. Duke claimed a shortage of generation on their system so Greenwood made arrangements with South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. for the generation of this power. Duke could not deliver this power due to overloading of their transformers. Abbeville Mills was forced to search the Nation for transformers and finally made arrangements with the War Department for transformers in Huntsville, Ala. Two of these transformers were shipped from Alabama to South Carolina but were never used and Duke's existing transformers furnished this power very easily. The amount of power involved was 3,000 to 3,500 kilowatts.

Greenwood County has been forced to operate as an isolated system without the advantages of an interconnection with a utility. The Greenwood Power Commission, which is the managing board, has been interested in Clark Hill since its inception and filed its application for Clark Hill power with the Secretary of Interior January 14, 1948. On April 20, 1951, the commission entered into a contract with the Southeastern Power Administration. This contract was approved by the Secretary of Interior May 16, 1951. In this contract the Government agreed to deliver power and energy to the commission at a substation constructed by the Government in the vicinity of Greenwood, S. C.

The Commission, having been assured of Clark Hill power and energy, set aside its steam plant and transmission expansion program. We have relied on the Government carrying out its contract and are still depending on the Government to fulfill its contract for the delivery of power. Failure of the Government to fulfill this contract with Greenwood County will cost Greenwood thousands of dollars if it has to start on a program today which otherwise would have been started over a year ago. The problem of power supply is a long-range

program with generating equipment deliveries running 3 years after an order is placed. If Greenwood had not been assured that the Government was going to build a line to Greenwood, it is needless to say that Greenwood would have most of the materials for a line to Clark Hill purchased and today would have a definite construction program underway.

The fact that Duke Power Co. officials offered to build a line to Clark Hill when they appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee is evidence enough that the line will not be a duplication. Today there is a load of 50,000 kilowatts in the Greenwood area. Greenwood's contract for 5,000 kilowatts is misleading unless the contract is fully understood. Greenwood has the right to increase this amount and will have an initial installation which will transmit 30,000 kilowatts of power to the area. Add to this the interchange benefits and it is easily understood that the people of Greenwood will have for the first time what they have been unable to get from Duke Power Co. the past 12 years.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the entire length of the transmission line is entirely within the district it is my honor to represent. This line will pass near my home at Route 1, Greenwood, S. C. I would like to say to the gentlemen of this House that I would not fight some project in your district which the people in your district desired and needed. I have not worked in this House for the construction of lines in your district when you wanted them eliminated. I am only asking similar treatment for the people of my district who need this connecting link with the great dam at Clark Hill.

Gentlemen of the House, let me digress at this point to say that I am proud of my little part in the fight for Clark Hill. It will mean much to the people of South Carolina and Georgia. It will contribute greatly to our national defense effort. Let me say here that the people in the Savannah River Valley shall ever be grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, for his great part in the winning battle for Clark Hill. Having been on the scene at that time, I attribute the successful fight for that great project more to PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, than any other American. Mr. BROWN is with me in this fight to protest the interests of the people who cannot protect themselves in any other way than through their duly elected Representatives. I wish to thank this fine committee and these conferees for seeing fit to honor the Southeastern Power Administration's contract with the Greenwood Power Commission. They have kept the faith and have upheld the people's confidence in their Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would be derelict in my responsibility to this occasion if I did not pay tribute to the members of the Greenwood Power Commission. I am proud of my part in bringing the Greenwood Power Commission into being. I was a member of the State legislature that created this commission. I have not been disappointed in their discharge of duty. They have been a tribute to local government and the people's ability to manage their own affairs at the local level. I had a part in naming the present membership of that commission. They are men who believe in free enterprise, who believe in individual Americanism. They believe that one of the best ways to fight socialism and communism is to give the common people a chance; to give them reasonable power rates so that they can maintain themselves and their families on the old homesteads. Such projects as the Greenwood hydroelectric system have encouraged our farmers to remain on the land where they are independent, self-reliant, and the very opposite of socialism. False prophets cry out that this transmission line is a socialistic trend. The opposite is true. This will help the farmers, municipalities, and little industries of Greenwood, Laurens, Abbeville, and Newberry Counties have power at rates that will help keep them free and independent.

Mr. Speaker, if I were an artist or a cartoonist today I could take you back to the times when the children of rural Greenwood County were studying their lessons by the light of a smokey kerosene lamp or by the dim light of a candle or a pine knot in the fireplace. I remind you today that in rural America, before REA, there were no deep freezes, no refrigerators, no electric milking machines, no poultry houses lighted up at night, no electric pumps in the wells and no electricity generally on the average American farm. Imagine during the present heat wave in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, the health hazard of no fresh milk for the little children of the deep South and the Middle West.

Before the coming of REA only a small percentage of my rural farmers had electricity. Now 95 percent of the rural people in Greenwood County have electricity at reasonable rates. All I am asking this morning is that this House allow the Government to keep the faith of its contract with the Greenwood Power Commission. I hope the House will adopt this amendment and this conference report which will greatly benefit the people in my home district in the great State of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 13, insert the following: "The sum of $1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the $1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction", is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"The unobligated portion of the $1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading 'Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction', is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 25, after "area", insert ": *Provided*, That the following paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities', in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'CONTINUING FUND

"'Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of $300,000, including the sum of $100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and said fund of $300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities'."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That the paragraph under the heading "Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, before the final period ': *Provided*, That expenditures from this fund to cover such costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities are to be made only in such amounts as may be approved annually in appropriation acts and for the fiscal year 1952 such expenditures may be made not in excess of $250,000'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10½: Page 5, line 9, after "granted", insert ": *Provided*, That $250,000 of the amount appropriated herein

shall be available for purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission lines and related facilities of others."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

"The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof, before the final period, insert "without transfer of funds."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 9, line 1, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, $995,000, of which not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$995,000" named in said amendment insert "$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 14, line 8, after "reservations", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof insert "and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept payment for such line in the form of credit on electric bills."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 19, line 16, after "facilities", insert the following: "and including a payment to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, for school facilities, proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam District, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and including a final payment of not to exceed $282,275 to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, to be made for school facilities, in accordance with the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Coulee School District, based on enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees, such payment to constitute full and final discharge of all Federal responsibility arising out of enrollment of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and its contractors."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 27, line 14, after "United States", insert the following: "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: On page 45, line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of the Navy Department may be made during the current fiscal year at the request of the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Interior Department for operations conducted in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at that point where amendment No. 4 was under discussion.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. Some of us want to be heard on this and we have not been treated fairly.

Mr. NORRELL. Why, I would be glad to yield time to the gentleman. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not made any request of me for time at all.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly have been standing here all the time seeking recognition.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 886)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 32, 43 and 66.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 70,

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,428,708"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,322,025"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$260,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$256,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers;

"(g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations;

"(h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (a) to (h) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds otherwise allowed under this section, the following agencies shall be allowed additional sums for personnel as follows: Commodity Exchange Authority, $58,928; Extension Service, salaries and expenses, $31,327; Office of the Secretary, $32,832; Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, $26,946."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 411. Except for the car officially assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 412. No part of the money appropriated for the Department of Agriculture by this Act or made available for expenditure by any corporation by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of Agriculture or by such corporation, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of tech-

nical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Yearbook, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the 'Farm and Home Hour' and similar radio programs, and other word required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 21, 30, 42, 60 and 67.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Research and Marketing Act

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,750,000, instead of $4,700,000 as proposed by the House and $4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 2: Economic investigations: Appropriates $2,150,000, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Crop and livestock estimates: Appropriates $2,848,304 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Administrator, Agricultural Research Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $541,440 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $560,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing for the alteration of a building at Greenfield, Massachusetts, at a cost not to exceed $7,500.

Research on Agricultural Problems of Alaska

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $261,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Payments to States, etc.: Authorizes $50,000 for research in Alaska, instead of $37,500 as proposed by the House and $52,500 as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates a total of $12,428,708, instead of $12,416,208 as proposed by the House and $12,431,208 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $367,090 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $390,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 10: Animal research: Appropriates $3,250,000, instead of $3,200,700 as proposed by the House and $3,320,700 as proposed by the Senate. The $49,300 authorized above the amount proposed by the House is to be used for research on infectious and noninfectious diseases.

Amendment No. 11: Animal disease control and eradication: Appropriates $7,731,022 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum: Appropriates $47,906 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $49,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Meat inspection: Restores language proposed by the House which permits reimbursement for meat-inspection work required beyond that which can be met from appropriated funds.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,475,000, instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,491,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the dairy work at Mandan, North Dakota, and Woodward, Oklahoma should be continued within the funds provided.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $7,250,000, instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House and $7,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17: Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research: Appropriate $10,589,730 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,351,400 as proposed by the House and authorize construction of a laboratory at Orlando, Florida. The additional funds provide $9,000 for onion research work and $40,000 for research on wheat mosaic. The $275,000 authorized for the laboratory at Orlando represents the full Federal contribution for the construction of this facility and not necessarily the full cost.

Amendment No. 18: National Arboretum: Appropriates $136,920 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $148,600 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 19: Insect investigations: Appropriates $3,650,000, instead of $3,525,000 as proposed by the House and $3,797,725 as proposed by the Senate. The increase approved includes $75,000 for research on the green bug, oak wilt, and the screw worm, and $50,000 for research on the wheat stem fly and Japanese beetle.

Amendment No. 20: Insect and plant-disease control: Appropriates $4,600,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,716,062 as proposed by the Senate.

Control of forest pests

Amendment No. 21: Forest Pest Control Act: Reported in disagreement.

Forest service

Amendment No. 22: National forest protection and management: Appropriates $27,322,025, instead of $27,122,025, as proposed by the House and $27,522,025 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Forest research: Appropriates $5,108,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,220,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Forest development roads and trails: Appropriates $13,000,000, instead of $11,500,000 as proposed by the House and $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. In the opinion of the conferees expenditures for new timber access roads should be made from receipts from timber sales in such a manner that local contributions can be obtained from their timber receipts. It is hoped that legislation can be enacted during the coming year to make this possible.

Amendment No. 25: Acquisition of lands, Weeks Act: Appropriates $75,000, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Acquisition of lands, Superior National Forest: Appropriates $125,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29: Acquisition of lands, Special Acts: Appropriate $141,680 as proposed by the Senate instead of $142,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Cooperative Range Improvements: Reported in disagreement.

Flood control

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: Appropriate $6,372,800 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,112,800 as proposed by the House, and eliminate language inserted by the Senate to authorize funds for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska. Even though this language is stricken, the conferees expect the Department to give this matter special attention in connection with special studies being made in the Missouri Basin area. It is expected that special attention will be given to projects where work is in process but has heretofore been delayed.

Soil conservation service

Amendment No. 33: Salaries and expenses: Strikes out a provision in the House bill limiting expenditures in the Everglades Region in Florida.

Amendment No. 34: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $53,474,991 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $54,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Water conservation and utilization projects: Appropriates $235,500, instead of $185,500 as proposed by the House and $285,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Production and marketing administration

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Appropriates $260,000,000, instead of $256,500,000 as proposed by the House and $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes a program for next year of $256,500,000, instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House and $280,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. These amounts have been agreed to by the conferees with the understanding that the program for the 1952 crop year will be reduced by the amount by which the appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 may be inadequate to meet commitments under the 1951 crop year program.

Amendment No. 38: Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: Substitutes perfecting language relative to authority for transfer of 5 per cent of agriculture conservation funds to the Soil Conservation Service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40: Agricultural production programs: Appropriate $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,300,000 as proposed by the House, of which $2,800,000 may be transferred for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: National school lunch program: Appropriates $83,367,491 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $83,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Marketing Services: Reported in disagreement.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $650,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $591,072 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $7,949,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47: Loan authorizations: Reduce the contingency fund of $100,000,000 for rural electrification authorized by the House to $75,000,000, and provide a contingency fund of $25,000,000 for the rural telephone program as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Loan authorizations: Authorize $110,000,000 for production and subsistence loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000 for water facilities loans as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $27,825,000, instead of $27,500,000 as proposed by the House and $28,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52: Authorize $2,725,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,625,000 as proposed by the House, and appropriate $400,000 for research and technical assistance to farmers' cooperatives as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

Extension service

Amendment No. 53: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $850,000, instead of $880,000 as proposed by the House and $818,673 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $2,025,000, instead of $2,082,200 as proposed by the House and $1,992,168 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $575,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $548,054 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $1,215,268 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,271,000 as proposed by the House.

Library

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $641,237 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $550,000, instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International wheat agreement

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $76,808,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are unanimously agreed that this item is more closely connected with our foreign policy than with activities of the Department of Agriculture and, accordingly, feel that it is not properly located in this appropriation bill.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 60: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 61—Sec. 401: Authorizes the purchase of 350 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 497 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, a provision carried in the House bill with reference to the payment of differentials to employees in the territories and possessions of the United States.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Correct section numbers.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66—Section 409: Restore language contained in the House bill with certain perfecting amendments and eliminate substitute language inserted by the Senate. The final provision agreed to, which is a revised version of the Jensen amendment reduce personnel and personal services funds by ten per cent, with certain exceptions agreed upon by the conferees. All savings resulting from the operation of this provision shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. In making reductions required under this section, attention should be given to maintaining average grades and salaries throughout the Department at a reasonably constant level.

Amendment No. 67—Section 410: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68—Section 411: Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the payment of compensation to any civilian employee of the Government whose principal duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle.

Amendment No. 69—Section 412: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to limit the payment of compensation to persons engaged in information activities to 75 percent of the 1952 budget estimates, as amended by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Corrects section number.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM G. STIGLER,
JOE B. BATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have agreed with the Senate on all matters with one exception which is brought back here in actual disagreement.

The House bill carried approximately $717,000,000. The Senate had to add to that in view of the fact of the International Wheat Agreement coming up, but on a comparative figure the Senate figures amounted to approximately $750,000,000. The conference report agrees to approximately $725,000,000 which, on a comparative basis, as I have stated, is about $8,000,000 more than the bill which passed the House and about $25,000,000 less than that as it passed the Senate to which, of course, must be added the funds for the International Wheat Agreement.

I call attention to the fact that as the bill passed the House it was less than 50 percent of what the appropriation was for 1940. Your conference committee and the Committee on Appropriations have consistently reduced these appropriations.

We have reached some compromise with regard to the PMA program. In this report we have authorized a program for next year of $256,500,000 which is about $23,500,000 below the Senate figure, although somewhat higher than the House figure. We provide in appropriations $260,000,000 which is $20,000,000 below the Senate figures.

We have tried to provide for range improvements by language which in effect is to pay for such from receipts

We have seen to it that with certain listed exceptions, 10 percent of all the money set out in the bill for personnel is no longer available. We have retained the features of the Jensen amendment as it was originally written, with the further provision, which, in my judgment, makes it workable. That is, within the 90 percent that is available they can shift personnel around within the department so as to actually meet its need within the personnel available.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to inform the House that the gentleman from Mississippi has been very helpful in working out a good compromise on the Jensen-Ferguson proposition.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question for the purpose of the RECORD. I refer to that part of the report having to do with the Parma, Idaho, onion research item, which is a very small item, but I notice that the words "Parma, Idaho," are not in the report. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the conferees that that particular item of $9,000 be expended at that particular station; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. We thought that making an especial allowance to special locations is not good practice, but since this work is centered there it is intended to be spent there. It was thoroughly understood that is where the money would be expended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further comment. I was very much pleased that the conferees agreed to my suggestion that we recede to the Senate position on amendments numbered 51 and 52, which affect largely research and technical assistance given to farmers' cooperatives. As the House will recall at the time the bill was up on the floor for consideration, I stated that in my opinion, we on the House side made an unwise cut in that particular item; in fact, we sliced it by about 40 percent. This restoration of $100,000 by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed at my urging, will enable the worthwhile projects in cooperative research to be carried out.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us what the conference agreed on with respect to amendment No. 30?

Mr. WHITTEN. In effect what we tried to do was to say that the money is available for this purpose, but it amounts to making it available from receipts in that enough of the receipts that would otherwise be due to the coun-

ties and States would be retained to pay their fourth. So it amounts to carrying on the policy which the Department has done in the past without authority. Now, that was my own position in that matter and we have tried to work it out where the Department can carry on the work with the local areas meeting one-fourth of the cost from receipts due such area.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note that the committee of conference on this bill has accepted the items inserted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations dealing with research on diseases and insect pests affecting wheat. I am referring particularly to the item of $40,000 to the Bureau of Plant Industry for research on wheat mosaic disease and $40,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for research on greenbugs.

These research items are of great interest and importance to wheat growers everywhere and particularly those in the hard winter wheat section of the Southwest where disease and insect damage have materially contributed to sharp reductions in wheat production both in 1950 and 1951. It is not contended that all of this loss was directly due to greenbugs and wheat mosaic, but these were important contributing factors, and it is imperative that a program of research dealing with these subjects be begun and carried out for such period as may be necessary.

I desire to call to the attention of the House the following figures which show the great decline in wheat production which has taken place in the Southwest hard winter wheat area:

	1945–49 5-year average production	1950 production	1951 August estimate
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Kansas	220, 600, 000	178, 060, 000	126, 732, 000
Nebraska	80, 000, 000	84, 128, 000	58, 965, 000
Oklahoma	90, 800, 000	43, 614, 000	40, 394, 000
Texas	79, 400, 000	22, 712, 000	17, 325, 000
Colorado	48, 800, 000	38, 199, 000	30, 213, 000
New Mexico	4, 600, 000	645, 000	781, 000
Total	524, 200, 000	367, 358, 000	274, 410, 000

Wheat producers do not expect the Federal Government to carry the entire burden of research on these matters. The State of Kansas has greatly expanded its research program on wheat and cereal diseases and pests. Other States in the area have done likewise. Private commercial organizations such as railroads and farm machinery companies which have a direct interest in the volume of wheat production are expected to make important contributions for research. The National Association of Wheat Growers and the various State organizations of wheat growers are taking an active part in securing adequate funds for research, as is the Kansas Wheat Improvement Association. Farm organizations in the States affected, such as the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the Farmers Union are interested, and commercial and industrial organizations such as the Western Kansas Development Association and local chambers of commerce are doing much in developing interest in research. However no matter how much may be undertaken at the State and local levels, it is important and necessary that the vast resources of the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Research Administration be enlisted in this research program, not only because of the work which will be done by the able scientists in the Agricultural Research Administration, but in order to make this a truly national research program.

It is important also to emphasize that a program of this kind must be a continuing one and that research takes time and patience. We cannot expect immediate and early results from any research program.

I am sure that the wheat producers of this country join me in thanking Senator RUSSELL, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the other members of the subcommittee for inserting these items in the bill, and the able chairman of the House committee, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the other conferees from the House for accepting these items in conference.

At this point, pursuant to permission given me by the House, I desire to submit some extracts from the statement which I made on this subject before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on July 13, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity which you have given me to appear before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the purpose of urging consideration of an increase in appropriations dealing with research on diseases and insect pests affecting wheat. I am appearing at this time because the 1951 wheat crop has suffered heavy damage from insect pests, particularly greenbugs, cutworms, and brown mites, and from the mosaic disease. The territory affected this year embraces the entire Southwest wheat-growing area comprising six States, and I understand that there have been losses in other States. This matter was not presented to the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the reason that at the time its hearings were held, the great damage to this year's crop had not become apparent.

On May 9, after it had become clear that tremendous injury had been done to this year's crop, this committee heard a group representing agricultural colleges, organizations of wheat producers, and others on the subject of increased appropriations for research on the problems of wheat diseases and insect infestation including not only the matters which I have mentioned but research in connection with new races of rust, particularly 15B, which have attacked strains of wheat hitherto resistant to other types of rust. I wish to endorse the research program which was presented to the subcommittee at that time.

It is impossible to say at this time the aggregate losses which have been suffered by the 1951 wheat crop due to insect pests and mosaic disease. This is due in part to the fact that in some cases these have not been direct causes of all of the losses but have been contributory causes. For instance, much wheat in western Kansas was winter-killed, but undoubtedly the fact that the plant was weakened by disease and insect infestation materially contributed to the winter kill. I do want to call attention to the fact that the wheat crop in the States directly affected by these pests and disease is materially below the 10-year average.

The wheat crop of this country has had an annual value of more than $2,000,000,000. It is grown on a large percentage of the farms in this country. Other industries such as milling and transportation are closely tied in with it. If any crop can be called basic, it is wheat.

The amount which has been spent in this country on wheat research by the Federal Government has been and is very small. I believe the time has come when we must provide additional funds for this purpose. It is not necessary that all of such additional funds be provided by the Federal Government. The State of Kansas has increased its appropriations for this purpose. I understand other States have done likewise. Some funds are available from private sources. I do not want to urge that any funds be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for research on these matters in excess of what the scientists in the Department of Agriculture say can be used effectively. I have discussed this question with those in the Department who are most familiar with this problem both in the Bureau of Plant Industry and in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. In response to my inquiries they advise that the most important thing to be considered in a program of this kind is continued and sustained research over a period of years. They state in response to my inquiries that if they had available in the Bureau of Plant Industry from $30,000 to $50,000 per year for the next 10 years, it would be possible by working with the States and private agencies to carry out a program of research in the pathology and economic phases of mosaic disease of which very little is known at the present time; and that if $50,000 per year were made available to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine a very good research program on brown mite, cutworms, and greenbugs could be carried out in connection with the States and interested private agencies.

I believe if these funds are made available over such period of time as may be necessary, they will be returned a thousandfold in the prevention of future disastrous losses due to these infestations. That has been our experience in all types of agricultural research. I know of no funds expended by the Federal Government which have brought in greater returns in added wealth and in the well-being of our people.

I have not included in my figures an amount to cover research in connection with the new rust, 15B. This matter has been adequately presented, however, and I wish to urge the appropriation of whatever amounts can be used by the Bureau of Plant Industry in meeting that situation and in continued research on the problem of developing rust-resistant varieties of wheat and eliminating sources of rust.

In view of the fact that there may be contained in this appropriation bill provisions which limit the amount of funds available for personal services, I would like to suggest that the following language be incorporated in the measure so as to make certain that the amounts appropriated may all be used for this necessary and emergency situation. This language is as follows: "Including not to exceed ——— dollars for additional research on wheat disease which is not subject to limitations in this act relating to the amounts available for personal service," and with similar provisions relating to the additional appropriation for insect pests.

Let me again say that I sincerely appreciate this opportunity of presenting this serious situation to the subcommittee.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have called the attention of my colleagues to Discharge Petition 4 on the Speaker's desk which has for its purpose to discharge the committee from further consideration of H. R. 2678 which will bring up for consideration on the floor this bill, as well as the companion bill, H. R. 2679, introduced by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

It is of vital importance to the welfare of the elderly people of America that this legislation be considered and passed at an early date. There are hundreds of thousands of old folks who are in dire need. Many of them are wasting away from malnutrition. We have recently passed appropriation bills which before we are through will approach $100,000,000,000 but nothing for the old folks of America. The bill we are now considering calls for the expenditure of almost $8,000,000,000 for foreign aid.

I asked the Federal Security Agency to supply me with statistics showing the number of persons in the United States 60 years of age and over and information as to their sources of income, if any, and the amount thereof. This information is most enlightening and should have the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. I will include the correspondence in these remarks but I call attention especially to the following information. It is estimated that the number of persons 65 years of age and over receiving income from social insurance and related programs and from old-age assistance is in the neighborhood of five and one-half to six million, and that 12,300,000 persons 65 years and over were enumerated in the census in April 1950.

Of the 6,000,000 in the labor force only 4,000,000 are in covered employment. There are about 1,500,000 employed persons not covered by any retirement system. There are about five to six million persons in this age group who are not in the labor force; neither are they married to persons in the labor force, nor in receipt of payments directly or indirectly under social security or old-age assistance or related programs.

The 2,760,000 recipients of old-age assistance as of February 1951 received an average monthly payment of $43.11, carrying from $18.39 in Mississippi to $67.52 in California. Under the old-age and survivors insurance program as of February 1951 the average payment was $43.32. These are starvation allowances.

I include the full report which is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: I submit below replies to the questions asked in your letter of June 21.

1. The number of persons in the United States 60 years of age or over.

Preliminary returns from the 1950 census indicate that there were 18,272,000 persons in the United States in April 1950 aged 60 years and over.

2. The number of persons over 60 years of age who are wholly or partially dependent on aid from relatives, pensions or other relief.

In December 1950, the latest month for which we have developed estimates of this character, approximately 2,600,000 persons 65 years of age and over were receiving benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program, 300,000 under the railroad retirement program, 100,000 under the Federal civil-service-retirement program and about 200,000 under the retirement programs for employees of State and local governments. Persons 65 years and over receiving pensions or compensation as aged or disabled veterans, or as the survivors of deceased veterans numbered about one-quarter of a million. Close to 200,000 women 65 years of age and over were married to men receiving benefits under the programs just enumerated, other than old-age and survivors' insurance. Persons in receipt of old-age assistance under the Federal-State program for aid to the needy aged numbered 2,800,000. Some persons received income from more than one of the sources mentioned, but we have no information on the extent of such overlapping. When a rough adjustment is made for this factor, the unduplicated number of persons 65 years of age and over with income from social insurance and related programs and from old-age assistance is in the neighborhood of 5,500,000 to 6,000,000, or somewhat less than half the 12,300,000 persons 65 years and over enumerated in the census in April 1950.

We do not have similar information for the age group 60 to 64 years.

We do not know how many persons are wholly or partially dependent on aid from relatives.

3. The number of persons in the United States 60 years of age or over who are not covered by any pension annuity program, private or public.

4. The number of persons 60 years of age or over who are now covered under the social security program.

We will answer these questions together, since they involve the same set of estimates.

Of the 18,000,000 persons aged 60 years and over, approximately 6,000,000 are in the labor force in an average week. The other 12,000,000 have retired from the labor force because of age or disability or consist of women who left gainful employment some time ago because of marriage, or who had never been in the labor force. Of the 6,000,000 in the labor force, perhaps 4,000,000 are in employments covered by the old-age and survivors insurance program, while another three-tenths to five-tenths million are in employments covered under other public retirement programs, such as the railroad program and the programs for Federal, State, and local government employees. About 1,500,000, perhaps, are in employments not covered by any public retirement system, primarily self-employment in agriculture, and in certain professions. Among the 12,000,000 persons 60 years of age and over not in the labor force in an average week, close to 2,000,000 are the wives of men in the labor force. Most of the 2,600,000 persons in receipt of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program are to be found in this group of 12,000,000 not in the labor force, as well as most of the 1,000,000 individuals either receiving benefits under the railroad, and Government retirement programs and the veterans programs or married to men in receipt of such benefits. The 12,000,000 not in the labor force also include about 2,800,000 persons on old-age assistance. Perhaps five to six million persons are neither in the labor force, nor married to men in the labor force, or in receipt of payments directly or indirectly under social insurance and related programs or under the old-age assistance program.

5. The average payments that are now being made to persons under old-age and survivors insurance.

Monthly payments to the individuals, by benefit type, averaged as follows in February 1951:

Old-age	$43.32
Wife's or husband's	23.34
Child's	27.46
Widow's or widower's	36.47
Mother's	34.05
Parent's	36.65

6. The number of persons now receiving payments under old-age relief provisions of the social security program and the average monthly payment to each at the present time.

Recipients of old-age assistance numbered 2,760,000 in February 1951. The average monthly payment under this program was $43.11. The average payment among the States varied from $18.39 in Mississippi to $67.52 in California.

If you wish any further information along these lines please do not hesitate to write again.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. THURSTON,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, it has frequently been called to the attention of the Congress that the funds received under old-age and survivors insurance by the Social Security Administration are expended by the Government for general expenses of the Government as received and that the fund, aside from cash on hand, is made up entirely of United States I O U's. Up to June 30, 1951, employers and employees had contributed to this trust fund $18,252,000,000 and only $4,874,000,000 has been disbursed as benefit payments. The administrative expenses were $459,000,000. The total I O U's in the trust fund as of June 30, 1951, amounted to $14,323,000,000, with a total cash on hand of $413,000,000, making the total assets $14,736,000,000.

I include a letter to me from A. J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, dated August 16, 1951, giving the complete information on the trust fund, which is as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, August 16, 1951.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: This is in reply to your letter of August 1, requesting certain data on the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

There have been transfers totaling $12,000,000 from the general fund to the trust fund under the provisions of section 210 of the Social Security Act in effect prior to enactment of the 1950 amendments. These provisions, which provided insurance benefits to survivors of certain veterans of World War II, authorized reimbursement to the trust fund for sums withdrawn to meet the additional cost (including administrative expenses) of these payments.

The following tabulation summarizes the financial operations of the old-age and sur-

vivors insurance trust fund for the period January 1, 1937, to June 30, 1951:

		Jan. 1, 1937, to June 30, 1951 [In millions]
Employers' and employees' contributions to trust fund	$18,252	
Interest on investments	1,805	
Transfers from general fund	12	
Total trust fund receipts		$20,069
Less:		
Benefit payments	$4,874	
Administrative expenses	459	5,333
Total assets		14,736
Total investments	$14,323	
Total cash on hand	413	14,736

All of the assets at June 30, 1951, except for $413,000,000 held in cash for current disbursements were invested in interest-bearing United States Government securities.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please don't hesitate to write to me again.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMEYER,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, this information brings to our attention most vividly the necessity of enacting a Federal old-age-security program such as is embodied in my bill, H. R. 2678, commonly known as the Townsend plan. The present plan has proved to be wholly insufficient to give protection to millions of elderly people and should be overhauled or an entirely new program enacted. I trust that every Member of the House interested in old-age security will sign Discharge Petition No. 4 and bring this legislation on the floor for consideration.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention, if I may, to a rather peculiar situation. In this bill, which the President has not yet signed, we have made certain reductions. Take the Bureau of Economics, for example. We have made certain reductions and here before us is final concurrence in that action. The President has not as yet signed this bill, yet further money has already been requested. The supplemental bill reported today by the full Appropriations Committee is giving back to B. and Q. E. practically the same amount I succeeded in deducting during the House consideration. The same thing applies to the Secretary's immediate office. In the supplemental bill, which will come up in a few days, there is restored to the Secretary's office $50,000, right after the Congress has agreed in the regular bill to practically the same amount as a reduction. It seems to me on the one hand we are trying to make a saving and on the other hand we have supplemental bills coming in amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, largely undoing the work that we have been trying all this spring to accomplish as far as economy is concerned. Other members of the Committee on Appropriations are going to have something to say on this supplemental bill when it comes before the House next Monday.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the point the gentleman raises is not involved in this conference report.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. I am simply informing the House that this matter will be discussed thoroughly next Monday. There is no sense in our making reductions in one bill, only to have that action repudiated almost immediately by a bill reported by another subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 18, line 8, strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: Strike the figure "$3,600,000" as it appears in said Senate amendment, and in lieu thereof insert the figure "$2,700,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, upon two previous occasions my colleagues from Colorado and I have brought before this forum a situation which exists in Colorado relative to the spruce bark beetle infestation. The gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of this subcommittee, has been very gracious in cooperating with us so that we would have an opportunity to present the condition out there. However, he remains adamant in his position, and I can understand his position thoroughly. On the other hand, I do not like to see the forests of Colorado being made the goat for certain procedures that perhaps have taken place within the Department of Agriculture in the presentation of requests before the Subcommittee on Appropriations; neither do I like to see our part of the Nation and this property that is owned by the Nation being made the goat for certain promises that have been made and allegedly have not been kept by the Department of Agriculture in its expenditure of funds.

When this matter was brought before the House previously we tried to get an appropriation for over $3,000,000 in order to continue our fight against the spruce bark beetle infestation. However, we did not at any time, in discussing the supplemental bill or the regular bill, ask for a vote and a decision. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate appropriated $1,900,000, realizing that the lateness of the season would make an impossible situation as far as spending the whole amount requested of the House committee. Now as the report of the conference committee is brought to the House there is no provision for any appropriation for the purpose of combating the beetle infestation. My amendment would decrease the amount allowed by the Senate by $900,000 and would give an appropriation for $1,000,000 to carry out approximately 5 weeks' work this summer in this eradication program. Since I talked to you and since my colleagues addressed you on this matter there has been a very effective campaign by the Denver Post, one of the great newspapers of the United States, and each one of you has received at different times a personal letter from the editor as well as some physical tokens of what is taking place in the spruce forests of Colorado.

Also, since that time great conservation groups have entered into the picture. The Isaac Walton League of the United States especially have stated their support of a program which would help carry on this eradication project.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it not true that this is not only a problem for the State of Colorado, but this beetle infestation might spread to all the forests of the country?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad the gentleman from Utah has brought that to my attention. The States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico are either infested at the present time or in danger of immediate infestation. But there is no reason that other spruce forests throughout the Nation may become affected if the infestation in Colorado is not controlled.

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

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

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that this will affect the entire United States, because we all use this lumber? Further, it is false economy to cut such items as these from the budget.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman from California. He is absolutely right.

May I suggest to you that Colorado and other Western States have in the properties within their borders five great natural resources which are of benefit to the country: Forests, grazing lands, mining resources, national parks and monuments, and watersheds. In this particular problem you have four of these natural resources classifications involved which affect the entire United States. You have the forests and the value of the timber. You have been advised as to the value of the timber. You

have the grazing lands most certainly. In our area where it is dry and hot you do not have good grazing even in the mountain areas unless you have a certain amount of forests. Then we have the national parks and the monuments, and we have the watersheds.

We appropriate millions of dollars to take care of dams and reservoirs lower down the Colorado River, but if the forests of Colorado, the State which furnishes 71 percent of the water of the Colorado River, are denuded and the spring run-off is allowed to carry the silt and debris down into these reservoirs, they are filled with sediment and their primary usefulness is curtailed and endangered.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I join my colleague from western Colorado on this matter simply because I am sure if we all understood exactly what the funds for which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is asking mean to the United States of America, not Colorado alone, there would not be a single vote against this appropriation.

As I understand, we have 2,000,000 acres of land already infested or in the path of this destructive beetle pest. If you destroy 2,000,000 acres of timberland high up on the mountains, you do more than destroy the resources up on the mountains, you prepare the way for floods down in the valley. You prepare the way for cities to be short of water in the valleys below those great watersheds.

There are three rivers affected, three river sheds, the Colorado River, the Rio Grande, and the Platte River.

Certainly we cannot afford as Members of this House to fail to recognize this terrific danger that is represented by the destruction of our forests. It is only a small matter to this House today if you will give us a million dollars to continue this work. I checked up here a moment ago and found that it would be one-seventh of 1 percent of the amount in this bill. I certainly feel that we cannot afford not to go on record here this morning as supplying funds to take care of our forests.

What is more important than to protect this natural resource, the forests that belong to you? Do not forget that 90 percent of all the forests that you and I are legislating for here today that belong to the United States Government are in those 11 Western States. We should protect them. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Colorado prevails.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I concur exactly. I am in support of the gentleman's amendment. His statement has been a splendid one. If anything, it was an understatement.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

I am informed that we send money to the Far East to fight the locusts, and I have voted for such appropriations, I suppose. I think that while taking care of the locusts in foreign countries we should also take care of some of the domestic pests at home.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. D'EWART. I join with the gentleman in supporting this amendment. Certainly, it is in the interest of the country as a whole to preserve this watershed and the timber that is on it. I think the amendment should be adopted, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I hope this is enough money to do the job, and, if not, the gentleman should offer an amendment to provide enough money to do it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding on this item, and so that any criticism which may seem to fall upon the shoulders of the committee may be dispelled, I would like to say that this item has not for the last 2 years been justified very well before our committee. We have found that we have been given all sorts of misleading statements. I want to say for my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, that his position is justified upon the basis of the conflicting testimony given to us on the subcommittee by the Forest Service.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the reason for eliminating this is because the committee takes the position that the Forest Service has not made a proper report to you?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is that any reason why you should not at this time continue to try to eradicate the beetles from the forests?

Mr. HORAN. Definitely—I am speaking in favor of the amendment. I hope the gentleman understands that.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is there any other basis on which to make appropriations except on the basis of justifications? You just cannot throw the Government's money to the winds. The justifications are supposed to be the basis for the appropriations; is that not correct?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, for whom I have the greatest affection, but let me tell him this afternoon we are going to vote on a great appropriation, or an authorization for an appropriation, and they are having a tough time telling me why I should support an authorization like that, which will take care of crickets and bugs all over the world, and then turn down our own forests and our own national resources at home. Tell me, how can you justify that?

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless they justify it to you, you should not vote for it.

Mr. HILL. If you would look at those forests, you would not have to ask anybody to justify this to you, to the extent of even a dime. You did not do it, and you had the opportunity.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will ask them to justify these expenditures to me, and I will do that as long as I am on this committee. Unless they justify it to me, I will not vote for this or any other appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Just because the Forest Service did not come before you and make a proper showing, that is no reason why the forests should be left to die as they are this very day.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to yield further because I asked for this time to report to the House that I made a reservation on this item when we reported out this bill and therefore can speak for the amendment. I am for the elimination of the bark beetle infestation in Colorado or in any other State. But the real reason why we must take care of the forests in Colorado, and throughout the Pacific Southwest States, is because we have less water in that area than we have population, and that any revegetation of the ranges, any upstream projects, or protection of the forests and the watersheds there, is vital to all of the Pacific Southwest States. I cannot state it any more clearly than that. This is as vital to the people of Los Angeles as it is to the people of Denver, and probably more so. It is vital to all of the folks who live in the Southwestern States.

I hope our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will be able to follow through on a program that we have tentatively set up for this fall. I trust that we can go to Hoover Dam, and see there that great relief map that they have of Hoover Dam and see the watersheds that the Colorado River drains, and then I hope we can fly over that blighted area where the forests and watersheds are in such bad shape. I trust the committee will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not represent any section of the West, we do still have in the State of Minnesota considerable pine and considerable spruce. I am very much concerned in that. There has been some statement made about why this amount has been left out of this appropriation. I have heard the argument that it is because the Department did not make a sufficient showing. Regardless of whether that is true or not, I have before me a telegram in which I place much confidence. It is

from one of the leading lumber men of the United States. I received this telegram this morning. On any subject dealing with lumber I think this man is well versed, from the Pacific coast to the Midwest. I want to quote this telegram for the RECORD. It is directed to several of us from Minnesota. Speaking of his experience out there, he says:

We have no timber investments in Colorado. However, for past fortnight I have been in Colorado account of asthma. Am shocked at amount of Government-owned bug-killed spruce seen and also reported but particularly at the fact that the Government has provided no funds to fight the bugs in its own timber so far this year. At this date only about 6 weeks left to fight bugs this year. Highest efficient rate of treating is about 75,000 trees per week. Therefore, each day lost means about 10,000 dead trees to Uncle Sam. As a citizen interested in our forest supplies hope very much you will do your best to impress House conferees with importance of prompt action and approval of funds for Colorado beetle control.

DAVID WINTON.

I think perhaps a number of you know or have heard of Mr. Winton. I want to lend my support and my humble plea for the curtailment of this ravishing bug, because no doubt he will extend himself to other parts of the Nation. You are going to ask me to vote very soon for billions of dollars to be spread all over the rest of the world. Here is a sample of our own neglect of one of the most valuable natural resources we have in this great country; that is, our forest land.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I certainly approve of the gentleman's statement. I think it is wonderful that he understands this great problem. The gentleman said "Colorado." This land, as you know, does not belong to Colorado. This land belongs to the United States Federal Government, and that is why we have had a hard time making the press and the Members of the House understand that there is not an acre of this land that belongs to the State of Colorado. We as a State cannot go onto that land and perform any of the work that is necessary to be done to kill these bugs without the consent of the Federal Government. It is a Federal Government proposition and a Federal job right from the bottom.

Mr. WIER. If those bugs happen to get over into the State of Minnesota, I will blame nobody else but the Congress for permitting that to happen.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is one item which is representative of the one thing for which many of us have been fighting for the past few years; that is, for an adequate staff attached to the Appropriations Committee so that we could examine thoroughly into such items as they come up and really know what we are doing.

In regard to this particular item I have been doubtful all along that we have done the right thing when we eliminated all of this money. On the other hand, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is absolutely right when he will say that the evidence given to us has been very meager and inconclusive.

I do not want to do anything that will hurt any part of our great Nation. I can well see where this tree pest might prove to be of inestimable damage to the great Rocky Mountain section unless we do something about it; and, personally, this morning after thinking this matter over very carefully I believe perhaps it would be wise for the House to agree to this compromise halfway between the position of the House and that of the Senate. Let us give $1,000,000 for this work; let us prevent the infestation from spreading further. In the meantime I hope the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will go out and look at the problem in the field before we go any further down the line to the conclusion of the $15,000,000 control project which this project entails. Personally, I would rather make a mistake in favor of spending too much, rather than too little, to preserve our national resources, and I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I did not appreciate this grave problem at all until the Denver Post sent to all Members of the House a scale picture of one of these beetles and a piece of infested bark which came from this stricken area. Knowing the great reputation of the Denver Post and being cognizant of the fact that this progressive paper was merely interested in the preservation of our forest lands, I, therefore, came to the conclusion that something ought to be done. The evidence furnished me by the Post was enough to convince any reasonable individual that an appropriation sufficient to get the job done ought to be voted by the Congress. If what little I saw was able to sell me on the urgent need of this project, and our Forestry Division with all its facts has not been able to convince the members of the committee that there is a horrible condition there in Colorado which can easily spread into the Government-owned forest lands of other Western States, then I think we had better have some reorganization of the Forestry Service by hiring some new personnel. Remember, those spruce trees aren't subscribers of the Post nor constituents of mine, but we both are interested in their preservation. I am for the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will tell the gentleman that we can put up a good argument either against this work or for it. It is a border-line project, and not wishing to harm the forests and natural resources, it is my opinion we should support the amendment.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield me a little time?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member, but perhaps I can point out something concerning this problem, for I have been a trained forester although I have not worked at it for about 20 years and have not followed minute developments. I have seen the chestnut trees in Pennsylvania disappear without a single hope of being able to contain the blight that struck them.

I talked recently with some representatives of the Forest Service. I believe one reason they cannot explain it to the committee to the full satisfaction of the members has been the fact that they have not found anything in the life cycle of this bug where they can contain it. They inject something at the base of the tree, something halfway up and something near the top of the tree. Of course, any area in the middle of the tree is liable to infection. Personally, I would not want to be a party in any way to blocking this program. I cannot see much hope myself in stopping it.

You take all of these precautions, then if on the particular day the beetle is evolved from the larva the wind blows the other way, it is liable to blow the beetle away from the place you are treating. I think salvation of the timber is the most important thing. I do not believe you should put the biggest pulp plant in the world up there, but I do believe there should be a pulp plant there to utilize this timber. That timber will stand there for 25 years without deterioration beyond its economic value.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it may be I do not recognize my responsibilities with regard to appropriation bills. However, I think I do. It is my understanding that it is not my duty to vote out appropriations because my friends want them or because some State wants money spent within its borders or because somebody wants to hire a lot of folks or because my colleagues are under pressure from newspapers or others. That is not the basis of voting appropriations to me.

It is said here that the Forestry Department made a poor showing on the justification for this item. But who shall I look to for justification of it? Not my friend from Kentucky who says he does not know anything about it. I have got to look to those who work with the problem, who are supposed to know what they are talking about, who are trained to know what they are talking about.

Mr. CHELF. May I say to the gentleman that I am under no pressure whatsoever from the Denver Post or anybody else. I feel the same as all the rest of my colleagues here, that apparently the forestry division either was not sufficiently interested in this problem or that they surely muffed the ball in their

presentation of the facts to the gentleman's committee. If the Denver Post could give the Members such a vivid graphic picture of this with only a personal letter and some bits of infested bark, then what a golden opportunity the forestry division missed. They should have been able to really justify this claim. If you are going to do some cutting you ought to cut off some of those inefficient, ineffective fellows in forestry. I think that is the trouble, the bureaucrats are not doing a job and I think this is a concrete example of it. Too many of them are sitting around on the back of their laps doing nothing.

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall not argue with the gentleman on that point.

Proceeding further, here is the history of this matter—and I have tried to be fair; I served notice on the gentleman from Colorado that we were going to bring this back in disagreement so that we could give the House a chance to hear both sides:

Last year the Forestry Department came before our committee and asked for in excess of $2,000,000 to handle these bark beetles in Colorado on a tree-to-tree basis at more than $2 per tree in an area bigger than New England. They told our committee that if they could treat 725,000 trees the job would be done. They said that the timber has tremendous value, that they were going to sell it to a paper mill. I cross-examined them, and their testimony was so weak that I opposed it, our committee opposed it, and the committee did not give them the money. They went before another committee and they got $2,000,000 to treat the 725,000 trees. They actually treated 850,000, and, according to their testimony, that should have done the job.

I had the matter investigated to see if I was right. The investigators came back and told me that it is a 100-percent gamble; that $2,000,000 will not begin to touch it; that instead of 725,000 trees, there were any number of trees; instead of a paper mill being in the process of locating out there, it is dependent upon the Government largely providing the funds for building a paper mill; instead of this timber being valuable as a marketable product, in 10 years they sold only $700,000 of it—I repeat, in 10 years they sold $700,000 worth of this timber.

Then the Department comes back this year, after I had made the investigation and had the evidence on them, anyway, and admitted they were wrong. "We treated 850,000 trees," they said, "and we find now instead of $2,000,000 and 725,000 trees doing the job, there are six or eight million trees; we have found that out, and we must use twelve or thirteen million dollars."

Now, let us not kid ourselves. You either ought not to give them any money or you have to give them enough money to do the job. Instead of this being a $900,000 issue this is a $12,000,000 to $13,000,000 project. If the next year the Forestry Department admits that they are as far wrong this year as they were last, it is a $75,000,000 project.

Now let us get back to business. We ought to do all we can to preserve our forests. Goodness knows, I fought on this floor trying to see that we did that, but there just is not enough money to treat our problem on a tree-to-tree basis at $2 per tree. Let them get money for research and find some program we can afford. You cannot go to the South and spend $2 a tree to eradicate the little leaf pine disease on a tree-to-tree basis. You cannot go into Ohio and pay $2 on a tree-to-tree basis to check oak wilt. You cannot go all over the West, where you have the white-pine blister rust, and spend $2 on a tree-to-tree basis. You cannot do that because we do not have enough money in the Treasury to meet this national tree-disease problem on a $2-per-tree basis.

The $1,000,000 included in this amendment will treat 500,000 trees. That leaves five or six million trees needing treatment and if the forestry department guess is correct, that will just scratch the surface.

You should spend your money where it would have a chance to do the overall job. If you are going to commit yourself to $2 per tree for every sick tree in the United States, the sky is the limit as to what you will be called on to appropriate for the Nation, for every region has its disease problems.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 65, noes 70.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 138, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—222

Aandahl	Budge	George
Adair	Burdick	Golden
Addonizio	Burnside	Granger
Allen, Calif.	Burton	Grant
Allen, Ill.	Butler	Greenwood
Andersen, H. Carl	Byrne, N. Y.	Hagen
Anderson, Calif.	Carnahan	Hale
Anfuso	Celler	Hall, Leonard W.
Angell	Chelf	Halleck
Arends	Chiperfield	Hand
Armstrong	Chudoff	Harden
Aspinall	Combs	Harrison, Wyo.
Ayres	Cooley	Hart
Bailey	Crosser	Harvey
Baker	Crumpacker	Havenner
Baring	Cunningham	Hill
Barrett	Dawson	Hillings
Beamer	Deane	Hoeven
Beckworth	Delaney	Hoffman, Ill.
Belcher	Dempsey	Holifield
Bennett, Mich.	Denton	Holmes
Berry	D'Ewart	Horan
Betts	Dingell	Hull
Bishop	Dollinger	Hunter
Blackney	Dolliver	Jackson, Calif.
Blatnik	Dondero	Jackson, Wash.
Bolton	Donohue	Javits
Bosone	Dorn	Jenison
Bow	Doyle	Jenkins
Boykin	Eberharter	Jensen
Bramblett	Elliott	Johnson
Bray	Feighan	Jonas
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Ohio	Fine	Judd
Bryson	Flood	Karsten, Mo.
Buchanan	Fugate	Kee
	Garmatz	

Kelley, Pa.	O'Hara	Shafer
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Neill	Sheehan
Keogh	Ostertag	Shelley
Kersten, Wis.	O'Toole	Sheppard
King	Patman	Short
Kirwan	Patten	Sieminski
Klein	Patterson	Simpson, Ill.
Kluczynski	Philbin	Smith, Wis.
Lane	Phillips	Spence
Lesinski	Poage	Springer
Lind	Polk	Staggers
Lovre	Potter	Stanley
McCormack	Poulson	Steed
McGuire	Powell	Tackett
McKinnon	Price	Taylor
McMullen	Prouty	Teague
McVey	Quinn	Thompson, Tex.
Mack, Ill.	Rabaut	Tollefson
Mack, Wash.	Radwan	Trimble
Madden	Rains	Vail
Magee	Rankin	Velde
Mansfield	Reams	Vursell
Marshall	Reece, Tenn.	Walter
Martin, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Merrow	Rees, Kans.	Wharton
Miller, Calif.	Rhodes	Wickersham
Miller, N. Y.	Richards	Widnall
Morano	Riehlman	Wier
Morgan	Riley	Williams, N. Y.
Morris	Roberts	Withrow
Moulder	Robeson	Wolcott
Multer	Rodino	Wolverton
Murdock	Rogers, Colo.	Wood, Idaho
Murphy	Rogers, Tex.	Woodruff
Nelson	Rooney	Yates
Norblad	Roosevelt	Yorty
O'Brien, Ill.	Sasscer	Zablocki
O'Brien, Mich.	Scudder	

NAYS—138

Abernethy	Forand	McGrath
Andrews	Ford	Mahon
Auchincloss	Forrester	Meader
Bakewell	Frazier	Miller, Md.
Barden	Fulton	Miller, Nebr.
Bates, Ky.	Furcolo	Mills
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Mumma
Battle	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Gathings	Nicholson
Bender	Gavin	Norrell
Bennett, Fla.	Goodwin	Passman
Bentsen	Graham	Perkins
Boggs, Del.	Green	Pickett
Bonner	Gregory	Priest
Brooks	Gross	Ramsay
Brownson	Gwinn	Redden
Burleson	Hardy	Regan
Bush	Harris	Ribicoff
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Camp	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Heffernan	St. George
Cannon	Herlong	Schwabe
Carlyle	Heselton	Scott, Hardie
Case	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Church	Hope	Secrest
Clemente	James	Seely-Brown
Clevenger	Jarman	Sikes
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooper	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sittler
Corbett	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Cotton	Kean	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Kearney	Stefan
Cox	Keating	Stigler
Crawford	Kennedy	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	Kerr	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kilburn	Thornberry
Dague	Kilday	Van Zandt
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Vaughn
Denny	Lantaff	Vorys
Devereux	Larcade	Watts
Donovan	Latham	Whitten
Doughton	LeCompte	Wigglesworth
Eaton	Lyle	Williams, Miss.
Evins	McConnell	Willis
Fallon	McCulloch	Wilson, Tex.
Fenton		Winstead
Fogarty		

NOT VOTING—72

Abbitt	Davis, Wis.	Herter
Albert	DeGraffenried	Hess
Allen, La.	Durham	Hinshaw
Andresen, August H.	Ellsworth	Howell
Boggs, La.	Elston	Irving
Bolling	Engle	Kearns
Breen	Fellows	Lucas
Brehm	Fisher	McCarthy
Buckley	Gordon	McDonough
Buffett	Gore	McGregor
Busbey	Granahan	McMillan
Chatham	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Machrowicz
Chenoweth	Hays, Ohio	Martin, Mass.
Cole, Kans.	Hébert	Mason
Cole, N. Y.	Hedrick	Mitchell
Davis, Tenn.	Heller	Morrison
		Morton

Murray, Wis.	Scott,	Van Pelt
O'Konski	Hugh D., Jr.	Vinson
Preston	Smith, Kans.	Welch
Reed, Ill.	Stockman	Werdel
Rivers	Taber	Wheeler
Sabath	Talle	Whitaker
Sadlak	Thomas	Wilson, Ind.
Saylor	Towe	Wood, Ga.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Wheeler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Lucas with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Mason.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Engle with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Ellsworth.

Messrs. MURPHY, BYRNE of New York, JAVITS, PATTERSON, and WOLVERTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 26, line 12, insert:

"COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 38, line 6, strike out "That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support" and insert "That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 51, line 25, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$16,500,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to $2,500,000)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 64, line 13, insert:

"SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full time, part time, and intermittent employees of the Department and its instrumentalities, cooperators, and collaborators receiving personnel services from the Department: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and above the number otherwise provided for in this act."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 887)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 60, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 94, 97, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 72, 77, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, and 133.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,188,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,016,919"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$4,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,072,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,859,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$4,361,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreemnt to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $2,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,123,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,948,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That not more than $900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$182,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,518,987"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,598,654"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$626,671"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$49,549,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within and by transfer to the department or agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to Saint Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital;

"(e) to the Public Health Service;

"(f) to educational institutions; and

"(g) to personnel engaged in law enforcement: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 704. Amounts available from appropriations and other funds in this Act, and amounts specified therein for personal services, are hereby reduced in the sum hereinafter set forth, such sums (except trust funds) to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, $31,835;

"Bureau of Labor Statistics

"Salaries and expenses, $238,461;

"Women's Bureau

"Salaries and expenses, $16,715;

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"Office of Education

"Salaries and expenses, $152,293;

"Office of the Administrator

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:

"Appropriation, $17,487;

"Transfer from Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, $3,673;

"Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:

"Appropriation, $21,350;

"Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, $21,197;

"NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, $348,541;

"NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, $15,753;

"Arbitration and emergency boards, $6,000;

National Railroad Adjustment Board

"Salaries and expenses, $24,251;

"RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund), $211,096;

"FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses, $135,087;

"Boards of inquiry, $1,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 131, and 132.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
H. M. KILGORE,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ZALES N. ECTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the replacement of two vehicles as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Appropriates $1,350,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, instead of $1,425,000 as proposed by

the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates $1,600,000, instead of $1,650,000 as proposed by the House and $1,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than $604,870.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: Appropriate $265,758, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $277,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than $213,603.

Bureau of Apprenticeship

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,600,000, instead of $2,692,000 as proposed by the House and $2,578,682 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than $2,188,680 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than $2,153,049 proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,016,919, instead of $5,245,959 as proposed by the Senate and $4,635,500 as proposed by the House, of which amount $1,300,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 instead of $1,513,765 as proposed by the Senate and $743,500 as proposed by the House, and of which total appropriation not more than $4,200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $4,351,773 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14—Grants to States: Appropriate $164,560,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $165,560,000 as proposed by the House, of which $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, is for the contingency reserve fund instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House; deletes the Senate provision limiting the amount available for personal services.

Bureau of Employees' Compensation

Amendments Nos 15 and 16—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,887,816 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,947,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $1,618,499 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,371,352 proposed by the Senate instead of $5,243,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than $4,530,755 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate. The conferees of both Houses agree that of the total appropriation available to the Bureau in 1952, $90,000 should be allotted for studies of foreign labor conditions, such amount to be taken from the amount otherwise available for housing and public construction statistics.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Revision of consumers' price index: Appropriate $1,072,825, instead of $1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Women's Bureau

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $379,285 proposed by the Senate instead of $389,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than $317,581 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Wage and Hour Division

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24—Appropriate $8,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $8,365,304 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than $6,859,200 shall be available for personal services instead of $7,119,227 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Columbia Institution for the Deaf

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $390,000 as proposed by the House instead of $374,537 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Food and Drug Administration

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—Salaries and expenses: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles instead of seven as proposed by the House and one as proposed by the Senate, of which two vehicles shall be for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of replacement of only one as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Appropriate $5,300,000, instead of $5,345,000 as proposed by the House and $5,172,975 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than $4,361,900 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than $4,218,475 as proposed by the Senate.

Freedmen's Hospital

Amendment No. 31—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,631,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,906,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32—Reported in disagreement.

Howard University

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,475,000, instead of $2,525,000 as proposed by the House and $2,415,084 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriate $19,123,261, instead of $20,017,760 as proposed by the Senate and $18,223,261 as proposed by the House, of which $18,948,261 is for the Vocational Education Act of 1946 instead of $19,847,760 as proposed by the Senate and $18,048,261 as proposed by the House, and amend the provision in the House bill so as to provide that not more than $900,000 of the appropriation shall be available for vocational education in the distributive occupations.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,397,706 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,253,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $2,893,577 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—Payments to school districts: Appropriate $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the language of the Senate making the appropriation available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874).

Amendment No. 41—Grants for school construction: Strikes out the paragraph of the House bill with respect to this appropriation and inserts the Senate paragraph in lieu thereof. The appropriation amount is identical to the House bill. The language agreed upon permits direct provision of school facilities, as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of the basic legislation, in addition to grants to local educational agencies. The conference agreement drops the two provisions of the House bill relating to reimbursement payments under section 205 of the basic law and to the determination of relative urgency of need for school facilities for purposes of prescribing under section 206 the order in which the Commissioner of Education shall make certifications for payments from the appropriation.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43—Payments to States: Appropriate $21,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,475,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount available for personal services. The conferees of both Houses agree that the reduction below the budget estimate, as agreed upon, should not be applied against the allotment for counseling, guidance, and placement services.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $675,620 as proposed by the Senate instead of $705,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $558,220 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 46—Venereal diseases: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 7 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48—Appropriate $11,653,360 for venereal diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,700,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50—Tuberculosis: Appropriate $8,745,000 as proposed by the House instead of $8,887,351 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 51—Assistance to States, general: Authorizes the purchase of not to exced 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 10 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52—Deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services from the appropriation "Assistance to States, General."

Amendment No. 53—Communicable diseases: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 20 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Appropriate $5,915,747 for communicable diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,090,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 56—Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 4 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of the provision of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 11 vehicles of which 9 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58—Appropriate $3,648,158 for "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,710,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60—Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: Appropriate $1,211,129 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,234,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 61—Grants for hospital construction: Appropriates $182,500,000, instead of $195,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $175,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Authorizes

purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64—Appropriate $1,166,465 for salaries and expenses, hospital construction services, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,195,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 65—Hospitals and medical service: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 9 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66—Foreign quarantine service: Authorize purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the language of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 12 vehicles of which 10 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68—Appropriate $2,900,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service, instead of $2,990,000 as proposed by the House and $2,868,029 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 69—National Institutes of Health: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed six as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71—Appropriate $15,500,000 for the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of $15,559,973 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 72—National Cancer Institute: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 73 and 74—Appropriate $19,500,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of $19,805,171 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76—Mental health activities: Appropriate $10,518,987, instead of $10,737,974 as proposed by the Senate and $10,300,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 77—National Heart Institute: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 78 and 79—Appropriate $10,000,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of $10,072,982 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—Dental health activities: Appropriate $1,598,654, instead of $1,697,308 as proposed by the Senate and $1,500,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, 84, and 85—Construction of research facilities: Appropriate $10,400,000 for continuation of construction of a combined hospital and research building as proposed by the House instead of $9,445,000 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the Senate language transferring $955,000 to this item from prior funds for construction of additional auxiliary structures; appropriate $350,000 for payment of obligations incurred under prior authority for construction of additional auxiliary structures as proposed by the House instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the Senate language authorizing the Surgeon General to enter into arrangements for the construction by private industry of rental quarters for employees of the National Institutes of Health.

Amendments Nos. 86 and 87—Appropriate $6,635,540 for purchase and installation of additional equipment, supplies, and furnishings for the research center as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,640,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89—Commissioned officers, pay and so forth: Appropriate $1,861,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,790,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 90—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92—Appropriate $2,745,868 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,850,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Saint Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 93—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendments Nos. 94 and 95—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Appropriate $175,000 direct appropriation as proposed by the House instead of $167,650 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the total, including funds to be derived from collection of fees; to be available for personal services to not more than $626,671 instead of not more than $614,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Authorizes purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 97 and 98—Authorize the expenditure of not more than $58,000,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for salaries and expenses of the Bureau, as proposed by the House, instead of not more than $57,437,980 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than $49,549,400 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than $48,697,378 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99—Grants to States for public assistance: Appropriates $1,150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,250,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 100 and 101—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: Appropriate $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,463,400 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $1,455,400 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 102 and 103—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriate $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $1,238,900 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 104 and 105—Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: Appropriate $31,500,000 instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $30,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the language of the House bill providing for pro rata allotment of the appropriation in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled by reason of section 331 of the 1950 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 107—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: Appropriate $200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $219,700 as proposed by the House, and in addition authorize transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed $110,300 as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108—Public assistance program: Strikes out the provision of the Senate prohibiting denial of allocation of Federal funds to any State which has by legislative enactment provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grant-in-aid funds and has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should consider the subject matter of this amendment.

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 109 and 110—Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Appropriate $2,050,000 from general funds as proposed by the House instead of $2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed $403,000 as proposed by the House instead of $413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111—Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than $402,045.

Amendment No. 112—Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriates $396,478 as proposed by the Senate instead of $412,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—Surplus property disposal: Appropriates $90,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendments Nos. 114 and 115—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $8,233,959 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $6,622,284 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendments Nos. 116 and 117—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $394,247 as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $299,307 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 118 and 119—Arbitration and emergency boards: Appropriate $144,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $114,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board: Inserts the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than $460,774.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 121—Payment to railroad retirement account: Strikes out the definite annual appropriation inserted by the Senate and restores the annual indefinite appropriation language of the House bill.

In recommending the annual indefinite form of appropriation, the conferees of both Houses will expect the Bureau of the Budget to withhold from the retirement fund any net overappropriations or overpayments made to the fund from the General Treasury through June 30, 1951.

Amendments Nos. 122 and 123—Salaries and expenses (from trust funds): Authorize $5,056,904 to be derived from the railroad retirement account for salaries and expenses of the Board as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,268,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $4,010,820 shall be available for personal service as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 124 and 125—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,047,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,949,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $2,566,653 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 126 and 127—Boards of inquiry: Appropriate $48,750 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than $23,750 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128—Section 703: Restores the provision of the House bill containing restrictions on the filling of personnel vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year 1952 in positions for which funds are provided by the bill, amended to change the list of exemptions as agreed upon by the conferees, and to provide that when the total number of personnel subject to this provision has been reduced to 90 percent of the total number provided for in the 1952 budget estimates, the restrictions of this provision may cease to apply.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the savings which accrue from the operation of the provisions of this section of the bill shall not be diverted to or expended for any other purpose but shall be impounded in the appropriations and other funds and returned to the Treasury, and will expect the agencies concerned to proceed accordingly.

Amendment No. 129—Further reductions in appropriations and authorizations: Makes reductions in various appropriations and authorizations carried in the act as set out in detail in the conference report by appropriation title and amount. The Senate amendment provided that each appropriation or authorization made by the act for any purpose, of which a specified portion was made available for personal services, and each amount so specified for personal services, was reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in the budget estimates. The conferees have agreed on reductions as provided in the Senate amendment in a number of instances. In most of such instances the amounts of the reductions are listed under this amendment in the conference report. In a few other instances, the amounts which would have been available after application of the reductions provided by the Senate amendment have been incorporated in the amendments of the Senate to the individual appropriation paragraphs involved.

Amendment No. 130—Strikes out the language of the Senate providing that no part of any appropriation contained in the act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle other than a bus or ambulance.

Amendment No. 131—Reduction in number of passenger cars: Reported in disagreement. The conferees of both Houses have agreed that agencies embraced within this act which operate passenger cars at the seat of Government during fiscal year 1952 shall periodically submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and to the General Accounting Office a daily trip record of use of the cars so operated.

Amendment No. 132—Employees engaged in personnel work: Reported in disagreement. The motion which the House managers will offer on this amendment will provide for exemption of the Public Health Service, during 1952, from the personnel ratio limitation agreed upon, in view of special circumstances existing in that Service. It will be expected, however, that the Service and the Agency will on their own take steps to improve the existing ratio before the 1953 budget is considered. At that time, the committees expect to fully examine into the matter as regards the Service with view to determining the proper relationship between total personnel and employees engaged in personnel work.

Amendment No. 133: Corrects a section number.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, this is the same report that was brought back about 6 weeks ago. We have followed the instructions of the House by returning to conference and, in conference yesterday, agreeing on the same formula for the Jensen amendment that was adopted in the Interior and Agricultural appropriation bills today.

I yield now to my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, my chairman has correctly stated the situation. The report is unanimous. As far as I know there is no disagreement, and there is no request for time on this side.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 13, line 16, after "title", insert a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 131: Page 45, line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 46, line 1, insert the following:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 105, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and its chairman upon the appointment of a subcommittee to look into the proposed consolidation of the insurance and death-claim activities of the Veterans' Administration. These activites were at one time centralized in the New York office. In 1946, under the direction of Gen. Omar Bradley, one of the ablest Administrators the Veterans' Administration has had, the activities were decentralized and dispersed among several offices for the more efficient service of the veterans. It is now proposed to again centralize the activities, this time in Philadelphia. The space, which is to be used for this recentralization, had been assigned to the Frankford Arsenal, which is a vital agency of the Army Ordnance Bureau. That agency was preparing to occupy the space last week with an essential defense activity, when it was told that the space was not available because it would be used by the Veterans' Administration for the proposed consolidation.

It is claimed there will be some economy in this change. Last week the Veterans' Administration advertised for 1,000 additional employees in Philadelphia—"experience unnecessary." We feel that this change will not be economical, and it will certainly impair the service which is now being rendered. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our distinguished floor leader, requested me to express his interest in this inquiry to be made by the Expenditures Committee. He is opposed to the proposed consolidation and believes the committee investigation will show conclusively that it is an improper move.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to this matter. I am not chairman of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the committee. I want to assure the gentleman that it is going to be the purpose of that subcommittee to go slowly into this matter and find out first of all, if it is in the interest of efficiency and economy to have any consolidation at all; and secondly, if it infringes upon the defense effort.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Virginia and commend him for the interest and activity he has shown in this matter.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. The removal of all these veteran administration offices to Philadelphia will not only discommode and inconvenience veterans who have claims, but it will make it utterly impossible, particularly in death cases, for the dear ones of deceased veterans to get justice because the records will be unavailable and they will not be able to travel great distances to Philadelphia to validate their claims.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to this very important matter. I will serve on this subcommittee, and I assure him I will give it my most careful attention for I recall the last time this change took place, it was months before any service could be had on questions asked about insurance.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113), with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 2, line 22, section 101 (a) subsection (1): Strike out "$5,028,000,000" and insert "$4,828,000,000."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$1,035,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be divided, in order that there may be a separate vote on each of the two subsections. That is, a separate vote on the military cut and a separate vote on the economic cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of $500,000,000; $200,000,000 on the military end and $300,000,000 on the economic end in the authorization for Europe.

Now, let us look first at the military side of this. Let me say that in considering any cuts to the bill which this committee has brought to the House, those of us who oppose any further cuts are at a serious disadvantage. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] yesterday said he was tired of voting for large amounts of authorizations without having every penny justified. Let me say we cannot justify, penny for penny and dollar for dollar, this appropriation because this information is a military secret. We cannot even tell you what amount of money in this military authorization will go to each of the countries involved. For this reason we are at a disadvantage when some Member says, "Let us knock $200,000,000 off of this." That appeals to the instincts of all of us to try to save money. We are in a difficult position to justify why we oppose such a cut.

First, let me tell you that throughout the entire hearings the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the author of this amendment, at least to my knowledge, never asked a single question which would tend to bring out evidence in support of the cut he is now recommending. In his statement yesterday he said he went to his office and spent 3 hours and came up with this suggestion. In his statement on the floor he offered no evidence in support of this cut.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that we on the committee have already cut the military appropriation for Western Europe by an amount of $265,000,000. This would increase the cut to $465,000,000, almost a 10 percent cut over what the military branch of our Government, the Department of Defense, felt was needed.

This problem of mutual security is a relatively simple one. Our problem is to get military equipment into the hands of the soldiers of the free countries of Western Europe as quickly as we can. They have the manpower, we have the military equipment. Our purpose is to get the two together to increase our mutual security. If we delay, if we dilly-dally, if we do not show our wholehearted effort to join with our allies and our friends of Western Europe, the time may be too late when we decide that it is to our advantage to put arms into the hands of our friends.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has commented on my method of bringing up this cut. May I point out that when the present Richards bill was offered, I am the one in the committee, 18 minutes before the present bill was put in, who asked the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] what the figures were, and I was denied any figure. I had to wait until the present bill was put in before I could find what any position of the committee was as to what the cuts might be that were different from the State Department.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Let me take exception of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman from South Carolina means the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has raised the question. So far as the chairman of the committee knows, and I think I would know if it had happened, at no time during the whole hearing did the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask the gentleman from South Carolina for any figures; nor did he at any time during the entire hearings of the committee question the figures that were presented in my bill. The action that he took, so far as I know in regard to the figures were only that he proposed to increase the over-all figures in the bill by $150,000,000. He did not propose one single cut.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from New York may have three additional minutes in order to pursue this further.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Has not the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who is a good friend of mine, forgotten that on the day he brought his bill in I was the one who asked directly of the chairman what the amount of the cut was and whether that amount would change in the 18 minutes between that time, which was 18 minutes of 12, the time we were then sitting, and the time the bill would be reported to the House at 12 o'clock? And that was directed expressly to the total of this bill.

My point is simply that I have worked on these figures and gone over them in great detail and have come up with what in my best judgment was the proper amount. I saw no reason to disclose them other than to the people I had been working with.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I should just like to make this amendment here: The question was asked about the details of military aid to Western Europe. As I said, we cannot divulge the secret testimony that was given to us; but it was the wholehearted and overwhelming opinion of the members of this committee when we reported this bill that this was a fair and absolutely rock-bottom figure if we were going to help the people of Western Europe before it was too late.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to confirm what the chairman of the committee has said. The gentleman from Pennsylvania who now wishes to reduce the bill by another $500,000,000, in the committee tried to increase the bill by $150,000,000. I should like to say also that as far as the actual figure was concerned we all knew it at the same time; at least we did if we were in the committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct; and the gentleman will recall that we agreed with the chairman of the committee to a cut of $265,000,000 in military aid in this title I and the reason was because we felt that that extra amount had not been justified before the committee and that the extra amount the administration had asked for could not be delivered.

One other last point, if we are going to do this job we must make the people of Western Europe realize that we are behind them, and behind them now, so that they can get to the business of getting armed as quickly as possible. Remember, these people are living under the constant threat of attack over there.

In my considered judgment this bill for $7,800,000,000 and this particular request for $5,028,000,000 for Western Europe military aid is important, if not more important to the safety and security of the people of the United States as was the $56,000,000,000 bill we passed in this House earlier this week for the military defense department.

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

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there were statements made to the effect that the people of India and Asia do not hold us in high regard. To dispel those notions that were spread on the RECORD at that time I should like to read from some of the speeches that have recently been made in and out of the Parliament of India. I do want to say at the outset that the people of India have expressed time out of mind the uttermost feelings of friendliness and kindness to the people of this country. They covet our good will as we do theirs. But we must not be supersensitive. We must show tolerance. We must not give undue weight to a few irresponsible criticisms of us that may have been expressed by some irresponsible persons in India. Likewise people in India must view with tolerance some of the demagogic statements concerning India uttered in the United States. I now give you some splendid statements by Indians concerning us.

I read an extract from an address by Dr. Rajendra Prasad delivered on July 4, in which he said:

> On the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of American independence I have great pleasure in offering heartiest felicitations to Your Excellency and to the Government and people of America. We look forward to the closest cooperation and friendship between India and your great country in the cause of world peace.

Here is a statement from Prime Minister Nehru as of July 4, 1951, to Secretary of State Acheson:

> On the anniversary of the Independence of your country, I send to you and to the Government and to the people of the United States of America my sincere greetings and best wishes from myself and from the Government and the people of India. I should like to take this opportunity of conveying through you to the American Government and the people our grateful appreciation of the aid being given to us to meet the very serious food situation that prevails in certain parts of India.

I quote a statement of Prime Minister Nehru in a message sent to the President of the United States expressing sympathy with the Kansas flood victims, dated July 19, 1951:

> I have heard with deep regret the very serious damage and loss of life and property caused by the Kansas flood. Please accept, Mr. President, my Government's and my people's deep sympathy at this calamity which has overtaken so many people. We in India have had the misfortune to suffer from serious floods in the past and so we can appreciate the suffering caused by such natural calamities and we extend our sympathy.

In a speech made in Parliament Nehru said on August 4 last:

> I was talking about America. Look at their tremendous achievements. Their achievement is amazing. It is a great country. It is very easy for you to find constructive peace forces at play in that country.

On December 6, 1950, Nehru said in a speech in Parliament:

> But there is something more which is the bitter truth that we have to understand and realize today. In this fighting that has taken place in Korea the main burden on the part of the United Nations has fallen on the forces of the United States. They have suffered greatly and at the present moment they are suffering greatly and our sympathy should go out to them in this present predicament.

I should also like to quote the following from an address delivered to the Parliament of India by the President of India on August 6, 1951:

> The food situation in the country has been a matter of the gravest concern to my Government and, for many months, the threat of famine hovered over large areas of the country, more especially over Bihar. I am glad to say that there has been appreciable improvement and that threat has receded into the background. But dangers remain and constant and cooperative effort is needed to overcome them. I should like to express my gratitude to the friendly nations who came forward with help in ships and food grains. In particular, I should like to express my gratitude to the United States of America for the loan of 2,000,000 tons of food grains.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on and read to you fulsome statements made by the leaders of India indicating their uttermost sympathy for what we stand for and which are indicative of the friendship they bear to us. It is true that some Indian may voice dissension from our aims and views or criticism of us, but it is unfair to take stray bits of criticism and balloon them out of all proportion, and, as is often the case, to lift from context. I think we must look at the picture as a whole, and I think then, the conclusion may reasonably and easily be drawn that India has the kindliest of feelings toward us.

We must be fair, we must be just in this regard, and I hope, therefore, there will not be a recurrence of these very bitter statements about India that we heard yesterday from Members who addressed the House.

Judging from some of the sharp and barbed statements of some Members, one would gather the impression that these Members would want India to grovel in the dust at our feet in expressing gratitude for our recent loan for food grains. Such attitude is ridiculous.

Let us rather try to understand each other with fairness and some degree of humility. Both nations have perplexing

problems of an international character crying for solution. Developing frictions between our two countries makes solutions more difficult.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a substitute for the first portion of the Fulton amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My amendment applies to both parts, Mr. Chairman, but I can ask unanimous consent to offer the first part to the Fulton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment to the first section?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. That was my thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the first portion of the amendment of Mr. FULTON: Page 2, line 22, section 101 (a), subsection (1) strike out "$5,028,000,000" and insert "$4,700,000,000."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Is it possible to divide an amendment and offer an amendment to a portion of an amendment or is a division applicable only in the case of voting on an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. That is what has been done here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to this first section of title would cut the appropriation for military $328,000,000. I know how sacred a proposition this military thing is, but in view of the testimony before our committee I think my cut of $328,000,000 is as much justified as is the figure that is in the bill.

We know that the testimony was very indefinite and uncertain. We were not able to pinpoint or to determine exactly what the need was for military end items, and I submit that so far as the record is concerned that much of the testimony that we had was of a guessing variety. We would insist upon specific testimony being brought in to justify the amount but, of course, the old bugaboo of secrecy confronted us.

I want to call your attention to a statement made by the gentleman from Ohio yesterday in connection with this matter which points out exactly what went on as far as the committee was concerned and so far as those who tried to justify these items are concerned. I refer to yesterday's RECORD, August 16, on page 10148. We had General Scott before the committee. There was some question as to how much of the end items had been delivered.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Can the gentleman give us the second part of his proposed amendment, how much that cut is?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. That cut is $672,000,000. We had an appropriation as of June 30, 1951 for military items of $5,794,300,000. That was the amount we appropriated. The gentleman from Ohio tried to find out what has been delivered. They wound up by showing that actually the correct figures on delivery as against a $5,500,000,000 appropriation were $108,400,000 worth of end items. The first guess was something like $450,000,000. General Scott was off only $291,000,000 in 1 month of shipments. If that is the extent of the accuracy of the testimony then it is not entitled to much weight.

In this matter of ECA aid, Mr. Bissell, the Deputy Administrator, came before the committee and finally admitted that they were off $500,000,000 on that item.

I submit that as far as this amount is concerned for military items, we can well afford to cut because money for military purposes is running out of our ears. Those who are in charge of the program know they cannot deliver with the money appropriated to them. The goods cannot be produced. The taxpayers of this country are asking that we as legislators here this afternoon give these huge authorizations a good going over. Certainly it seems to me that this $238,000,000 cut is amply justified.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for me to understand how Members of this body who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs could offer amendments similar to those offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but it is most difficult for me to understand how any members of the committee, who were in attendance for 31 hearing days and 9 days of executive session, can be unaware of what the committee actually did in cutting these authorizations as originally sent down.

I think I can say to the House that there are no two more "show-me guys" in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. Our committee frizzled and fried every bit of fat that there was in this particular bill.

I should like to give the House some facts and not generalities as to what we really did, because you will find actual cuts throughout the entire breadth of this bill.

This bill came down from the executive branch for $8,500,000,000. For title I there was allowed $6,968,000,000. The chairman of our committee in introducing his bill deducted from title I a total of $605,000,000. You are talking now about $605,000,000, but that is just the beginning. What else did we do in the committee to cut this authorization in title I? In the first place, we deducted from title I the sum of $55,000,000, and put it in title VI. Title VI provides that that $55,000,000 will go for the procurement and development of strategic materials all over the world. So there is another $55,000,000 deducted. In addition, the cost for administering this program all over the globe comes out of title I, and that will take approximately $78,000,000 more from title I.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] introduced in committee, and it was overwhelmingly adopted, an amendment which will be found in section 612 of the bill. Section 612 provides that 20 percent of all the authorizations for ECA shall be by way of loan. That means that this is not give-away money, but that this is $320,000,000 of come-back money to the United States of America. So, if you are talking about whether we are giving away the money of the United States of America and of our taxpayers, here is another $320,000,000 that is not give-away funds, but represents an actual cut in the authorization.

What else have we done to further a cut? If you read the bill, and try to understand it, you will find in section 612 (2) (D), a provision also introduced by that great student of foreign affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], a provision requiring that $500,000,000 of the counterpart fund be utilized for the specific purpose of increasing military production. If you understand how the counterpart fund works, you will know this fund was originally used, or intended to be used, to help the economies of all these European nations, but with the requirement of this amendment, we take $500,000,000 more for the purpose of increasing military production.

So, if my figures are correct, we actually shaved off of title I, $1,053,000,000 and a contingent fund of an additional $500,000,000. Therefore, the gentlemen are not explaining this bill to the House when they tell you we have not cut the bill in committee. Now it is all right for you gentlemen to go back to your home districts and say that we have cut this bill and that we have saved $500,000,000. But will you be frank enough to go back to your districts and tell your people that at the same time you are hurting the security of the United States of America? This reminds me of the profligate husband who tells his wife to go out on a shopping spree on the money that he saved by canceling his life-insurance policy. What protection. That is exactly what you will be doing. I say the amendment of the gentleman from the Keystone State is actually an amendment which will remove one keystone from the security of the United States of America. If you believe in this bill and if you believe in the principle of this mutual security program, you should be in favor of the bill that we have worked out in committee so carefully. But, if you are against the bill, then vote against it and do not try to hamstring it by these undercutting amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Connecticut, I think that a cut of one-fiftieth on a $25,000,000,000

program, which is a cut of 2 percent on this 3-year defense program, which we are just entering into under this mutual security bill, is a little something less than the keystone of defense of the United States of America.

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

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman is talking about a 3-year program here, when the gentleman knows that we are now considering the authorization for the first year, and that what happens 2 years from now depends upon what the Congress does. We must address ourselves to the cut which you propose now in this bill, and not talk of something that will come up in 1952 or 1953.

Mr. FULTON. Of course, we all know this is part of a $25,000,000,000 program. Secretary of State Acheson has said so in his testimony before the Senate committee.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] made the suggestion that if anyone was against the bill he should just vote against it, but not undertake to scuttle it or cripple it with amendments. Does not the gentleman agree with me that one might be for this program but he might yet exercise his own judgment about how much needs to be appropriated to implement it? Certainly, to question the good faith of anyone who raises a question about a figure, particularly when the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee themselves say they cannot justify it dollar for dollar, is not a fair argument.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman. Positions have changed in 2 years. At that time I supported the full military assistance and economic aid in title I amounting to $1,168,000,000. On August 18, 1949, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] introduced an amendment to cut $584,000,000 from title I, military aid to Europe, in the mutual defense assistance program, when it first started and when conditions were much worse, when the United States had not given this aid to Europe and when there was great disparity in our forces. I argued against that 50 percent cut that the gentleman from South Carolina recommended then, as I felt it affected the success of the program and United States security. These same countries then needed only $155,000,000 to expand their military plants in Europe and to increase their arms production. The House voted that be cut by 50 percent through that amendment. It was too much of a cut and amount was restored. Now, on a big authorization for military and economic purposes of $6,000,000,000 in title I, I come in with less than a 10-percent cut, and one member from the committee feels that might be pulling something called the keystone of the defense. Well, it is something less than that broad statement, we all know. If we look at the whole program of $25,000,000,000, a cut of 2 percent is simply saying to these fellows, "Be careful of your administrative expenses. Use up the large balances of funds these programs already have from previous programs."

Let me show you what balances they already have. You would think from hearing the arguments here that the $300,000,000 cut on economic aid was going to hurt something. There is right now in economic aid, in the pipelines, that has not yet reached the European countries, $1,507,000,000. So a billion and a half dollars in title I, is on the way to Europe in the pipeline, which will give these countries a great further boost above 1938–39 levels.

Now, on the military program, let us see what else they have.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 3 of the bill, lines 24 and 25, the bill provides:

> In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued——

Mr. FULTON. Those balances are in this program by that section. I am reducing the $1,335,000,000 figure for economic aid under title I simply by $300,000,000, and we will still have a billion and a half that is moving in the pipelines to Europe in addition. So that, with my amendment, they still have $2,500,000,000 in economic aid for 1 year, after 3 years of the Marshall-plan program.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. Do your figures include the counterpart funds?

Mr. FULTON. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any limitation on counterpart funds?

Mr. FULTON. These counterpart funds can be used either for economic or military aid as agreed upon between the United States and recipient countries.

Mr. STEFAN. These are dollars you are talking about?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; the figures I have given are in dollars. The joint accounts are held in the currencies in each country.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceeed for five additional minutes to explain these figures.

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. I am sorry I cannot yield further.

I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] as to the unexpended counterpart funds. There is now $1,728,000,000 in joint accounts with those countries in which the United States has a joint interest, in unexpended counterpart funds. At the present time the balance available, that they have not even decided where it shall go, is $1,534,000,000.

Now, on military aid: From the fiscal year 1950 in military aid in title I there is still $146,100,000 not even obligated; no orders for military equipment have been issued on these funds.

As of June 30, 1951, under title I there is unobligated $315,000,000, under the military program.

The total military program unobligated balance as of June 30, 1951, is $456,000,000.

Going over to the economic side we find there is a total of $112,600,000 unobligated in the economic program as of June 30 of this year.

This makes a total of unobligated money right now of $568,600,000 for title I, military and economic aid.

Then go over to counterpart funds and we find $1,728,000,000 for Europe in local funds which can be used on both military and economic aid.

In the pipeline you find $1,500,000,000 more that has not even reached Europe in economic aid.

I think that will explain why this title should be cut. I ask anybody on the committee to deny that those figures are the exact figures of our own committee staff reports. These figures are being read right from the committee staff reports.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has mentioned my name in connection with these proposed cuts and cuts I have offered in the past, and my attitude in the premises I think I should say something about it.

As I said in the House yesterday, I do not apologize for my action in 1949 when I proposed to cut in half the mutual defense assistance authorization for Europe, and I told the House why: We had no unified command; the men were not marching, and we had no Eisenhower in command. I thought it was folly to provide a 2-year program when not even a 1-year program had been started. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who at that time favored a 2-year program, has now developed into a great economizer in the Foreign Affairs Committee where he said he worked so hard and so strong for economy. The figures in this bill are not sacred; the figures from the executive branch are not sacred; I have never contended that they were. The figures I presented in title I are not sacred; I have never pretended they were. I do say that they are my honest conclusions; these cuts in the bill are made where the economy of the United States could stand them and where the framework of the aid program could stand them.

But what did the gentleman from Pennsylvania do when we had this bill in committee, my bill (H. R. 5020) containing a cut of $265,000,000 I proposed

cuts in my bill of $200,000,000? Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania—according to his own words—propose in the Foreign Affairs Committee to cut the over-all figure of the bill by one dollar? No; and neither did he propose the cut or add to the cut of $285,000,000 in economic aid made in my bill (H. R. 5020). On the contrary, the gentleman was very consistent; in every one of the aid programs brought to the House he has gone down the line to the dollar for the amount that the executive branch proposes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not propose to cut one single dollar when the Foreign Affairs Committee was considering this bill; on the contrary, he proposed to add $150,000,000 to it.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not yield.

Mr. FULTON. I should like to make a correction on that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman proposed to add $150,000,000 to it. When did he "get religion?" What caused the gentleman from Pennsylvania suddenly to become an economizer? Is it a desire on his part to cut the ground from under the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee because he does not like something the chairman has done? I do not know. But I will say this: the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has done something that is rather new in proceedings in this Congress. He took the bull by the horns and cut $550,000,000 off of title I of this bill and the committee agreed with this figure. Now all of a sudden the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the great economizer, comes in here with some figures that he says are sacred, and the gentleman who wanted to add $150,000,000 to this bill now wants to cut it down by another $500,000,000. Now, overnight, he says that in the interest of the welfare and security of the United States the House should cut title I funds according to the Fulton figures.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes at the mutual-defense program in Europe which General Eisenhower is laboring so hard to implement at the present time. It was my privilege several weeks ago to visit Europe with 17 other Members of the House who went over to look over this program.

I know that a great many people in this House are saying today: "We believe in the Eisenhower military program but we want to cut the economic aid."

Let me say to you in all seriousness that there is no difference between the military program and the economic program today in Europe. I will give you an illustration which shows how the economic-aid funds are being used. We visited a plant in Holland which is one of the most modern airplane plants I have ever seen. As a matter of fact, before the plant was built they sent engineers to the United States to look over plants here. This plant would do credit to any manufacturer in the United States.

At that plant they are turning out Mercury fighting planes for use in the mutual-defense program. Let me show you how the various countries are cooperating. The license for the Mercury plane is owned by England, so England is permitting the planes to be build under its license. The engines are being manufactured in the Rolls-Royce plant in Belgium. Those engines are then sent to Holland. Holland builds the frames, assembles the planes, and they go out from that plant ready to fly.

The United States under the economic-aid program lent $350,000 to build that plant. Now that is where a part of your economic aid went—to help build that plant so that these fighting planes can be manufactured for defense purposes. The economic aid in Europe today is being used for such purposes.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact, though, that in that plant those airplane engines are made in minor quantities and are not having any appreciable effect on the defense of Europe?

Mr. GARY. Of course, they are not turning them out in mass production like we are in the United States; but if we can help those countries to help themselves we will relieve the United States of just that much effort, and that is what we are doing in this particular case.

Let me say to you in connection with the amounts you are considering today that this is a bill merely authorizing the funds for this program. You will get another shot at the amounts in the appropriation bill that will come before you later. I have the privilege of being chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that will consider these appropriations. I think it is an able subcommittee. We have as members the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. We are going to be conducting hearings during at least a part of the recess when the other Members will be away from Washington enjoying themselves and we will be considering the very questions you are trying to settle here on the floor today. I pledge to the House that our committee will consider very, very carefully every item that is requested for this program. I ask you to give us a little latitude in the authorizing legislation.

I promise you that our committee, when we bring the appropriation bill before you, will have a bill that we can fully justify.

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

Mr. Chairman, I propose to support all amendments to this bill that will limit the amount of money appropriated, but even with these amendments I will vote "no" on the entire bill.

I did not favor this Atlantic Pact, and spoke against it, and have had no reason, upon reflection, to change my vote. Over 5 years have passed since the shooting in World War II stopped, and Western Europe has been exposed to overwhelming Russian armies ever since—but no trouble has broken out, and in my opinion no trouble will break out. My reasons for this belief are based on the following facts: Great Britain has been, and still is, carrying on a brisk trade with Russia. The fact is Russia is a good customer of the British Empire, and England has many manufactured articles that Russia wants. England is a manufacturing island, and she depends on manufacture and trade to exist. As long as this relation between Russia and England continues, two things are certain:

First. Russia will not attack England.

Second. England will not be much concerned with arming against Russia.

We have absolutely no business at all in Western Europe, because under the terms of the Atlantic Pact itself we are not obligated to go to the defense of any of the countries contained within the pact, unless one of these countries is invaded; when that happens, under the terms of the pact, we automatically declare war on the aggressor and enter the conflict. Congress has been stripped of any power to declare or refuse to declare war against such an aggressor as the terms of the treaty provide automatic war, without any further action on the part of Congress.

No country in Western Europe has been attacked by any aggressor, so just what is our status in Western Europe today? We have Sir Dwight Eisenhower, already titled by the British, running around Europe playing Paul Revere to arouse those countries to action. We have seen that England is not concerned about the situation. France cannot be stirred up to fight an aggressor that has not yet appeared, and besides the French people are about equally divided between Communists and anti-Communists. Sweden and Denmark do not want any of it and Norway is not enthusiastic and many of the countries who have had experience in world wars cannot stand another invasion and another American liberation. The liberation, to them, is more damaging than the invasion, because when we get through liberating a country there is not much left of it except the road signs.

Germany holds back and well she might. The deal we handed the Germans is still remembered and will be for generations. We could have taken Berlin in 3 days, but we camped outside of Berlin for 3 weeks to give the Russians a chance to take Berlin. General Patton could have entered at any time, but he was stopped by General Eisenhower, who no doubt was acting upon orders from Washington.

The Russians entered and there has been nothing but turmoil and intrigue between the occupying forces ever since. The German people have been the sufferers in this game of politics and they have reason to doubt us in the present situation. If Germany is attacked, of

course, the Germans will fight, but they will never grow enthusiastic over our war scare in Europe.

We are to dump $8,500,000,000 more into the hopper of international strife and to no present purpose and at a time when, under the pact, we have no business in Europe.

I would not be much surprised that the $2,000,000,000 to be spent on France would finally fall into the hands of the Communists, just as our money assigned to Czechoslovakia went. You have not very far to go, as the United Nations is composed of delegates who represent more Communist people than are represented by the anti-Communist group. A careful study of the multitude of organizations within the United Nations is spreading communistic ideas directed at this country faster than the Russians are. The U. N. seems more concerned with changing our laws here than they are in any other country. If they can concoct a law or convention which when approved will set one law aside in the United States, it can set other laws aside. The Genocide Convention now before the Senate, if adopted, will take away the jurisdiction of our courts to give protection to citizens of this country who are charged with crime as defined by the United Nations.

I am for this country regardless of all organizations and the sooner we quit spending money in wild goose chases around the world with Communist advisers, the more apt we shall be to protect this Republic. Of the 60 nations in the United Nations, how many of them can give us any protection? In the trial run in Korea, 52 of those nations have not contributed a single man or a single dollar. I would rather rely on one State in the United States, than to rely on all of Latin America from Mexico to Cape Horn. We are capable of defending ourselves—abundantly capable—if we spend 25 percent of the money we are giving away and spend it on our own defense. We are abundantly capable of aiding any country that is willing to stand up and fight, but to spend money on Great Britain who cannot resist the rich trade with Russia and who sucks us in to defend her trade is a perfect example of the asininity of our foreign policy.

I am sure a few amendments to our Constitution can head off some of this international interference:

First, I have introduced a constitutional amendment making all treaties subject to approval by both Houses of Congress.

Second, in another amendment I propose that no citizen of this country shall be compelled to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States in any foreign country, unless Congress has declared war on that country, and that no citizen of the United States shall be compelled to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States under any other banner or insignia than that of the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America.

These amendments will protect this country from the activities of the United Nations in interfering with the laws of this country, and will end sending our boys across the seas to enter conflicts which the Congress of the United States has not declared as wars.

It will check the plan of General Eisenhower to have all soldiers in Western Europe wear the same uniform and march under the banner and flag of the United Nations instead of the Stars and Stripes of the United States.

The taxpayers of the United States can no longer support appropriations in one Congress aggregating over $80,000,000,000 for supporting our international meddling. We will have to call a halt sometime and that time has arrived so far as I am concerned. I will vote "No" on this bill, no matter how it is reduced by amendments.

I submit a dispatch from London dated August 15, 1951:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 16, 1951]

BRITISH TO DEFY UNITED STATES AND TRADE WITH RED BLOC—MAKE NEW DEAL SWAPPING RUBBER FOR TIMBER

LONDON, August 15.—A British spokesman said today that short of general war, this nation must continue to do business with Communist countries despite American criticism.

Hartley Shawcross, president of the board of trade, urged the American people to believe Britain's economic woes make trade with East Europe essential and irreplaceable.

In a major policy speech at Truro, Cornwall, Shawcross also disclosed that Russia has reserved the right to tear up a new $28,000,000 timber contract with Britain unless this country swaps rubber supplies in return.

MOSCOW WANTS UNITED STATES TRADE

About the time Shawcross was speaking, the Moscow radio broadcast a plea for more trade between Russia and the United States. An article in the English language News, the radio said, expressed the view that a revival of Soviet-American trade would be a valuable contribution toward a healthier world economy. It suggested the United States, machine-tool industry could find a big market in Russia.

Timber and grain make up the bulk of Russia's exports to Britain. The British pay with wool, rubber, machinery, and such other Commonwealth products as jute, cotton, and cocoa.

Shawcross said Britain will continue the general western ban on shipment of war-potential goods.

But the Battle bill in the United States Congress, with few exceptions, would bar all forms of American aid to nations which do any trading with Communist countries.

"This (east-west trade) is not a matter which ought to be settled by the laying down of unilateral conditions or by the denial of supplies essential to our well-being," Shawcross said. "It is preeminently one for frank but friendly discussion between allies."

GETS 6,000 TONS MONTHLY

Under American pressure, Britain last April cut off all British rubber exports to Red China. Rubber has important war uses. Rubber exports have continued to Russia, but on a basis of rationing. Britain sends 6,000 tons to Russia monthly, a quantity considered necessary for her normal civilian needs.

Anglo-Soviet discussions have begun for a new coarse-grains agreement to cover the Russians' latest harvest-sales period. This country hopes to get up to a million tons of corn, barley, and oats.

Shawcross noted that 60 percent of Britain's food is imported. He warned Britain's world trade balance is showing a deficit and is especially serious on the dollar side. Britain could get grains and timber to replace her Russian supplies only from the dollar area.

The biggest items of Commonwealth trade with Russia in 1950 were wool and rubber.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, again it appears that the President has overridden the expressed will of the Congress and has set out on a course of action designed to nullify the rightful exercise of its powers by the legislative branch.

Not more than a week ago the House took action on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] which would have authorized the Chief Executive to take steps looking to the dispersal of plants and industries considered by him to be dangerously centralized and subject to enemy attack. The House listened to the arguments in favor of the gentleman's amendment, and after mature consideration of the provisions of the amendment proceeded to vote down the measure in the committee. In light of the fact that the other body had taken similar action on the proposal, it appeared certain that plant dispersal had been disposed of for a few weeks at least. Those who thought so knew little of the obstinacy which is the hallmark of the bureaucrat.

On Friday, last, and in a manner which could only lead one to think that the President holds the legislative branch and its acts in utter contempt, Mr. Truman instructed Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson to proceed with administration plans for plant disposal, the action of the Congress to the contrary notwithstanding. As the matter stands at the moment these plans will be carried into effect, and industry and labor will be told when and where to build and to work. Precedents for such arbitrary action are not difficult to find, nor historically remote. Every dictatorship in history, from the Nile Valley to the planned socialism of England, have depended upon an absolute power in the hands of the rulers to direct employment, the location and the production of industry; and the regulatory power over such dispositions have been detailed in much the same manner as is proposed by the President.

We find again the excuse that the proposed dispersal of American industry and American workers is necessary in the national defense. If many of the planners here in Washington were to have their way, we should soon find ourselves completely at the mercy of the total state without having had an opportunity to strike a blow in defense, and all would be accomplished under the guise of aiding the defense effort.

If the Congress permits this blatant usurpation of its power to legislate and to declare its clear intent with respect to such legislation, we might better close

the doors of these halls and return to our homes, there to find our respective places in the new order and prepare ourselves for life in a state where the people have no direction of their individual and collective destinies.

The fact that many of our great leaders of industry have not raised their voice in protest over the unwarranted and arbitrary action of the President and his advisers is tragic evidence of the sad state of disrepair into which the American spirit has fallen. So complete has become the dependence of many businessmen upon the largess of the Federal Government, that today they lack the courage to speak up in their own behalf. Like a parcel of mendicants they take their instructions meekly and without a murmur of protest. I am content to hold out the shoe of subjugation to government and let those wear it on whose feet it feels comfortable.

Nor have the protests of organized labor been forthcoming, yet men and women who work for a living in the great industries are affected even more than management. These are the men and women who have hoarded their savings to buy a home. These are the Americans whose children have been raised in the community in which the plant is located, and whose youngsters attend the local schools. If they are prepared to tear up their economic roots at the direction of the President, they alone must suffer the consequences.

Why has American industry centered in certain areas? The answers are obvious and many. Geography, transportation, access to raw materials, facilities for producing, harvesting, and marketing, have all contributed to the growth of centers of industry and business. Yet the social planners, working as always with funds from the taxpayer's pocket, propose to repeal additional natural laws governing commercial transactions.

The mortarboard morons, fresh from a Pyrrhic victory over the law of supply and demand seek new fields to conquer, and dispersal of industry is the newest fascinating toy. No one suggests what the bill will amount to as the national defense wizards move toward the disruption of an industrial economy which has outstripped the world in know-how and production.

It is past time for the Congress to bare its teeth. Its vaunted power and authority is in rags and tatters, its expressed wishes and intent treated as the aberrations of a diseased mind. Unless it stands to its guns and services them when necessary, there is no excuse for its existence as the legislative agent of a free people.

When the Government tells a worker where to work, it is a police state government. When an administration withholds essential material or contracts because it does not approve the location of an industry, it becomes a power of economic life or death, and wields a whiplash of destruction.

The President should be informed of the intent of the Congress on the question of plant dispersal. It was perfectly clear to all of us what was intended when the House and the other body acted, but evidently Mr. Truman still does not get the idea. We should say to the President that the Congress meant hands off American industry and American labor.

The action of the administration in seeking to disperse American industry and labor in the face of a protest from the Congress and the American people is not new. Since 1940 the plans have gone forward and a new publication, Is Your Plant a Target?, issued by the National Security Resources Board draws the blueprint for the action to be taken in circumventing the will of the Congress.

It is past time that action be taken to curb the arrogance of the administration.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing about the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], when he gets through speaking we all know where he stands, and that certainly is commendable.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard in the course of the debate a question raised as to whether or not the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Wisconsin proposed these cuts in the committee. I do not think that makes any difference. It does not make any difference to me. It might mean something personal to somebody on the committee, but, as far as I am concerned, I have a responsibility here to the people I represent and to my own conscience to try to do what is right in this matter in the best interests of my country. So to my mind it does not add anything to question the integrity or the continuity of purpose or anything else that might be involved in respect to anyone who offers an amendment.

Let me say also that I commend the committee on the cuts it has made in these amounts. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina who said of himself that he thinks probably he perhaps started something new as far as his committee is concerned by backing some cuts himself.

From what I have been able to discover in this matter, and unfortunately there is quite a curtain of secrecy drawn here, the need for which I sometimes doubt, I just do not happen to believe that the cuts have gone deep enough. You might say to me, "Well, how are you going to prove that by any arithmetic?" I answer that by asking, "Where is the arithmetic by which you establish the figure you have here arrived at?" There is no such arithmetic.

Someone has well said in the debate that we are not dealing with an exact matter; the best we can do is to exercise our best judgment about it on the basis of the facts we are permitted to have, and then vote accordingly.

Of course, the chairman of the committee and all of us must recognize there is nothing sacred in any of these figures; there is nothing inviolate in respect to any of them.

Let me point out again that it cannot be said of anyone who may challenge the figure that is here before us, who seeks to reduce it, that he thereby is against the whole program or is undertaking by subterfuge or sabotage to kill or scuttle the program. Quite the contrary. One may be for the program and believe that it is desirable in our own national interest to further the program, but in the light of our own economies here at home and our obligations in the world, it is necessary to take a long, hard look at how far we ought to go and how much we ought to do in an attempt to implement that program. That is the reason I am going to support the Smith amendment. If that is defeated, I am going to support the Fulton amendment.

A suggestion was made here that the Committee on Appropriations will shortly come along and that this probably is where justification of the figures should be established. Let me pay my respects to that argument, may I say, as it was advanced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I think he spoke rightly. I think the Committee on Appropriations should take a good, hard long look at whatever is to be appropriated and exercise its final, last judgment in its recommendations to us. But I do not believe we can escape our responsibility, a primary responsibility that comes to us as we consider first the authorization bill.

Here we are dealing with figures, and if it is not important that the figures be as near what they should be as we can get them, then why put in any figures at all? Moreover, time and again after we have voted this kind of an authorization, and the figure has been put into the bill, as it goes into passage, the Committee on Appropriations says, "We want to look into the amount here. We want to have it proved to us." Then some newspapers in their editorial columns will come out and say "What goes on here? Why is JOHN TABER questioning the figure? The Congress voted on that once. What right does the Committee on Appropriations have to take another look at it?"

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, to my mind, for that reason—if for no other—in order that it be definitely understood in the country, we ought to express ourselves here and now in connection with this authorization bill. In 1950—and this by no means is an injection of any partisan note into the debate here today—quite to the contrary, it deals if anything on the other side—the Republicans of the Congress of the United States issued a declaration of principles and policies, and in order that it be in the record, let me read to you this sentence which was included in that declaration of principles and policies:

> We favor full support of the inter-American system as an integral part of the international organization and of our treaty obligations in the North Atlantic community.

I well recall, because I served on the committee which prepared this draft, that a question was raised as to our obli-

gations under the Atlantic Pact, and the suggestion was promptly made that that matter had been passed upon, the treaty confirmed and approved by the Senate of the United States by a vote of 82 to 13, and that our obligations thereunder had been created. But that is not to say there is not every reason in the world to examine what support should be extended, and how much it should be.

In respect to aid otherwise, we said the following:

> We support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is given to our national security; if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford; if it will be effective; and if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself; and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need to remind the responsible Members of the House of Representatives that it is obvious with the appropriation we are making for the security of our country, that we are rushing headlong into more deficit financing with an increase in the national debt. I know that you say, "We all understand that and we all know about it." But, there is no one among you who will not agree with me that in that very process there is a danger signal for this country of ours. Hence we have fought here in respect to appropriations on the home front to bring about a belt tightening, and to avoid as much as possible unnecessary drain upon our economy. Is it too much to ask as we go into these foreign programs, that we exercise that same sort of belt tightening? Is it too much to ask that we should say to the people who we are seeking to help and who we hope will be our friends in the event of trouble, "You, too, must be judicious and helpful and economical in the use of the funds and materials we give you"? Yes; materials that we give them because it is in our own self interest to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Smith amendment. I want to commend the chairman and the members of the committee for the reductions which they made in the committee. In my opinion, however, they have not gone far enough with these reductions.

I think the ECA request could be cut $2,000,000,000 without jeopardizing the military program, and to the great benefit of the American taxpayer who is footing the bill for all this global spending under the ECA program, which includes everything from free farm machinery to hydroelectric dams, powerhouses, and canals.

It is no help to the American taxpayer to tell him that counterpart dollars are being used to construct these huge projects and chains of giant dams, powerhouses, canals, and so forth. Every counterpart dollar that exists anywhere, exists because a corresponding American dollar was first taken from the pocket of an American taxpayer.

House Document No. 198 of this Congress is the twelfth report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration. It covers the period ending March 31, 1951. It is a book containing 156 pages of information on this world-wide spending and give-away program. It would pay everybody to read it and study it. It tells about the chains of giant powerhouses, dams, and canals which we are financing all over Europe and elsewhere in the world, while our own people are being told that we must forego dams, flood control, navigation and irrigation projects because we cannot afford them on account of the military program.

This report gives on page 36 a breakdown of the countries receiving this ECA aid from our taxpayers, and the amount distributed through March 31, 1951, to each. It shows that up to that date the total was $11,221,300,000. It does not include the $83,457,000 Far East aid program through March 31, 1951. That breakdown is on page 62, and shows the amounts given to Formosa, Indochina, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, India, and others, and it does not include the $190,000,000 recently voted to India for grain. Neither does it include the $2,000,000,000 we have given to the Philippines since the war ended, as outlined in the statement of Philippine Ambassador Myron Cowen on June 15, 1951, State Department press release No. 516.

I am convinced that we have given much of our taxpayers' money unnecessarily to countries and to projects that could have gotten along without it. What was the purpose in including Switzerland in the European recovery program? She was not in the war. She stood on the side lines and suffered no devastation. Let it be said to her credit that she accepted none of our money. But she was included in the program, and could have gotten our taxpayers' money by merely holding out her hand.

We owe a national debt of $256,000,000,000. This is nearly twice as much as the combined national debt of all the principal nations which have received or are scheduled to receive American aid. Our per capita debt of $1,682 is higher than the per capita debt of any of those nations. We have imposed about all the taxes our people can bear. Spending is still increasing, as everyone of us in this body knows full well.

Since the ECA plan was first devised and placed into operation, many unexpected events have occurred.

When the ECA program was formulated, the Korean war was not expected, nor was all the expense contemplated which it brought.

When the ECA program was made up the $56,000,000,000 military appropriation bill we passed a few days ago was not contemplated. Neither was the $5,000,000,000 military construction bill we passed last week contemplated, nor was the $7,000,000,000 new tax bill we passed a few weeks ago. We did not contemplate at that time an armed force of 3,500,000 men. Yet all these things have become necessary since that time.

We have been forced to revise our spending upward to the extent of something like a hundred billion dollars, and more to come, but it is claimed here that we cannot revise this foreign-aid program downward by $2,000,000,000. I say it can be revised downward to that extent by reducing this ECA program, and not injure our military program at all. The military aid in this bill will amply take care of the situation.

We have given away since July 1, 1940, through March 31, 1951, a gross sum of $80,649,000,000 as foreign aid. All the revision should not be upward. There must be some revision downward. This is the time and place to begin it.

The $1,000,000,000 reduction which the Smith amendment provides will greatly benefit the American taxpayer, because he is already taxed almost to the limit. This sum can well be taken out of this foreign-aid program from the ECA funds, because European production has already passed prewar levels. I quote the following from the twelfth report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration, page 10:

> There was no slackening in the over-all pace of Western European industrial activity during the first quarter of 1951. While the level of output in some countries fell below that in the previous quarter, it rose to a new high in others. Despite the increasing shortage of raw materials, over-all production for the area averaged 139 percent of prewar levels—a gain of 13 percent over production in the corresponding quarter a year earlier (appendix, table A-1).

How much higher must their production go beyond prewar levels before we cut down on the recovery money we have been sending them? If we cannot begin to cut down on these gifts when production reaches 139 percent of prewar levels, what figure must it reach before we can begin to cut down?

This same ECA report shows on page 13 that coal production in Western Europe averaged about 500,000 tons per month more than in the final quarter of 1950, and 700,000 tons per month more than in the first quarter of last year.

With over-all European production already 139 percent of prewar levels, with more than $11,000,000,000 ECA money already contributed since April 1948, with military aid of more than $6,000,000,000 carried in this bill for ECA countries, why is it not proper to lighten the burden on our own countrymen, when it will not hinder the military program?

Certainly it can be done, and should be done. For these and other good reasons I am supporting the Smith amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. In case that fails, I shall also support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I shall support every reasonable amendment to cut the amount requested. I shall do so because I think such attempts to cut are honest attempts to meet head-on and put some brake upon the profligacy with which we are spending public moneys. May I remind you

that there is no one in this body who stands more strongly for national defense than myself. I shall continue to go the second mile for adequate national defense. I proved that point indubitably by voting recently for over $61,000,000,000 in one short week.

Also, I have all the sympathy in the world for backward or needy nations; I certainly would wish for them all suitable help and progress possible, and I would hope with equal certainty that we might have them with us when we need their help. But, Mr. Chairman, there are limits to our capacity to help; and on that score I approach this bill with more soul-searching than I have given to any other bill before the House. With all that I want to do to help, and I expressed my good will and interest by voting to lend India the money to buy its needed wheat, I have come to the conclusion that we in the House have a responsibility that we are evading. Because of the structure, perhaps, through which we plan legislation and appropriate moneys we seem unable to make an over-all estimate of our national capacity to spend or of the relative importance of the requests for appropriations. Some time ago I introduced a bill, H. R. 3406, for the purpose of setting up a commission to investigate the administration of our overseas operations. We need the results of such an investigation when we are called upon today to vote on this very large and very important bill. But even such investigation is not enough; what I am now suggesting is that a committee of the House and Senate, or a commission, be created which will sit down and face the vital issue of how much money this Nation can actually and safely spend. I would in fact like such a group of experts to settle four questions:

First of all, how big a public debt can we safely carry and remain solvent?

Second, how much of a tax load can we safely put upon the American people?

Third, what within the Constitution is our actual right to tax for foreign projects? And I would submit to you on that score that if you study table 8 in this report you will find there certain items for which we are spending the American taxpayers' money, which might well be questioned if anyone wanted to raise the point.

Fourth, I would have this proposed committee, and every committee or agency that appropriates money or draws plans for which money must be appropriated, make very sure that for what we spend of American money we get something in return. That is no lack of humanitarianism; it is no lack of altruism; it is justifiable and necessary self-interest. Unless we get back something for what we give, it is dishonest to appropriate money.

All that I have said boils down to this: It is time for us to cast out the star dust from our eyes and the fear from our hearts. We know perfectly well the real fear that we should face. I have said over and over again, that my own main fear has been twofold: That by the methods we are adopting in seeking to save our liberty we lose all the liberties we have and the very freedom that we love; and, second, that in this feverish effort to build up national defense we become inextricably enmeshed in the clutches of engulfing militarism. Today, however, I face an even greater fear—the fear of national bankruptcy.

I call your attention to two sets of figures: When I first came to Washington in 1935 our national debt was $28,700,892,625; today it is $257,357,352,351, without including the indirect debt. In 1935 we spent $6,520,965,945 in Federal expenditures; yesterday a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee told me that this year our expenditures for the Federal Government will be from ninety to one hundred billions.

This has been a great country. I use that tense of the verb intentionally. Its greatness was originally based on the endemic strength of human freedom, but it has endured to this day because we Americans have combined with our productive capacity, our idealism, and our sense of spiritual values, a hard core of common sense. We need that common sense today.

Such expenditures as we are continuing to vote make no sense unless we are sure that we can carry the load. I am tempted to say to you, when I think of this increase in spending within the last 16 short years, how crazy can we get?

This then we must know, of this we must be sure, before we appropriate any more huge sums of money: How far can we actually go? You know, as I know, that no national defense itself can stand, let alone world defense, unless we maintain national solvency. If we permit, even in a good cause, even in a noble cause, even in a desire to defend ourselves, the national economy to go bankrupt, our whole house will fall around our ears and with it will go the peace, the safety, and the hope of the free world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for clarity of statement and beauty of expression, there is no Member of this body that excels the gentlewoman who has just left the floor. She is strong and logical in what she has to say, and I salute her.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is the first instance where my position on important public legislation has not completely paralleled that of my devoted, genial, and able friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. The fact that I find myself in disagreement with him makes me wonder just a little bit as to the correctness and soundness of my views. However, Mr. Chairman, I must take a position which is in accordance with what my best judgment dictates, and with this in mind I have to differ from him.

I question no man's motive; I attack no Member's vote. Each must act within the light of his own best judgment and accept responsibility for what he or she may do. I dare say, Mr. Chairman, there is not a Member of this House who has indulged in criticism of the powers that be more liberally than myself. Maybe at times I have been reckless in the declarations I have made.

I have said that the mistakes of the administration handling our problems during and since World War II are responsible for the plight in which we and the rest of the free world find ourselves. I still think that is so. But, whatever the facts may be, Mr. Chairman, I am not relieved of the responsibility of overcoming these mistakes. I must continue to do my best in the interest of my country and to keep the flag still flying. So, being convinced, and profoundly so, that if we are to even hope for survival, we must cultivate friendships and formulate understanding between ourselves and the rest of the world which has not already been overrun by the Communist influence.

I know that committees handling bills of a character similar to that which is before the committee at this time quite frequently provide for margins that would give them some bargaining power. I know that that question arose in the putting together the bill, but that suggestion the chairman of the committee proudly and indignantly spurned, and I honor him for it. He took the position that he was under responsibility to keep good faith with the House, and that, whatever the results might be, he would continue to operate in an atmosphere of complete frankness; that he intended to reduce authorized appropriations to the minimum and take the responsibility of defending them. That I believe he and his committee has done. They have come here with a bill reducing the departmental recommendation something in the neighborhood of three-quarters of a billion dollars. I know they have more understanding of all of the problems involved in this bill than most of the rest of us, and therefore I think their judgment is entitled to greater consideration.

I know one thing, Mr. Chairman, I know that I want to keep the battlefields as far away from our homeland as possible. I have seen the devastation, wreckage, and ruins in areas where battles were fought. I have seen orphaned children in the tens of thousands roaming the streets of formerly great cities like little frightened dumb animals looking for food. I know, Mr. Chairman, that nobody wants war. I know that no one wants to waste the resources of our country; that no one wants to increase the national debt, nor do they want to impose heavier tax burdens upon the people; but, Mr. Chairman, the world situation is so desperate, our freedom is in such great peril, that the law of self-preservation compels us to make all sacrifices necessary to our survival.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Fulton and the Smith amendments are divided into two parts, one to cut the military assistance to Europe the other to cut the economic assistance. I think it would be a great mistake to cut military assistance. I think the whole difficulty in Europe is the slowness with which the Europeans are rearming and the inability of General Eisenhower and the other Americans there to successfully persuade them to

rearm. Nevertheless, I do not see how it would help if we cut the military assistance that we are giving them. I do not think that that will advance our cause or will make Europe more secure. Are we going to stop giving Europeans assistance merely because the Europeans themselves are unwilling to make sacrifices to rearm themselves? I think that would be a mistake. I think it is entirely a different matter however to cut the economic assistance. I do not think sufficient grounds have been shown here why we should not, after all we have given them in the past, cut this tremendous economic aid.

Mr. Foster, in his testimony before the committee, said—and he is talking about the North Atlantic Treaty members:

> We know that Europe's basic resources—such things as coal, steel, electric power, or even their total industrial potential—are roughly one and one-half times that of Russia and her European Communist satellite states.

Industrial production is up 140 percent of what it was in 1938. Their agricultural production is up at least 10 percent in all of the European countries in the North Atlantic Treaty. Yet the Europeans have been unwilling to make sufficient sacrifices to build up their own strength. I do not think there is any doubt but what the cut proposed in the Fulton amendment can be made. I think it is foolish to cut the military assistance, but I do not think there is any doubt but what the economic assistance can be cut. The one nation that is making great sacrifices is Great Britain, and under this bill she is not going to receive any economic assistance.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sure the gentleman would be interested, so far as his argument is concerned, to know just what kind of a balance remains in both the economic and military aid.

Mr. KENNEDY. I know it is a tremendous balance.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will give it to the gentleman. The military balance as of June 30 was $4,782,300,000 and the economic-aid balance was $1,698,000,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the gentleman I am in favor of the economic cut. I do not see any point, however, in making a cut in the military. The great mistake we are making is in the slowness with which Europe is rearming. The one thing that will bring on a war is to rearm Europe gradually and slowly. But I do not think it will help to cut the amount of defense assistance to Europe.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman say that one of General Eisenhower's difficulties was in forcing those people over there to rearm materially?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the great failure is his inability to persuade them to rearm sufficiently. They are going to have under arms at the end of this year only 20 divisions, of which one-third are going to be American, in Western Germany under General Eisenhower.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think we have a fair prospect of winning a war in Western Europe where the people do not want to, will not rearm in their own defense?

Mr. KENNEDY. The prospects are against our making a success of this defense of Western Europe because I think the chances are in favor, at the present slow rate of European rearmament, of the Russians moving in to Western Europe before we are ready, but I think it is a risk that is worth taking. I am in favor of taking it. If you are going to do it at all, if you are going to give them any military assistance, I see no point in cutting the amount we give them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot see any point in attempting to force the people of Western Europe to fight in defense of their homeland if they do not want to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think there can be a good argument for not giving them any military assistance, but if you are going to give them any you might as well give them the full amount. However, I do not think that is true about the economic assistance.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I wonder if the gentleman in reaching the conclusion that he cannot support any cut in the military aid part of it is aware of the provision on page 26 that permits the Army to use equipment and funds under the large bill which we previously passed at any time for this aid here? I feel that that is a considerable hedge if any mistake were made in voting for a reduction.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it must be admitted by all of us who serve on the committee that these figures in the main were pulled out of the air; the figures which the Department sent up, the figures which the chairman used in the introduction of his bill and, too, the figures embodied in the Smith and Fulton amendments which are before us now. It has been very difficult to get information from the Government witnesses. It has almost been, using a homely expression, like trying to pull a rabbit out of a hole with a forked stick. You have just had to twist material information out of these witnesses. I think requests for these amounts should be justified.

I do not think the reductions proposed in the military phase of the amendment will reduce by one gun, one tank, or one airplane the matériel that goes to Europe next year. The amount of matériel to be sent abroad will be determined by the production facilities here in America, and they are being augmented to the maximum at the present time. I would not support an amendment that reduced our military effectiveness.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin said a moment ago, there is now about $4,700,000,000 of unexpended military balances. In addition we appropriated here only a few days ago $56,000,000,000 for defense and there is a provision in this bill which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to allocate to Europe up to 11 percent of either with or without compensation, production authorized in that bill. I do not think that means there is going to be any lessening of the sending of arms to Europe by reason of the adoption of either one of these amendments.

It means there will be available for Europe, if the Secretary of Defense sees fit to use it, more than eleven billion in arms.

So far as the proposed reductions in economic aid are concerned Mr. Foster or Mr. Bissell, when they were before the committee, stated that except for the rearmament program, only $672,000,000 is all that would be needed to complete the economic program in Europe. The rearmament program has not been stepped up appreciably in Europe. As has been repeated here, the defense budget in the NATO countries ranges from 2 percent to 9.7 percent. The rearmament program in Europe has not been stepped up enough to justify the proposed increase in economic aid even if it is to be used for that purpose. But further, as has been said, there is $1,500,000,000 of the counterpart funds, all of which could be used as economic aid to the defense effort—and, I think, most of it should be used for that purpose. There is $600,000,000 of the counterpart funds that has been used to pay off the national debt of those countries. Since we have moved into a military emergency, I think all of the counterpart funds, or almost all of the counterpart funds, should be used in the defense effort. These counterpart funds more than equal the amount of the proposed bill in economic aid.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, agree with me that one of the major obstacles confronting the European nations in their rearmament program is the shortage of, and inability of those countries to get, the raw materials needed for rearmament. Such raw materials being steel, coal, iron and so forth. The other factor in the problem is their lack of machine tools and the factories to produce these materials. That is one of the reasons why this economic aid has been stepped up over the $672,000,000 needed to finish out the Marshall plan, to permit them to use this additional new dollar economic aid to build up their economies so they will be able to make military preparations.

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The industrial capacity of the NATO nations has been increased to 142 percent of the 1938 production.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is in consumer goods.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The industrial capacity of the NATO nations has been increased 142 percent of what it was in 1938.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is for consumer goods.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That is for all goods.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is right; they are consumer goods, not military goods.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The industrial capacity has been stepped up to 142 percent of what it was in 1938. Every nation is better off. As a further indication, there is practically no unemployment in any of the NATO countries. The report in connection with this bill discusses the problem for setting up the machinery to transport labor from Italy and a few countries where there is a surplus into the NATO countries. Those countries are just as well off economically, as compared to 1938 standards, today as we are.

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman is in good company, when he talks for a cut, because Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, came out for a billion-dollar cut, and Senator BLAIR MOODY, who has just returned from Europe yesterday, said, according to the Detroit Free Press: "MOODY finds United States aid to Europe costly and said it can be had cheaper."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, if my friend will yield, my good friend from Tennessee and my good friend from Pennsylvania know that when the Senator from Illinois said he was for a billion-dollar cut he fell right into the same trap that you have fallen into—he was completely unable to justify one dime of that cut.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. We have heard a good deal about the justification for this. There has been little justification before this committee. Talk about secret testimony—there has been very little testimony given before our committee bearing upon the important phases of this bill that could not have been given to the public.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, like many of the other Members who have spoken recently, pay my respects to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I believe they are sincere in their approach to the problem before us. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], in his 5-minute talk a few moments ago, said that he wanted to present a few facts. I think he did, to the best of his ability. I find no fault with his presentation. However, he did not present many facts. I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and therefore would not be as familiar with the details of this legislation as the members of the committee. But I frankly wonder how much factual information was presented to the committee itself.

Since the day Admiral Denfield was fired for stating facts before the Armed Services Committee—a regular standing committee of the House of Representatives—I have felt that words have been put into the minds and mouths of all witnesses to present solely the administration's viewpoint. In other words, I do not accuse them of telling us untruths. I do not believe that. Most of these witnesses are fine, respectable gentlemen, but I question whether they tell us all the truth. I question whether they give us all the facts. The reason they do not is that to a degree their mouths have been closed, therefore we do not get all the facts.

Mr. Chairman, the question whether or not we should make an effort to reduce this bill can best be answered by two experiences I had within the last week. One of them was upon the return of a business friend of mine from a two and a half months' tour of Europe. He took his own automobile with him, and he went around, up and down the highways and byways of Europe. He did not spend his time in the embassies; he did not spend his time with ECA officials, but with the business folks and rank-and-file citizens of Central Europe.

After he told me his story, I said, "Could you, in one sentence, tell me exactly what your conclusion is as to the thinking of the people in Central Europe in relation to this foreign-aid problem?"

He answered, "I believe the honest opinion of the average citizen of Europe is that they are not convinced they should go all out in an effort to assist the United States of America, for the simple reason that they believe the United States of America will expend itself and be broke within the next 20 years, because of the extensive, costly programs we follow."

That shocked me. Even the average citizen of Europe questions our ability to stand these heavy drains on our resources and therefore questions the wisdom of following our recommendations.

The very next day I ran into another friend of mine. He is not a politician. As far as I know, he knows nothing about politics. He is down here doing a job for his country as a good, patriotic, American citizen. We visited a little while, and I tried to feel him out as to his views on this bill presently before us. To my astonishment he said he felt one would be right and justified in voting for a reduction in this bill or even against the entire bill.

I am not going to say anything to identify this individual, because he occupies a highly important position in Government affairs today. He deals with high-level policy and has first-hand knowledge of facts, both in Europe and in this country.

During the course of my conversation with him about this eight and one-half billion foreign-aid program, I spoke of the $56,000,000,000 bill we had just passed, and the five-billion-odd-dollar bill for military public works. He said, "Do you know that the most surprised people in Washington when the House of Representatives passed the $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill for defense was the Pentagon people?" And he emphasized that he knew it to be a fact from his contacts daily with them.

I inquired as to why that would be so, and he said, "For the simple reason that they did not expect to get that much. But they got it, and now they are going to worry about what to do with it should the Senate provide the same amount of funds as the House did.

I think we are justified in standing up here today and voting for cuts, both in the military aid and the economic aid. I should like to emphasize that out of that $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill for defense sufficient money is available for military assistance abroad.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. As I understand it, under the terms of this bill, the $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill, which we made available to the military, is also available for the military assistance part of this program, if it should so happen that this committee did not vote a sufficient sum?

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. With reference to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the fifty-six billion made available under the appropriation bill is available for use under this bill up to 11 percent.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned these two experiences as indicative of the opinion of those who really know the facts. I should like to present a few conclusions of my own.

This bill is presented to us as part of our over-all defense program. It purports to be a bill to help maintain the security of the American people. In my opinion, that is its only valid justification for even being considered.

If the proposed expenditure of seven-billion-eight-hundred-and-forty-eight-million-odd dollars contemplated by this bill did not have some relationship to our own people's security, I would vote against this entire measure without the slightest hesitation. I am willing to consider it only on the premise that it may be to the best interests of the American people themselves.

One of the primary reasons we are in this sorry international mess today is that our own leaders have not been disposed to place the interests of the United States first. If they had, they certainly would not have made such extensive concessions to the demands of other nations and thereby produced this state of insecurity. There have been times when I have honestly felt that our own leaders have been more interested in the wants and needs of other peoples than in the wants and needs of our own people.

And so, I say, the time has long since arrived when we should think solely in terms of the best interests of the United States, first, last, and always. I have become weary and disgusted with the oft-repeated arguments that not to grant this aid or that, or not to follow some

particular course of action will cause an adverse reaction abroad. We seem to forget that while it is to our advantage to have foreign allies, they need us much more than we need them.

You may be sure that the policy of Great Britain, France, or any of the other so-called allies is firmly based on the premise as to what is to their own best interests. They are interested in us only to the extent that our interests are mutual or to their own nationalistic advantage. But I am not at all sure that the policy which our State Department pursues is based on the premise as to what is to the best interests of the United States. And this fact may readily account for our failure to win the peace and our costly diplomatic failures. Our leaders rarely stand firm but instead have repeatedly yielded.

The sole question I ask myself in connection with this bill is: Will it serve the American people? Will it help give them security? Or is there a sounder and better way to reach that objective?

No one is more keenly interested in our national defense than I. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have consistently supported to the fullest the various bills for a sound national defense. I have also given my support to the various appropriations for that purpose.

In honest belief that various foreign-aid programs would serve our own interests and materially help our people in the defense of their freedom against the threat of communism, I have given these programs my support. Permit me to remind you that this ECA program or Marshall plan was first adopted by the Republican Eightieth Congress, in which it was my privilege to serve as majority whip. Indeed, it was at the insistence of the Republican Congress, over the objection of the administration, that aid to the Nationalist government of China was included in the bill. I have also given my support to the legislation to aid Greece and Turkey in their fight against the Communists.

In short, I have supported foreign-aid programs to the extent that I believed they would serve the best interests of the American people. And I think they have had a real value in that respect.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are definite limits to what the United States can and should do by way of foreign aid even in our own self-interests. We certainly cannot subsidize the world. It is certainly not in our own best interests to have our own people endure a lower standard of living in order to raise the standard of living of other peoples to our own level. It must be borne in mind that with the help of the Marshall plan the productivity of Western European countries is already substantially above the prewar level. The Marshall plan has served its purpose, and the time has come to bring about its termination.

It seems to me that the extent and nature of the foreign-aid program being advanced by the administration goes well beyond what would best serve our own interests. In fact, it is of such size and character as presented to us by the administration that I am inclined to believe the program to be contrary to our best long-range interests.

As originally proposed by the administration, the bill would authorize a total expenditure of $8,500,000,000. To the credit of the Foreign Affairs Committee, this was reduced by some $651,250,000, leaving the amount contained in this bill at $7,848,750,000. That in itself is a tremendous sum, but it is only part of what is actually proposed.

This bill of almost $8,000,000,000 is but part of a $25,000,000,000 program of assistance to foreign nations proposed by the administration, for the the next 3 years. This bill inaugurates an entirely new program to be known as the mutual security program. The Marshall plan as such terminates, and we are proposing to enter upon this mutual-security plan.

I honestly believe that our economy cannot stand this strain. Our people are already overburdened with taxes, with an increase pending, and the prospects of still further increases. They are suffering from the rise in prices due to shortages of materials and extensive Government spending. In order to help the weak, we ourselves must be strong. If we enter upon such extensive programs as this we will be actually destroying ourselves.

I have seen various estimates of the amount of foreign aid already extended by the United States. One estimate is that, in one form or another, we have extended foreign aid to the extent of $115,000,000,000. This is equivalent to the physical assets of the five great States—Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin. I think it can be said that foreign aid is going beyond the realm of reality into the realm of fantasy. But it is bitter reality to the American taxpayers who defray the costs.

And so I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of foreign aid to be extended by this bill can be and should be substantially reduced. It must be recognized that our own defense demands are extraordinary. As I mentioned at the outset, just last week we passed a defense appropriation bill of around $56,000,000,000. We also authorized a military and naval public-works bill for which appropriations are subsequently to be made in the amount of $5,700,000,000.

Insofar as I am personally concerned, I intend to vote for the various amendments to be offered which will reduce the amount embodied in this bill. I propose to support only those items and those amounts where it can be clearly shown that our own defense and our own best interests will be advanced. If, at the end of consideration of the bill, I still find it unrealistic and excessive, I will have no alternative but to vote against the bill. I am ever mindful of the all-important fact that our first line of defense is our own fiscal stability.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have but 5 minutes; I cannot yield now but will later if I have time.

Mr. Chairman, I made some remarks on this bill yesterday in which I indicated that I thought there were places where it might well be cut. I think those Members who know me know that I have joined with Members on the minority side, with Members on the majority side, or with anybody else that would help me during this session of Congress to cut down unnecessary expenses. I think in this bill we are confronted in title I, the defense of Europe, with an entirely different proposition. I do not think we can consider the question of economy on the defense of Europe and I want to tell you why. We have the Atlantic Treaty. We committed ourselves and our country to the defense of Europe. We then followed that by sending General Eisenhower to Europe. We followed that by sending our own divisions and our own troops to Europe, and they are there today. I think it is unfortunate that we should be having this debate today; I think it may raise a little question psychologically in the mind of some of our soldiers, both here and there, when they find the Congress debating the question of whether we are going to cut down what General Eisenhower has told us he needs for the defense of Europe.

We fought two world wars and by fighting them over there we prevented ourselves from having to fight them on our own soil. I do not know much about warfare, but I imagine that we had better fight these battles somewhere else. So that was probably in the mind of the leadership of this country in doing what we are doing here. So I very much hope that the Members will give very serious consideration to the question of our obligation, not only to European countries, but our obligation under the United Nations Treaty, our obligation to General Eisenhower, our obligation to our own divisions now on European soil, before we make any cut in title I of this bill, which is aid to Europe.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I do not care to yield; I have only a little bit of time.

Mr. Chairman, there are other items in this bill. It is perhaps unfortunate that in a bill of this kind we have to cover the whole face of the earth and everything in it, and a lot of matters that are more or less unrelated to the main thing in the bill, but it seems to me beyond any question of a shadow of doubt that the main and the vital point in this bill is this title I of whether we are going to lay down on the line all of the moneys needed as we will subsequently have to lay down on the line, God forbid, all the men who are needed to defend the life of this Nation on European soil. When I say what I do say, I say it with the deepest affection and regard for all of my colleagues who entertain doubts on this bill. I know it is a difficult question; I have been troubled with it myself; and I know that every Member, whether he is for or against this proposition, is speaking from the depths of his

deepest conviction for the welfare of his country, and that is what I am seeking to do now. I just feel that this question of not denying to Eisenhower as long as we keep him over there and not denying to our own divisions in Europe as long as we keep them over there anything that they may need in the way of arms and ammunition is vital to the defense and the welfare of this Nation and to the peace of the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time not to slow up anyone else, but a matter has arisen which I think requires clarification before the debate goes further on this bill.

In section 509, page 26, there appears a provision for which I was responsible in committee which would allow the Secretary of Defense to utilize up to 11 percent of the appropriations that he has received in the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952 for military-end items for the purposes of this bill. That provision got into the bill for the reason I felt from the outset that insofar as the military-end items part of this bill is concerned, that was an essential part of our defense and there ought to be one single appropriation for our Defense Department to take care of all of our defense needs from which a portion would be assigned as the Defense Department felt necessary to this European scene. That view was not accepted by the committee. However, section 509 as now written was accepted, together with the money authorization for military-end items.

The 11 percent provided for in this section and the total authorization for military-end items in this bill are almost exactly the same amount when translated into dollars. But at the moment I make a plea for maintaining the authorization intact in this bill.

I think the Appropriations Committee has got a real responsibility when this bill comes to that committee to find out from the military whether they are going to require every dollar of the fifty-two billion that we have already appropriated to them for end items for our own internal defense and for the Korean war or whether from that fifty-two billion they can assign a part, up to 11 percent, for the European theater. If that can be done, then, certainly, the appropriation for these military-end items can be cut down materially. But that is a determination that can be made only by a study of the requirements of the military for domestic purposes as well as for the Korean war. Therefore, I think that determination should be held in abeyance until this bill gets before the Appropriations Committee.

I feel as does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that we ought to do nothing that would look here as though we were deliberately cutting out military aid to Europe at a time when the entire morale of the people of Europe is largely dependent on whether they feel we are going to stand by them or not. However, we should not spend an unnecessary dollar in doing that. If the Appropriations Committee finds there is enough money in existing appropriations, then new appropriations for end items can be very materially cut down. But let us make certain before we cut down.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. I wonder if the gentleman realizes what he is putting up to the Appropriations Committee. Has he forgotten that every single dollar of that $56,000,000,000 heretofore appropriated has already been screened and approved by the Appropriations Committee? Now, he says, go back to the Appropriations Committee and ask them to consider it all over again.

Mr. HERTER. Yes; I mean exactly that. A statement was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] in which he told this House that he as chairman of that subcommittee would do that very thing. Am I not correct in that understanding?

Mr. GARY. We will do that. But I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill which was passed here recently, the military defense bill, did not include any sums for Korea or for the war in Korea. If that war continues, it is estimated that $5,000,000,000 additional will have to be reported to carry on the war in Korea. I want to keep the RECORD straight on that.

Mr. HERTER. That may very well be true. I want to point out to the gentleman that in the bill which passed the House, of the $56,000,000,000 appropriated $28,000,000,000 were for end items, identically similar to those which will be furnished to Europe under the $5,700,000,000 that is to be authorized for end items under this bill.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be limited on this title to 1½ hours from the present time.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will make his request only on the amendments before us now and dispose of the military side of it, and then come in and debate on its own merits the economic side.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I will revise my request and ask unanimous consent that the time on the two amendments before us be limited to 1 hour.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the distinguished chairman that he let this debate continue for a reasonable time, considering the number of Members who have arisen and who have not had 1 minute to speak on this floor.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been in a quandary for a considerable length of time as to what I ought to do about supporting this bill in its original form. I have finally come to the conclusion that I cannot support this bill in its original form and probably not support it even if it is amended. I realize that when I make this decision that I am probably placing whatever is left of my political ambitions somewhat in jeopardy. There is a large segment of voting population in my district who are fine, outstanding, loyal, and patriotic Americans, who have a vital interest in certain parts of this bill, and I am frank to admit that I do not cherish my inability to be of specific help to them. But I do not like package bills. This is another one of those bills that has confronted me here during my limited tenure in the House which does not give me what I call freedom of expression. I am compelled to take the bad with the good, or if I do not do that, I have to discard the good or not participate in the activities of this legislation whatsoever, and this is exactly what I am confronted with again today as I have been on numerous occasions in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of making some of these drastic cuts. I think it is very necessary for the preservation of our economic stability and for our future welfare. I would like to call attention to a number of statements made on this floor, all of which were implemented with the idea of hurry, hurry, hurry; get this legislation over with; get it passed; get money over there and get troops over there; get arms over on the other side; the people are waiting and they are crying and screaming and impatient, and they want the American people to hurry, which means, so far as my congressional district is concerned, consisting of 360,000 people, that I have to go to them and say, "Dig down in your pocketbooks; get out your tax money; jack up the taxes; increase appropriations in order that you might hurry and hurry and hurry to satisfy the demands and the cries and the screams over there." Well, I have not heard anything like that, the need for this special hurry from over there.

By way of contrast, I just want to point this out. It was not so very long ago when on the Korean battlefields a brave American army was in dire stress and in danger, not because of lack of any inherent patriotism and loyalty of our troops, but because of lack of manpower and lack of proper equipment.

I should like to have any Member on this floor get up today in this cry for "Hurray, do not wait," and name me one single member of a legislative body in Europe who then or now has risen on the floor in his parliamentary body and cried "Hurry, get on with it and vote some money, get our troops out in the field to help the American Army in Korea because they are in dire trouble and desperately need our help and support." I have yet to hear a word today from any member anywhere, or read about it, where presently the members of any

parliamentary body are crying for and saying, "Let us hurry, let us get some troops and arms over into Korea and get this over with." That is why we furnish 80 percent of the manpower and 83 percent of the cost of the equipment and war material and everything else in Korea, and our supposed allies carry the 20 percent and the 17 percent load and not more.

May I say in conclusion that I have a great deal of respect for some of the ladies and gentlemen who have spoken on the floor of this House today. The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services is a learned man with a record of great experience. It is evident by the talks he made that he knows his subject and knows it exceptionally well. He led me to believe in his talk here the other day, Mr. Chairman, that one of the underlying causes for supporting this legislation and voting billions was intended to pave the way for inculcating in the hearts and spirit and minds of the people of Europe some of the philosophies that prevail in connection with the operation of our Government here in the United States so we could grapple the people in Furope not now behind the iron curtain to our philosophies with hoops of steel. What is the answer? Name me one country in Europe anywhere among those in the Atlantic Pact that has adopted our philosophies. On the contrary, we had better be careful that we do not absorb their philosophies over here and turn into a socialistic country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are traveling down the road to national ruin against which George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and the other great statesmen of the past, warned us. America is being dragged down to bankruptcy. The further you go down this international road, the sooner we are likely to reach the end.

Lenin, the Russian Communist leader, said 30 years ago that the way to destroy the United States of America was to bankrupt her. That is the policy they are following now.

They brand me as an "isolationist," because I am a nationalist. I am for building up America. I supported the increased Air Force bill. If we will build the strongest Air Force on earth, build up our naval facilities, build a radar perimeter to cover the entire Western Hemisphere, we can protect this country throughout the years to come against any enemy that would dare attack us.

But if you keep on dragging America down toward national bankruptcy, and sending our boys to fight other people's battles all over the world, and increasing the tax burdens of the American people, when our Government already owes more money than all the rest of the nations of the earth put together, you will take this country right down the road to national bankruptcy, if not to utter destruction.

I had this argument with President Roosevelt on lifting the embargo in 1939. I told him then that if we lifted that embargo it would give France and England a green light to go on into a war they did not want, with the understanding that we were coming in with them. I said that the things to do was to keep England, the United States, and France out of that war and let Russia and Germany fight it out. That is what we should have done. Instead of that, our country sacrificed 1,300,000 men—killed, wounded, and missing—in that war, spent more than $300,000,000,000, and then turned the victory over to Communist Russia—the worst enemy our Christian civilization has ever known.

Now, Mr. Truman has plunged us into a war in Korea, without even consulting the Congress of the United States. In Korea alone we have lost more men than we lost in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Spanish-American War, and the Mexican War—all combined. Still nobody knows where we are going.

You talk about Russia attacking the rest of the world. Why, that little group of Asiatics, that have control in Russia, know that if the white Christians in the Ukraine, whose people they have murdered in the most beastly manner, ever get a chance at them, their yellow heads are going to roll in the sawdust. They are afraid to start a war with any other country, because they know that the Ukranians, and other peoples, whose relatives have been murdered by them, will rise up and chop their yellow heads off at the first opportunity.

Take Poland—Members who are looking at me now heard a representative of the American people, who had just come back from Poland, tell us that the little racial minority group of Yiddish Communists in control in Poland, were treating the Polish people worse than if they were dogs. They are not going to start a war, because they know their yellow heads will roll in the sawdust, if the people of Poland ever get a chance at them.

The same thing is happening in Czechoslovakia, the same thing in Yugoslavia, and in all the other Communist controlled countries throughout the world, and especially in Europe.

If we are going to save America for Americans, we had better follow the advice laid down by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and the other great statesmen of the past, and stop bankrupting our own country and sacrificing American boys to fight other peoples' wars and to finance Communist, or near-Communist countries all over the world.

Is it not ridiculous for this Congress to vote money to build power dams in Belgium, in Italy, or in Israel, or to construct flood-control and power projects on the Ganges River in Asia, or in South America, at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers of the United States, and then refuse to appropriate a small amount to speed up the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway—the missing link in our national defense program, as well as the missing link in our internal waterway system?

If this project were in Italy, Israel, Belgium, India, or any other foreign country, the chances are that you would have no trouble in getting the funds with which to speed up its construction.

But it is in America; and its construction would contribute greatly to America's defense.

It would shorten the water distance between the Gulf and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by more than 800 miles, and would cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to the Tennessee River by more than 75 percent—or from $2.79 to 62 cents a ton.

It would shorten the water distance between the Gulf and our new atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio River, by more than 300 miles, and reduce the cost of transportation by more than 60 percent—or from $2.47 to 89 cents a ton.

It would be worth untold hundreds of millions of dollars to western Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, and all the other States drained by the Mississippi River and its tributaries; because it would furnish what would amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, and the Great Lakes.

But it is in America, and its construction would contribute to our national-defense program and to the prosperity of the American people.

Therefore, it must wait, while you bleed the American people to construct similar projects in other countries, all over the world.

I am going to vote for every one of these cuts, and then I am going to vote against the passage of this so-called foreign-aid bill, because I think its passage would simply be dragging America down to destruction.

We cannot afford to vote seven or eight billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money for foreign countries and refuse to appropriate funds to strengthen our own country and to protect our own people.

Let us get back to the policies of the great statesmen of the past, whose leadership made our country great, and save America for Americans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not offering this motion merely for purposes of delay. Like the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I propose to vote against the bill, no matter what you do to it. Experience has demonstrated that the program is a failure—a waste of money, of the lives of our men, and the hearings in the other body show that its chief advocate now seriously doubts its soundness; yes, practically admits it has been and will continue to be a failure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if in your remarks you would not discuss the preamble of this bill: "to maintain the security and to promote the foreign policy and to provide for the general welfare of the United States."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, rather than express my own

opinion about it, because it might be said that I am a little biased or prejudiced against continuing to weaken ourselves by giving to people. Permit me to give you the views of a gentleman who has been on the other side of this issue, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee which has been handling the foreign policy which has gotten us into the situation we are now in. I will quote from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we have been told that this bill and this plan was to cut ECA off in Europe largely, and to divert the funds that have heretofore been allotted to ECA to the military and the arming of Western Europe. That is what we have been told.

You come up here for hundreds of millions for southeast Asia. What does that have to do with work in Europe of an economic nature, or rearming Western Europe?

Mr. FOSTER. It has this to do with it, Mr. Chairman. We have out in that area, as I said earlier, numerically the greatest number of free peoples yet——

The CHAIRMAN. They are not free if they are in the shape you are talking about. We have to go out there and furnish them the money to do all these things for them. How are they free?

Mr. FOSTER. They are free in terms of having their own governments; they are free in terms of having the ability to make their own decisions; they are free in terms of the possibility of hope for the future and they are free in terms of being able to enter into international trade and to provide us with a great many of the things which we need to do this job in Europe to which you refer.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the shoemaker should stick to his last. You were appointed to take care of ECA over in Europe, get out of the business over in Europe and to divert the funds you have been receiving for ECA to the military rearming of Western Europe and here you are putting the main emphasis on going out to southeast Asia and chasing a problem out there instead of sticking to Western Europe. Western Europe is our danger if we are going to be invaded or are going to be attacked. It will be through Western Europe if we are attacked. I do not agree with your philosophy at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to make one correction. I do not think we are putting the main emphasis on South and southeast Asia. I think it is an important point.

The CHAIRMAN. You have in your testimony here made more noise about that than anything else you have said.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps more noise, sir, but I doubt if there was more emphasis. I felt it was important for this committee to understand that there is a substantial interest for the security of the United States in helping south and southeast Asia and the Middle East and the Near East.

I hope that answers the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. They came before the committee over there with one idea, and that was we were to help Western Europe, and in the bill they have hundreds of millions of dollars, according to the chairman, to go down into southeast Asia. So, apparently, it is just an attempt by a fraudulent representation not to get money for the announced purpose, but to get millions for the purpose of doing what they want to do. Permit another quotation which shows how they use the money:

The CHAIRMAN. Helping everybody. You say it is world-wide. You have to help everybody. The United States cannot preserve its own freedom; it cannot preserve its own productivity if, according to you, we have to take care of the whole world. That is what you said earlier.

Mr. FOSTER. I say, sir, that the free world is important to our own security and I think, therefore, it is in our interest to contribute to maintaining the whole free world.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that is our business, to maintain the whole free world?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you going to get the revenue and the money and the taxes to do that? The fellows who spend all your time spending money for the Government do not ever think about how we have to struggle here in Congress to get the money. Right down the hall now the Finance Committee is in session struggling with a tremendous tax bill. You want to take that money that is squeezed out of our people and take it over across on the other side of the world to build up and take care of those little wobbling countries. Is that your philosophy?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not anything I want to do. These things are forced on the United States by a situation created by others.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not the whole United States.

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You act like it. You talk like you are the whole United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no such illusions. I have a job which I am attempting to do, to contribute, as I see it, to improving the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to do it as you see it. How about as Congress sees it?

And with that statement about it, I hope you will let me agree.

The Marshall plan, the ECA, is a ruinous world-wide policy. Permit another quotation showing that the United States cannot preserve its own freedom, productivity, while operating a world-wide ECA:

The CHAIRMAN. Helping everybody. You say it is world-wide. You have to help everybody. The United States cannot preserve its own freedom; it cannot preserve its own productivity if, according to you, we have to take care of the whole world. That is what you said earlier.

Mr. FOSTER. I say, sir, that the free world is important to our own security and I think, therefore, it is in our interest to contribute to maintaining the whole free world.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that is our business, to maintain the whole free world?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe so.

That, may I suggest, is the Henry Wallace idea.

I say to our colleagues who are on this committee, do you think you are going to for one moment take care of the whole world? That is the purpose of Mr. Foster.

Then the chairman asked where would we get the money? Again I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you going to get the revenue and the money and the taxes to do that? The fellows who spend all their time spending money for the Government do not ever think about how we have to struggle here in Congress to get the money. Right down the hall now the Finance Committee is in session struggling with a tremendous tax bill. You want to take that money that is squeezed out of our people and take it over across on the other side of the world to build up and take care of those little wobbling countries. Is that your philosophy?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not anything I want to do. These things are forced on the United States by a situation created by others.

I suggest that you read the testimony, read the questions and answers and assertions of the chairman of that committee. If there ever was an advocate of this foreign policy, it was the gentleman who presided over the committee hearings of the other body. In effect, if not in words, he said, "You are not going to rearm Europe. You are not trying to defend Europe, you intend to follow part of the Wallace program of doing good throughout the world."

This request for funds is a fraud perpetrated on us when they ask for money to rearm in Europe, then use it for other purposes in other lands.

Let me repeat, those are not my words. They are the words of the chairman of the committee which handled this bill in the other body. Now, unless you are to assume that his change of mind is not based on our experience, is not because he sees the futility and the danger of this program, but because he has his eye on an election in 1952, why do you not think a little, I say to our Committee on Foreign Affairs? Why do not you think that maybe there is a possibility that you who started this thing may be mistaken? But no, you will not do that. You just close your minds and you go right on; more and more dollars; more bankruptcy; more young men being killed abroad.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]—I am sure he is a man of more than average ability and integrity, and I am sure he will serve in this body and in the other body for many years to come with profit to the country and honor to himself.

Among other things, the gentleman said that General Eisenhower's difficulty and that of others was in forcing, and he may, in his revision, change that to influencing the people there to rearm.

If they do not want a war, do not, will not rearm without being forced to do so, can a war in their country be won without their support?

The situation seems to be somewhat similar to that of the manager of a prize fighter who must force his man to put on the gloves and stay in the ring. Apparently we are trying to force the people of Western Germany to rearm and fight a war they do not want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The gentleman from New York, a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible to talk against this motion which the gentleman from Michigan has just offered?

The CHAIRMAN. Only for 5 minutes, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I tell my colleagues that I expect to speak against the motion, and I hope the Committee will turn down the motion. This is a serious matter that we have before us, and it ranks in importance with the

appropriations for our own armed services. I do not believe this Committee would think for a moment of being irresponsible enough to toss over the vitally important remainder of the great alliance which was successful in World Wars I and II, and which we are counting on to protect us against the possibility of world war III, in any such summary fashion as to vote favorably on this motion.

I would like to clarify two things.

First, let us understand that the answer to the military cut has been made best by the gentleman from Masschusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If we want to arm Western Europe, we want arm it in a hurry—and it is a fact, and I state it as a fact—that Europe can mobilize the men if we give them the equipment—then, certainly, the authorization for equipment is no place to cut. We know the time is limited. We know the danger is great. We have to get the end items to arm and men ready to receive them in Western Europe. Certainly it is a short-sighted saving if we cut the military provision.

My colleague from Massauchetts [Mr. HERTER] has well pointed out that his saving provision with regard to end items that can move out of the regular military appropriation will not cure the cut in the military authorization in this bill, because the additional amount of money in this bill is needed for the purpose to be served by this bill, and he himself, therefore, opposes the military-aid cut.

I would like to call to the attention of the Committee the consequences of the economic cut.

If members will look at page 20 of the Committee's report they will find that $840,000,000 of the total amount to Europe for economic aid is for rearmament; it is for coal, steel, leather, machine tools, and other items in order to enable the Western European peoples themselves to manufacture equipment to effect rearmament. The remainder between that amount of $840,000,000 and the amounts in the bill for economic aid amounts to approximately $500,000,000 according to the Committee's figures with respect to the completion of the Marshall plan there—and I think this is very important—we should understand that the peoples who are to get the whole of this $500,000,000 are in Austria, Western Germany, Greece, and Italy. This is no longer money that is going to France, England, and other countries that had been provided for in Marshall plan funds; this is going to the hard core of nations who are really having fundamental economic difficulties and which we are anxious to save economically. These figures are disclosed, and they are in the Committee's report on page 20.

A cut in economic aid represents a diminution in one of two things: One, the amount that is going to buttress armament by manufacture and self help in Western Europe itself; or, two, the amount that is going to Austria, Western Germany, Greece, and Italy, which we are anxious to sustain in the paths of freedom.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Do I understand that the gentleman from New York opposes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania completely, and therefore differs from the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who opposes only the military cut in my amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I oppose both of the gentleman's cuts. I am sorry but I did not hear the gentleman from Massachusetts express himself as favoring the gentleman's economic cut.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I made no such statement.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman favor the economic cut?

Mr. JAVITS. May I go on, if the gentleman will permit me? Another question that has been brought up is that of counterpart. Counterpart funds represent internal money in each country participating in ECA. Counterpart will not buy imported iron ore, imported coal, or imported leather, or machine tools or others of the things which these European nations need for rearmament; but only to such extent as it can be bought by such one country from another under their trade relations. That is the nature of the counterpart money referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]; and counterpart funds could not be used to make up a half-billion-dollar deficiency if we cut the bill. We took that into consideration.

One further point, you have been told about the increased production in Europe. Production in Europe has increased up to approximately 142 percent of 1938, but that is absolutely essential to Europe because of the fact that they have to import their raw materials and much food and raw materials and food have gone up very much in price, so much so, in fact, that despite all this emphasis on increased production, the standards of living of the people today in the Western European countries to participate in this program is just about what it was in 1938, and has not improved at all—that is the standard that counts.

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

The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the number of words to be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken any time on this bill so far because I could not get any time. But as we listen to the colossal sums that we have already voted in the name of national defense and peace of the world, well might the Members of the House of Representatives reflect and say to themselves: "I wonder if I am becoming one of the instruments for the destruction of my own country?" The amounts are so large that the average citizen of the United States does not pay any attention to them any more because he cannot understand what they mean. I do not believe the United States can take the whole world on its lap, and nurse it forever without destroying itself.

Yesterday the Public Works Committee was in session; we were called together to consider about a dozen bills for the erection of post offices, courthouses, and the purchase of sites for post offices. One of our Members made a most convincing appeal to the committee for the necessity, almost the tragic necessity, for the building of a courthouse and post office in one of the cities of his district. It was suggested to him by one of the other members that if his congressional district were somewhere in Europe, no doubt his plea would be given attention and the money provided to build what he needed.

For 10 mortal weeks, and I use the word "mortal," during this session of Congress in the early part of the spring that same committee was considering the St. Lawrence seaway, and over and over again witnesses appeared before the committee and said: "We just cannot afford to do this; it costs too much," even though the top-flight officials of our Government, charged with the defense of our country, came before our committee testifying that that project was necessary and essential for the defense of our country. How much would it cost? $566,000,000, said the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, General Pick. But it was denied. The project has been laid aside. It will not be heard again for months, perhaps not until next year, perhaps not until the next Congress. Yet in this bill before us this afternoon, if it passes, and I assume it will pass, we are going to send 12 St. Lawrence seaways to Europe, all in the name of national defense.

I think we are doing what Russia wants us to do. We are all for the defense of our country and the saving of it. The question that you might well ask in your mind today is this: Is the United States Government as a world leader more able to preserve peace in this world and prevent war as a solvent nation or is it more able to do so as a bankrupt nation? A bankrupt business does not long continue; it just vanishes from the face of the earth. A bankrupt government, like ours will be if we continue the road we are traveling on now, will also cease to function and we will vanish as a republic from the face of the earth. I say, we are doing, I think, what Russia intends we should do, and that is bleed ourselves white until we are so weak we will no longer be a world leader, and thus make it easier for communism to spread her wet and bloody blanket over the face of the earth. If we remain solvent and strong we can serve the purpose of peace better, in my judgment, than if we go bankrupt.

Of course, I, like many of you, voted for the $56,000,000,000 bill the other day. What do the people back home think of the course we are pursuing? I was home at the end of last week and talked to some of the citizens of my district. They cannot understand

the action of their Congress here in Washington. They do not believe that their country—our country, yours and mine—is able to stand the strain that has been put upon it by the voting of these colossal sums which only means, of course, in the days ahead more and heavier taxes, although every citizen now knows he is working one-third of the year just to pay for the cost of Government. Four months out of every year he is the slave of Government.

I have listened to a number of people who have been around this world since the last election and without exception, even though we have poured billions of dollars around the world in an effort to prevent war and keep peace, they have come back here and said that you would be surprised at the amount of unfriendliness and resentment held by other nations of the world toward us. They think we are imperialistic. Even some of the nations receiving aid from us are unfriendly.

I shall vote to reduce the amount in this bill by supporting the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. It is disheartening to learn that next year and the year after bills for a similar amount—about $8,000,000,000—are to be presented for further aid to Europe. What a bleak prospect for the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in the same position as the gentleman from North Dakota, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Mississippi. I am not going to vote for this bill either, and I am not going to vote for it, Mr. Chairman, because about 5 years ago we established an International Bank that gave every country in Europe an opportunity to go there and get money. They have the right to use $8,000,000,000. After 5 years the countries have borrowed a billion dollars. If they cannot afford to take care of themselves after 5 years, with the assertions from everybody I have seen that their economy is apparently from 50 percent to 150 percent greater now than 5 years ago, then there is not any necessity for any more economic aid when they can go and borrow all the money they want to provided they are a good security and a good risk. We realize now, Mr. Chairman, what treatment we got after the First World War. I think we wrote off about $11,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000 that we gave those countries after we were dragged into war.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I admire him sincerely. I admired him a long time before I came to this Congress, but I do not believe that the people of this country realize that if any nation, a member of the Atlantic Pact, starts a war with somebody else, that we have got to go in and finish it. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, the first thing we ought to do here is to get out of the United Nations pact and paddle our own canoe.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there never was a country in history that started to take care of everybody else and give everybody else advice and move in and take over their resources that did not wind up as a fourth-rate power; not one of them, and as soon, Mr. Chairman, as we start meddling and trying to fix up everybody else's business, every other country's business, then we are bound to go where the rest of the countries went. It can happen to us. We can wake up some morning if we keep on going the way we are and find that a dollar bill will not be worth any more than a franc or a mark or a lira or any other of the moneys of central Europe. It is kind of a tough thing to look forward to see a country like this spend itself into bankruptcy for nothing. Who sent General Eisenhower to Europe to raise armies there? Well, will somebody get up and tell me who sent him? Take these propagandists in the Pentagon—because that is about all they do is to spread propaganda—was it they who sent him? Well, it seems to me Eisenhower has had a pretty difficult job raising legions over in England and France and central Europe, and every one of these propagandists will tell you that if Russia would start moving tomorrow, that they could go to the English Channel in 2 weeks. What is going to happen then to the 200,000 men that we have stationed in Europe? Does that mean that they will have to go to the salt mines? They realize that 200,000 men is nothing compared to the power of Russia if they were going to attack us, which they are not.

Well, some of us are getting a little bit tired of owing $250,000,000,000, twice as much as all Europe owes, and then for us to go and give them some more. Certainly I am going to vote to cut out the economic aid; all of it. I voted for $56,000,000,000 to take care of this country and I would for $156,000,000,000 to take care of this country, but not another cent for people who do not want to take care of themselves.

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

Mr. Chairman, some years ago on the floor of this House Cliff Woodrum, who was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, asked us to vote money to erect the Pentagon Building. My vote was one of two votes cast against that project. Mr. Woodrum made the representation that it would take $18,000,000 to build that structure. Actually the building cost $83,000,000. Other money was used to complete the construction of this white elephant. So, when we vote money here you can bet your bottom dollar that as long as this administration is in power the way will be found to switch money from one pocket to the other.

It has been represented that part of the $56,000,000,000 appropriated last week will go toward this effort. Now we are asked to authorize the spending of $7,840,000,000.

Knowing that many countries are looking upon us with envy, and realizing that many people throughout the world are aiming to milk America dry, I still wonder what would happen in the event that we withdrew from this European mess. I am wondering what would happen if we would give the Communists the green light. I do not feel any responsibility for what happened at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran. Our American soldiers on the battlefields distinguished themselves in fighting for freedom, and won the war but our politicians in making deals with these Russian fakers, in recognizing them, in dealing with them and turning over territory to them, not only our ships and our equipment and our dollars but turning other countries over to them, for them to run riot in, have gotten us into this trouble. Now we are stuck, and I am wondering what would happen in Europe and in Asia if we would do exactly as we did in Korea. We gave the Communists the green light in Korea. Our Government officially, through our President and our Secretary of State, said we would have no interest in what would happen in Korea. We washed our hands of Chiang Kai-shek. What happened? Why, we have lost over 50,000 of our boys. I am sure when the story is told we will find that such is the case. We have had over 160,000 casualties.

If we withdraw at this time from this program, you can depend on it that we would be in a war overnight, and not in a police action either. So I say, even though I am apprehensive about these figures, I cannot vote against it. I think the Congress is derelict in its duty, however, when it does not comply with its own rules. We have a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that is charged with the responsibility of watching these expenditures. We actually have only 27 persons on our staff to watch these expenditures. The full committee has a staff of 10, including stenographers. One subcommittee has 2, another has 1, another has 10, another has 1. We provided only $210,000 for that committee to watch the expenditures of government. They are charged with the responsibility of watching these expenditures. Here it is in the RECORD, here for all of you to read.

What kind of Congress is this, that appropriates billions of dollars and then fails to follow through and provide the tools for these committees to work with so that taxpayers' funds are not wasted or stolen? Possibly Congress is not informed as to the powers it bestowed on one of its committees. Here you have it:

THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS — ITS POWERS UNDER THE STATUTE AND THE REORGANIZATION ACT

This committee was established December 5, 1927, and took the place of 11 separate committees on expenditures in the several executive departments. The first of these committees was establishd in 1816, and others were added as new departments were created. They reported bills relating to the efficiency and integrity of the public service, and creation and abolition of offices. The jurisdiction is now defined in the rule made effective January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Clause 3, giving the committee the power of subpena, was adopted February 10, 1947.

On March 17, 1928, the rule was amended to include: "Independent establishments

and commissions of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments." (Rule 11, subsec. 34.)

Section 105-A of title V of the United States Code, adopted May 29, 1928, reads as follows:

"Every executive department and independent establishment of the Government shall, upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, or of any seven members thereof, or upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, or any five members thereof, furnish any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of said committee."

Section 101 of the Reorganization Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), page 3, reads:

"The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

Section 121 (a) of the Reorganization Act, page 12, provides: "For a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 25 members." [1]

The applicable words of rule XI, section 121 of the Reorganization Act are:

"All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively: *Provided*, That unless otherwise provided herein, any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of that committee or of the consolidated committee succeeding generally to the jurisdiction of that committee."

Subsequent pertinent provisions of rule XI, page 15 of the act are as follows:

"(h) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) Studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"(3) For the purpose of performing such duties the committee, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee, is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to employ such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures within the amount authorized or appropriated as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

Precedents bearing upon previous activities of Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will be found in Cannons Precedents, sections 2041-2042.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I bespeak the attention of the Committee at this time. The gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. MARTIN] who is about to address the committee, is an expert on the subject which he is about to discuss.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee of conference between the House and the Senate on the original stock-pile legislation of our Nation in 1939, I think I should examine this program especially as to its bearing on the acquisition of our stock piles of strategic and critical materials.

When Great Britain owed us heavily in 1935, Cordell Hull relates that he could not get tin from them when they controlled that tin, and it was not until 1939, just at the outbreak of World War II that they were willing to trade tin and rubber for what we could give them further in the way of cotton, and so on. Sir Ronald Lindsey's statements at that time as quoted in Cordell Hull's Memoirs are rather revealing.

As I watched the development of the Marshall plan, I listened carefully to the President's statement on it before Congress and I read the pronouncements of the Department of State building up to that plan. I have reread those statements and I have reread the reports of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid and of the Harriman Commission.

Just prior to World War II the British Empire, U. S. S. R., and the United States were responsible for more than two-thirds of the world's total mineral output. Russia, of course, is now out of the picture as a source of strategic and critical materials for us today. The British Empire stands in quite different relationship to us but the memoirs of Cordell Hull, chapter 10, presented graphically the story of our inability to secure strategic and critical materials from the British to apply on Britain's indebtedness to this Government. In 1935, British Ambassador Sir Ronald Lindsey presented to his Government Cordell Hull's request for tin which was under the control of British capital. The answer from London was a complete refusal and it was not until 4 years later and just 3 months before the outbreak of the European war that we were able to negotiate an agreement with Britain whereby through exchanging cotton for rubber and tin we began to create reserves of strategic materials.

I will not attempt to review here our own inadequate approach to our stockpiling problems in the years from 1937 to 1939, nor our extending power to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1940 to take over the large-scale handling of strategic materials needed so desperately in our war program. At the end of the war our stockpile legislation was revised as Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. In that act we set up what we intended to be a 5-year program starting in 1946. We intended to create a stockpile of approximately $3,300,000,000 value at prices then current and Congress intended to have a sizable portion of that stockpile transferred to the Munitions Board by other Government agencies including Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I found in January 1948 that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had disposed of more than $11,000,000,000 of strategic and critical materials and that only $410,000,000 of that supply had been channeled to our national-defense stockpile and the total transfer of materials from all Government agencies up to the year 1950 amounted to $451,000,000. By that time also it had become apparent that the acquisition of our stockpile through purchases was moving at a snail's pace. Consequently many of us were desperate in the search for ways to build up our stockpile of strategic and critical materials from any available source just at the time the Marshall plan was before Congress in 1947 and 1948.

I noted with great interest the treatment of strategic materials by the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid in 1947 and by the Harriman commission in its report of November 7, 1947. I observed also with great interest the President's reference to our possible acquisition of needed materials in his statement to Congress December 18, 1947, and the discussion of the State Department of the possibility of our securing strategic and critical materials through the Marshall plan in their treatises of December 19, 1947. These statements were followed by committee action in the development of the Foreign Aid Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, which was approved by the President, April 3, 1948.

In one of the committee reports reference is made to the fact that lend-lease and the Second World War cut deeply into available stocks of natural resources and created the necessity of increased imports of strategic materials. Sections 111 (c), 115 (b) (5), 115 (b) (9) and 117 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 treated specifically with the matter of including and encouraging the acquisition of strategic and critical

[1] H. Res. 60 agreed to January 12, 1951, increased membership to consist of 27 members.

materials with ECA funds. Quite naturally I have followed the progress made under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 with great interest. Because of the state of our relations with Russia and because of Britain's tremendous need for her own supplies of strategic and critical materials, I was not too optimistic of the results to be expected from ECA's venture into this particular field.

In appendix A of the report of the President's Committee on Foreign Aid, dated November 7, 1947, the estimated annual value of additional strategic material production of Marshall-plan countries available for the United States stockpile was reported as $223,201,000, and this statement was made "with comparatively small increases in production, which in most cases would require reaching but not exceeding wartime peak outputs, strategic mineral raw materials valued at approximately $2,231,000,000 annually could be made available."

It is very hazardous for ECA to assume, however, that they have taken into consideration all factors in predicting returns of strategic materials to our Government in exchange for ECA help. The twelfth report of ECA to Congress for the quarter ended March 31, 1951, at page 11 shows the expanding economic base of Western Europe. In the 12 countries, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, the index of industrial production based on 1938, averaged 139 percent during the first quarter of 1951. The percentage for the United Kingdom was 156 percent.

In the financial papers of August 10 there appeared a very interesting news item announcing that ECA intends lending funds directly to British, Belgian, Italian, and other private European manufacturers for plant expansion and modernization under a so-called productivity plan the details of which have not yet been fully worked out.

With production in Europe up to 139 percent and with an enlarged productivity plan in the offing, it is a bit out of line to assume that these same European nations will turn over to America's stockpile the very strategic materials that are short in their own area. Furthermore, the daily papers of Washington within the past 48 hours have brought us news that Sir Hartley Shawcross, president of the Government's Board of Trade in England, stated on August 15 in a major policy speech that Britain cannot abandon trade with East Europe without seriously endangering its own economy. His speech was regarded as Britain's reply to the United States "Battle" bill. Shawcross is reported as stating, "To deprive each part of Europe of the resources of the other will not put an end to communism." Shawcross is reported further as saying that while Britain has in fact banned some items regarded as of military or strategic importance from shipment to the Communist bloc in Europe, Britain could not go along with the "strategic" value of some other items such as rubber and wool. These news reports add that the United States Government has expressed concern over Russia's build-up of a sizable trade balance with Britain amounting to nearly $50,000,000 in the first half of this year, and that of Russia's total purchase in the British-led sterling area, three-quarters has been made up of wool and rubber. Other materials sold to Russia included tin. Britain, however, is reported to ration the suply of rubber sold to Russia according to what is considered her normal civilian needs. In these news reports Britain is listed as doing business with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and China, as well as Russia. Britain's excuse for such sale and delivery of strategic materials to Russia is her need for food and fiber supplied her by Russia. From the European Continent Britain gets badly needed bacon, eggs, and sugar, and from China she gets hog bristles, preserved eggs, tung oil, and other products. This trade policy of Britain is in considerable contrast with any program for building the defensive strength of the Western Powers.

I will turn now to the discussion of the part ECA has taken to date in the matter of strategic and critical materials. ECA has purchased up to July 1, 1951, with the 5-percent counterpart funds, from all Marshall plan countries, approximately only $70,000,000 worth of strategic materials for our stockpile. About $56,000,000 in value of such materials have been delivered to the stockpile to date. ECA has executed exploration and development contracts in the amount of about $60,000,000 and repayment deliveries of strategic and critical materials have been made to us to date in the sum of $245,000.

It will take considerable time for the investment in projects abroad to produce any appreciable increase in the amount of strategic materials we can expect from the ECA program. Several serious limiting factors must be faced. There is a paucity of good mines within the area covered by ECA, ocean transportation is a problem, the shortage of trained personnel in our own forces, together with unstable monetary conditions in ECA countries and necessarily the complex commercial negotiations with foreign cartels, and the great need for the very materials in the countries that control their production abroad, all lead me to predict we will not be able to use ECA extensively in building our stockpiles within the time they should be built.

In my opinion, it is illogical for Congress to expend large sums to promote an increase in the production of strategic materials abroad through exploration and development when Congress has declined to grant subsidies for the encouragement and promotion of exploration and development within our own country.

The meager addition of strategic and critical materials to our stockpile from ECA together with prospective further need for strategic materials in Western Europe lead me to the conclusion that the estimates made by the President's Committee on Foreign Aid in 1947 do not give us grounds for supporting ECA as a means for building the self-sufficiency of America and yet that is exactly what the proponents of ECA attempted to do when they embraced our stockpile program as one of their appeals for support of ECA.

There is a further factor that may more than offset the net balance of strategic and critical materials added by ECA to our stockpile. I refer to information given in the report to the President by the Director of Defense Mobilization dated April 1, 1951, at page 36, where the statement is made, "Despite the heavy demands of our own armed services, we have supplied, under the mutual defense assistance program, more than 1,000,000 measurement tons of military equipment to friendly nations since shipments began in March 1950. This figure is exclusive of aircraft and naval vessels delivered under their own power."

Revisions and additions to our stockpile program have increased the size of the planned cost of our stockpile program to $8,300,000,000. At the rate of acquisition of these materials through ECA during the past 2 years and a half it would require 369 years for us to acquire our entire stockpile from that source.

From April 1948 to March 1951 we allotted to participating countries $11,221,000,000 in Marshall-plan aid, and this program has produced $56,245,000 of strategic and critical materials now in our stockpile. In other words, we have spent $200 in Marshall-plain aid for each dollar we have received in strategic and critical materials to date. At that rate, if we should plan to acquire our entire stockpile of strategic and critical materials through ECA, it would necessitate our spending in Marshall-plan assistance to the world the sum of $1,660,000,000,000. My conclusion is that we should not try to justify ECA expenditures on the ground that this program as now administered will give us our stockpile of strategic and critical materials.

One billion dollars of ECA funds is now available for loans, and 20 percent of ECA grants under the present bill is earmarked and required to be used for loans to the participating countries. This provision in the bill under consideration will add $300,000,000 to the billion now available for such loans, and all of these loans can be paid back in strategic and critical materials by participating countries. These countries cannot pay back quickly, but the loan provisions and the exploration and development provisions could be greatly expanded to increase our return in strategic and critical materials and tremendously change the ratio I have discussed above. The machinery is here in this bill. It was placed there at the insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], but the Truman administration has not indicated any determination to urge repayment by the participating countries in strategic and critical materials so that America's return in such materials for ECA dollars spent and loaned to the participating countries might come closer to the glowing predictions made by the Harriman Commission in 1947 and by the President's statement of December 18, 1947, and the discussion of the State Department on

this subject in their treatises of December 19, 1947.

Without identifying individual items I believe it will be of interest to Congress that in 1950, 42 of the 69 materials then listed as strategic and critical by the Munitions Board were not produced at all in the United States. Only 8 of those 69 materials were produced to the extent of half of our peacetime needs; 21 of the materials could be obtained from other countries of the Western Hemisphere, but at least 13 of them are not obtainable in any quantity in the Western Hemisphere.

I have examined the latest report of ECA on their purchases and projects through June 30, 1951, and one of my criticisms of their activities in the field of strategic and critical materials is that too much of their dealing has been with materials that are most competitive with American mine production and not enough with the most strategic items.

Figures compiled by the United States Bureau of Mines show that between 1935 and 1950 the number of mines producing gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc in our western mining States reduced from 11,033 to 2,308. I am told by very competent mining experts that many of our most important strategic metals such as tungsten, manganese, antimony, mercury, chromium, and vanadium, and many others occur in appreciable quantities within the continental United States although they are somewhat lower grade than the richer deposits abroad. It is true as stated in preliminary report No. 10 of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid in their report to Congress on November 25, 1947, that "with the exception of aluminum and molybdenum, the United States is currently an importer of every major nonferrous metal." But it is my hope that America will wake up to the serious need for encouragement of our own domestic mining industry through extending help to every reasonable extent for exploration prospecting and development of our own mine resources. The health of the mining industry of America is of greater importance to America's welfare both in war and in peace than any other single factor. We recognized in paragraph 1 of the Stockpile Act, Public Law 520, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, that the health of the mining industry of America was of greater importance than the stockpile but that both the mining industry and the stockpile were essential insurance policies in this war-torn world. I only wish it were possible for us to bring to the American mining industry the help and the attention that it must be given if we are to maintain our place both in war and in peace in the family of nations.

The acquisition of strategic and critical materials by ECA is entirely inadequate and as now administered will remain so. Such acquisition should be under the control and direction of experts who understand the mining industry and who are fully informed of the entire American metals problem. President Truman on August 1 announced that all dealings in strategic and critical materials, both foreign and domestic, would be transferred to the jurisdiction of the newly created Defense Materials Procurement Agency. It is my hope that this transfer will achieve greater defense security for our Nation.

ECA has made maximum use of its part in the acquisition of strategic and critical materials as a selling point to Congress for the perpetuation of ECA and its spending of vast sums of American tax dollars throughout the world. Far greater returns for less money can be had through a program in which our main objective is the direct acquisition of strategic and critical materials and greater defense security rather than American-financed industrial world conquest.

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

Mr. Chairman, with a great deal of reluctance, I have felt that I must speak for a moment to this Committee. Reluctant because of the fact that I hesitate to disagree with colleagues whom I have followed for 5 years and in whom I have great confidence. But I have noted today that spenders and economists, liberals and conservatives, have become strangely reversed and intermingled. I feel compelled to mention one thing in this Committee. It is not entirely because I traveled to Europe with a group that went over recently. I came back fully convinced that we must watch with extreme care every dollar that we expend there; and, as one of the junior members on the Committee on Appropriations, I pledge to you that, for my part, whatever authorization is made I shall try to do my part in watching with care each appropriation. But I just want to say this to the Committee: Remember that when the chips are down and the vote is taken the eyes of the world—the press and the people of America, and the press and the people across the sea will not be focused upon the seven billion or seven and one-half billion or six and three-fourths billions that we authorize, but they will be focused upon the quarter of a billion or half a billion or three or four hundred million that we cut. The moral effect of all that we do here may well be dimmed and dulled if we are not careful in the matter of applying these cuts.

I have wondered why some of these speeches for the solvency of America were not made last week, when we were appropriating—not authorizing but appropriating—$56,000,000,000 for national defense, and the next day some more billions for air bases and military installations. We voted for them without batting an eye, because I think every one of us is conscious, as we watch the deliberations in the so-called cease-fire conference, that we are in a serious and solemn hour. We have swallowed the camel and we are straining at the gnat. I have no quarrel with anyone who wants to vote against all European aid, even though I cannot agree that we can relinquish the beachheads we have won, the airfields that we hold there, the industries and mineral resources, and the friendship and help that we crave. I do believe that we ought to think carefully before we apply cuts to the carefully considered recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Congress. Our action is being watched with extreme care all over this world. Let us watch the dollars as they are spent, but I beg of you to think carefully of the moral effect of a relatively small proportionate reduction, the difference between a quarter of a billion or a half a billion dollars, a few million dollars in the authorization after we have already appropriated over sixty billions. I, myself, do not feel that I want to be in the position of being pointed to later as having done something here today that perhaps lost us some of our strength in a critical time of history. I do not like to have the party, which I sincerely believe in, placed in that position. I, personally, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who took this trip abroad and observed carefully as we went through these various countries, feel that I am going to vote against a cut beyond the recommendations of the committee that has been considering it, and I shall then give these expenditures a long second look and searching consideration when the time comes to spend these dollars.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want it misunderstood as to how I personally feel about this bill; I want to be perfectly frank and tell you that I am going to vote for these reductions and then I shall vote against the whole bill. I have been here long enough to remember the early 1941 days of lend-lease when we were sold the great program of lend-lease under the guise to keep us out of war, and I have listened to each of the appealing and emotional reasons why we should vote for this foreign-aid program and that foreign-aid program. I must take the responsibility for saying that in my judgment they have contributed but one thing for us, and that is that those programs have contributed but to inflation and bankruptcy of America. I cannot see how you who have been so conservative in dealing with appropriations necessary for the people of our own country cannot deal with the same concern when it comes to throwing our money all over the world. I say to you that it is as easy for you to buy your way into heaven, and I believe there is a heaven, as I believe it is for you to try to buy countries to fight against communism or to instill a desire in the people of other countries of the world to fight for their own homeland. If they have not that patriotic feeling then you have not enough money in the United States ever to buy it. Many mental justifications for this bill will be advanced by the membership. The gentleman from Iowa spoke about strategic materials a few minutes ago. Let me talk to you about steel. The great iron mines of the United States are in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota. With normal use—not wartime, but peacetime use—there is about 20 years of steel left in those ranges, as has been testified to by experts.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The information given to the Committee on Public Works—and we were there in the month of June—was not 20 years, but about 10.

Mr. O'HARA. I accept the gentleman's correction, because he was there this summer investigating that very problem. So pretty soon we will have sent steel under the ECA programs, and various programs of rearmament, to other nations of the world, I do not know how much, that they will use for fighting. But when our steel is gone in this country then we subject ourselves to the same condition England and other countries who have no steel find themselves in today. We must then depend on foreign imports.

My judgment and my feeling upon this bill is expressed perhaps by the thought of a great southerner, Benjamin Hill, of Georgia, who wrote some time ago this statement:

> He who serves his country saves all things, and all things saved shall bless him. But he who lets his country die lets all things die, and all things dying shall curse him.

I feel that it is my responsibility to see that we do what we still can to save this country from complete bankruptcy and insolvency. I say to you that we are close to that border where taxation will be destructive of this country, destructive of the initiative and the desire of the people of this country to work and to save and to fight. It is not just economic. It is all of the things that make up common sense, and if you think your people back home do not realize their burdens, the great tax burden of the poor and rich alike, you are mistaken. If you think they are not deeply concerned over this design, and unless you deal with this subject realistically in your thinking, you are also mistaken.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, last week August 9, I called the attention of the House to conditions in Europe which to me appear to warrant the inclusion in our foreign aid program of certain provisions designed to correct basic weaknesses of current ECA policies. I said that, while the Marshall plan has saved Western Europe from economic collapse and subsequent communization of most of her nations, the workingman is still not receiving the benefits intended by us, that he is just not getting his share of the economic gains made possible by the contributions of the American taxpayers.

Through the kindness of Philip M. Kaiser, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor, I have received brief statistical information which bears out the principal point of my statement and which, I believe, is particularly apropos in view of the fact that extension of economic aid is at the present time being studied by the House. This condition is a fruitful argument by the Communists to maintain their membership and discredit us.

FRANCE

General situation: Industrial production in France has reached in May 1951 its highest level in postwartime, with an index number of 129—1937 equals 100—compared with an annual average of 102 in 1948. Gross national income in 1950 was estimated at 7,390,000,000,000 francs, compared with 6,875,000,000,000 in 1949, and 5,712,000,000,000 in 1948. ECA has contributed largely to the economic recovery of France, but it has not assured to French labor an adequate share of the results of this progress. The gains in nominal wages which the workers could register were again and again absorbed by rising prices, with the result that real earnings of French workers today are much lower than they were in prewartime. Physical reconstruction in France has been slow, and the housing situation is still extremely serious. Only in the consumption of some essential foodstuffs, such as meat, milk, and cereals, did the level of living in 1950 exceed the prewar level, and there, too, only by a few points.

Earnings: The French worker presents the unhappy spectacle of a marked deterioration in his living standards compared to prewar, and a decline in 1950 compared to 1949. According to a calculation made by ECA's European Labor Division, real earnings of a single worker in Paris were at the end of 1950 39.1 percent lower than in 1938; under the Marshall plan, they had grown only by 3.5 percent. For a Parisian worker with wife and two children who received the statutory family allowances, the corresponding figures were: 19.9-percent decrease from 1938 to 1950, and 1.7-percent increase from 1948 to 1950.

Whereas before World War II, a single French worker could buy approximately 68 percent as much food with an hour's labor, as could an average American worker, in 1949 he could buy only 37 percent as much, and in 1950 only 31 percent as much. The French worker with wife and two children could in 1949 buy 51 percent as much, and in 1950 42 percent as much as an average American worker.

ITALY

General situation: Italy has not yet—even with Marshall aid—been able to organize all of her labor potential for production. This is partly because of her lack of resources such as coal, power, and raw materials. Italy has long exported population, and when the customary outlets were denied to her the accumulating surplus brought about overcrowding of farms and underemployment in factories. As a result, payrolls in the early postwar years were padded with unnecessary workers who actually impeded productive efficiency. The ERP has mitigated, but not solved, the problem by, first, enabling Italy to acquire raw materials and improve capital equipment; and, second, by aiding international migration schemes.

Production indexes have risen to unprecedented heights; compared to 1938, the general index of industrial production reached 140 in March 1951—a larger increase than that shown by almost any other European country. The whole of the increase has occurred since 1948. In contrast, the employment index stands no higher than it did in 1948, and unemployment has shown little except seasonal changes in absolute numbers. Hours of work have increased somewhat since 1948. Obviously many workers have obtained steadier and more remunerative employment, while others are still eking out a precarious existence and the competition for jobs continues keen.

Wages: Since 1948 the industrial worker's wages appear to have risen slightly more than prices of consumer goods. In April 1951 the index of real-wage rates of industrial workers, including cost-of-living allowances, stood at 100 and including family allowances calculated for a wife and three children at 105—1948 equals 100.

In terms of American standards, Italian wages are still very low and are even now a little lower than they were before the war. With an hour's labor an Italian worker could buy only 26 percent as much food as an American worker before the war, and 24 percent as much in 1949 and 1950. This was the lowest ratio of any ERP country. A married worker with two children could buy 28 percent as much as the American in 1949 and 1950, owing to his receipt of family allowance.

The Italian worker's purchasing power is not worsening at present and that is very important. But there is both room for and, indeed, desperate need for further improvement.

Housing: In spite of recent Government-sponsored housing plans, Italy has not yet caught up with the backlog of postponed demand. The overcrowded and often unsanitary condition of housing in Italy is one of the factors causing political unrest. With the help of ECA counterpart funds the Government has recently launched a 7-year low-cost housing program which aims at the construction of almost 1,000,000 rooms.

WEST GERMANY

In many respects German economic recovery has been remarkable during the Marshall plan period, especially during 1950 and early 1951. Particularly during the latter period improvement has been noteworthy in the fields of industry production and productivity, living standards, including real earnings and housing, and increased employment.

Production and productivity: The index of industrial production increased 175 percent from 1947–48 to 1950–51 to reach an annual average of 129—1936 equals 100. In April and May 1951, it reached the peak of more than 138. During 1950 alone, production increased by more than one-fourth. This encouraging increase was largely brought about by fuller use of capacities based upon increased demand, larger imports of raw materials, and the rise in worker productivity.

Between the middle of 1947 and the middle of 1951 the index of output per man-hour in industry increased by 65 percent and climbed to 96 percent of

1936. The greatest improvement during 1950 was noted in shipbuilding, crude oil and refining—over 65 percent—while the consumer goods industries and coal mining showed an increase of less than 10 percent.

To both these developments, ECA has made vital contributions, by grants and loans from dollar funds and by release of DM counterpart funds.

Housing: The housing situation has improved during recent years, but is still grave. Although 1950 was a record-breaking year with 350,000 dwelling units completed—a significant part of them through ECA—it will take more than 15 years at this record rate of construction to return to the prewar housing density. Housing density estimated at 1.8 persons per room contrasts sharply with the prewar average of about 1.3 persons per room. There exists at present a housing shortage of about 3,400,000 units. The shortage has arisen from war damages and the abnormal increase in Western Germany's population by more than 8,000,000 refugees.

Employment situation: The number of employed wage and salary earners has been growing steadily since 1947–48, reaching in May 1951, 14,526,000, an increase of 10 percent. Employment accelerated during 1950 in manufacturing, construction, trade and commerce. An interesting new development is the increase in the number of women in the labor force, who now form about 30 percent of all employed persons.

Unemployment continues to be a serious problem with a level of 1,387,000 at the end of May 1951. Although this represents a considerable improvement over the near catastrophic winter of 1949–50 when unemployment was about 2,000,000, the disquieting feature consists in the chronic nature of unemployment and the fact that it is proportionately high among refugees thus constituting a potential cause for political instability. An expanded housing program is an essential prerequisite for a lasting decline of unemployment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, all amendments and substitutes thereto, and there can be but one, as I understand the parliamentary rules, close in 1 hour.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it was our understanding when we had only 4 hours of debate on the bill that there would be no tendency to shut off debate. I have not been heard on the bill, and the gentleman has been heard, I think, 21 times, the RECORD will show.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been heard one time on the bill and once under the 5-minute rule, and may I say further that we had time here to turn back. Had the gentleman asked me for time in general debate, he would have gotten it. I also understand that the gentleman who had charge of the time on the other side had time to turn back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will not try to limit debate.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there has been the suggestion that in the event we do not vote the entire amount called for in this bill the psychological reaction in Europe may be bad. Now, I do not pose as an expert on Europe, not having lived there for many years, but I have known Europeans throughout the world.

I respectfully suggest that perhaps the reaction might be very favorable in the event that we do effect some reductions in this authorization. I suggest that perhaps the European countries and the countries of the world will realize that we as a nation have finally reached maturity and that we are not going to do everything for them. As a result they will respect us a great deal more than they have in the past.

In the event the reaction is bad and they walk out on us, I suggest perhaps it is about time that we find out whether they are with us or are against us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to what seems to me to be an utterly inconsistent policy of our government, not the policy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for I am not criticizing them—but a policy which this Congress is following. We are here about to appropriate multiplied billions of dollars to buy arms for our friends all over the world. You may well say "That is fine; we want them to help us," and so do I. I realize they cannot help us very much with butcher knives and clubs; I realize that they have got to have modern weapons. I think that this aid has been and may yet be very helpful, but somehow or other I have a sneaking doubt about what some of those people can do in case of an outbreak of world war. I do not believe that a dozen jet planes in the hands of some country that has no mechanical background or facilities will be of very much value in case of war with Russia. About all that would happen is that those planes would fall into Russian hands, and the Russians are smart enough to use them, and they have the facilities to use them. I do not believe that a bunch of tanks in some country that cannot maintain those tanks either with equipment or with gasoline is of very much help. They, too, will probably fall into Russian hands, and again the Russians can use them.

I do not even know that a large number of foot soldiers, where it is doubtful that they will be able to make a stand, or where it is doubtful that their government will make a stand, is of very much help. They are likely to simply let their arms fall into the Communists' hands. We have seen that happen all over Asia, and that is what we are crying about now. The Communists are equipped, at least in large part, in Korea, with arms that we supplied to those who were our friends.

Why should not we play this game safe and accomplish the same results for our friends and accomplish a whole lot more results for ourselves by paying the men of those countries of doubtful strength or determination as our soldiers? Why not give them the opportunity to enlist in the United States Army, rather than setting up a bunch of little indefensible military units all over this world that cannot possibly support themselves and cannot possibly be of very much help to us?

You can take a billion dollars and you can pay 1,000,000 men $1,000 a year, and you can make those men members of the United States Armed Forces. It will not cost you any more to arm them under the American flag than it does to arm them under 40 different flags, and we are going to pay for the arms anyway. When you have done that you have a striking force of some real power. In that way you would put a million men in the Army in various parts of this world under the command of the United States of America. Right here, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, I am not talking about a United Nations army; I am talking about the United States; I am talking about enlisting Japanese, Germans, Filipinos, enlisting Nationalist Chinese, on whom we spent a third of a billion dollars in this bill, and we do not know whether it is going down the rat hole or not. I am talking about enlisting these people and any other people who want to enlist in the United States Army. I am suggesting that we control the disposition of those men and the equipment for which we are paying rather than let somebody of doubtful judgment, to say the least, control them.

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

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

Mr. BATTLE. Does the gentleman from Texas realize how much more that will cost us?

Mr. POAGE. It would cost a billion dollars for a million men; that is what it will cost us.

Mr. BATTLE. Some of the people in France and the other countries are serving for 5 cents a day, and when a battalion, and so forth, can be effective, it has to be good.

Mr. POAGE. You do not have to bother about the Frenchman. The French will organize an army. You do not have to bother about the Englishman. You are not going to enlist any Englishmen. I am not suggesting that we should take anyone against his will, or seek any enlistments where the local forces are strong enough to stand against the foe. But there are many millions of men in this world who would like to enlist in the United States Army, and all I am doing is saying, "Let us open the door and give them that opportunity."

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

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman think we might very well use for that purpose some of these, our new allies, in middle Europe, West German manpower, for instance?

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, I think we should use the West German manpower.

They are good soldiers. You can get a million men in Western Germany alone. Just yesterday we were told that there were 9,000,000 displaced persons in

Western Germany, and that the German Government wanted us to assume responsibility for these people. Let us give some of them a job. But as long as we are going to pay the bill, let us keep control of the armies we pay and equip.

We are spending this money to protect America. If that is not so, there is no justification for its expenditure. The assistance others get is desirable, but it cannot justify the taxation of American citizens. Why, then, should we try so hard to make our aid ineffectual by breaking it up into small items with no over-all directing head? I plead with Congress to keep American officers in command of at least the bulk of the men and materials we pay for.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. In answer to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], General Marshall told our committee that there are 12,000 officer personnel in this country receiving training for the very purposes mentioned; that is, they go back to their own countries to train men in the rearmament program.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to discuss a bill which comes out of a committee of which I am not a member, but I did have the very interesting experience last summer of studying the military assistance program in seven of the countries in the North Atlantic Pact and also in Sweden and Spain. I was sold on the concept that we must unite with the free countries of the world for our own protection.

I have listened to this debate. There is one underlying thought that seems to creep up in two-thirds of the speeches, and that is that this legislation is primarily a foreign-aid bill. Under my concept of the matter, it is not a foreign-aid bill, it is distinctly a bill for the protection of the American Nation and American institutions. It is true that France and Norway and Denmark, and so forth, do get aid, but the real purpose of the bill is not to protect them; the real purpose of the bill is to protect the United States of America.

In that regard, I would far rather have the frontier of our security system 3,000 miles away from home than to sit here at home and wait for aggression to come to us in the form of an air attack on the eastern seaboard.

Another thing that has been brought up is that we should not be in Europe. Do you not see that really America is a transplanted Europe? Most of the people in America came from Europe. Our immigration is fashioned on the theory that most, if not all, of our immigrants will come from Europe. Eighteen percent of us in the Congress of the United States today are the first generation of parents who migrated from Europe.

The point I want to make, and I was convinced of this last summer, is that we have the Communist threat pointed directly at us. The Soviets are not interested in capturing Italy as Italy or Norway as Norway, and so forth. They think if they can lop off one free nation after the other and take with that free nation their industrial capacity plus their military capacity, which now is very low, then finally they will get to the major plum and they will then perhaps be in a position to capture America. That is why I think we would be very unwise to cut off any of the military appropriations we are authorizing by this bill.

We must in the nature of things take our strategic concept and make up our minds by taking the advice of men who are spending their lives to protect America. That is their business. By and large, I am going to accept their judgment and not the judgment of somebody that I happen to talk to or some isolated statements that I happened to hear, which frequently come from irresponsible and ill-informed persons.

I was home last week and talked about this and similar problems before a group of businessmen. Practically every man there thanked me for presenting this security problem to them. They did not understand it. They said, "We are with you if you will use good judgment in trying to preserve and protect America and the free-enterprise system under which we operate. If that is what you are doing, then we are willing to stand high taxes, although they are very onerous." So I say to you that is the problem we have for consideration.

I believe there is another thing you must think about, and that is this: The United Nations, in my humble opinion, is dying on the vine. The basic concept of that organization is such that it cannot be effective. Of the 48 vetoes that have been invoked, 47 were invoked by one country. If the United Nations dies, I should like to see a strong group like the North Atlantic Treaty nations tied together for their mutual protection. We are committed to a 20-year-security agreement with Europe. We did not have a chance to vote on it. I am for the amendment to give the House a chance to approve treaties. But we are tied by a solemn agreement for 20 years, and it is for our protection and their protection. I am willing to stand behind it and implement it if necessary.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to thank the gentleman for the fine contribution he has made to this debate. His statement is extraordinary. I compliment him.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we are in an armaments race. Most armament races finally explode into a war. We are praying that this will not happen. It may be that a showing of military and economic power such as we are building here and abroad will avoid the war, which hovers over our horizon. But if that terrible catastrophe should befall the earth our efforts today would be immensely useful, in fact might be the foundation upon which victory would rest.

Much bitter criticism has been indulged in here today to the effect that the European nations do not have the will to fight. This measure is one, I think, that will stiffen their determination to fight and will provide the weapons to make the fight. In three separate countries the nationals with whom I dealt told me definitely that with the military defense assistance plan in effect they would very definitely fight to retain their sovereignty and their freedom. As one man from a small country said: "We know we cannot resist Communist aggression very long; perhaps only a few days. But if we know that the United States, England, France, and others are coming to our rescue with men and modern arms, then we will fight to the last man. Your country must mean business, or it would not have signed the Atlantic Treaty." So I say to you the will to fight is there providing the North Atlantic Treaty plan is carried out.

I am worried about this terrific expenditure. But when we fight for our freedom and our survival I want to do what little I can to assure victory even though it is extremely expensive. This is the kind of struggle that we cannot lose. We are taking money from our grandchildren, but it is an expense that they may have to carry because we took steps to preserve their freedom.

Time and space have been wiped out, so we cannot procrastinate now if we are to be ready for the worst. If we are ready I am hopeful that the aggression will not come and posterity may get the peaceful world that the veterans of the last war fought and died for. If we do our part today to protect America, as this bill provides, we will in part atone for the terrible sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors and of many of our people at home. I do hope that the military authorizations in the bill will not be disturbed.

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

Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of very interesting questions raised in the debate. Two of the gentlemen in particular have said that "the eyes of the European nations would be upon us. Three hundred and fifty million dollars may be a very small cut to make, but it might have a very bad psychological effect on the people with their eyes on America." We have heard that so often. What must we do to hold the confidence of the people we have joined with to protect them for the last number of years? I voted for $5,000,000,000 or more to go over there to implement this matter. The other day we appropriated $56,000,000,000 to make ourselves strong. We have given them more than they have asked for. We have spent billions upon billions upon billions of dollars and shed our blood by the hundreds of thousands and even millions of our soldiers and now we hear said on the floor of the House that the eyes of the world are upon us. To me that is a very

poor argument. I will tell you that the eyes of the American people are on us. At the expense of being classified as a little old fashioned, I want to speak again for the people who pay the taxes to send us here to spend their money for their defense. I received a letter this morning from one of my constituents, Ed Lacey, of Kinmundy, Ill., that made me think probably the people back home have their eyes upon us. I knew as I have said before many times in these debates when urging greater economy in the interest of our people that they did have their eyes upon us. Here is a farmer and he is a very substantial and intelligent farmer whom I have known a good many years—he is a Republican, I will say, for the benefit of you Members on the Republican side who are going to have to pass on this matter pretty soon. He said: "I have recently read a report from a roving reporter in Washington that says that the people in Washington drink more booze than in any other city of the United States of its size. When I read the reports last Friday in the paper that the Congress, by 348 to 2, had passed a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill, I decided they must all have been drunk and probably this reporter is right."

He also said: "Where does the Congress think all this money is coming from? Do they think there is no limit to what the taxpayers can pay?" My colleagues, the defense bill to which he referred should have been cut, in my judgment, by $10,000,000,000. Yet no member of the committee made such an attempt.

I realize we have a big problem here and we have to keep the defense of our country and of the world in proper perspective with the other countries of the world. But I think we could and should make a reduction in this bill over $2,000,000,000. I will tell you why. It has been brought out before. There is about a 5- or 6-billion-dollar backlog which was voted last year, which has not yet been spent. Now it is almost fall. We will be back here in January and we will be called upon to appropriate once more. Certainly, if we appropriate nothing in this bill, I think there is enough money to carry this on and I do not think they would spend it before we come back here in January when they would be able to bring in proper legislation.

I ask you to support the Smith amendment that would cut out $1,000,000,000. That is not enough, but that would help.

I say to you, in all seriousness, unless you stop voting to recklessly give away countless billions all over the world, you will soon spend this Nation into bankruptcy and we shall lose our liberty and freedom.

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to speak on this measure today. I intended to reserve my remarks until after consideration of the matter in the Appropriations Committee.

The measure is of such great importance, however, that I feel compelled to express very briefly my point of view in respect to it.

I speak only for myself, fully conscious of the fact that many of my colleagues, with whom I usually see eye to eye, disagree with my point of view in this connection.

I yield to no man in this House, Mr. Chairman, in appreciation of the dangers for this country involved in the tremendous spending in which we have indulged over the years under the present administration.

I have fought that spending over the years time and time again. I expressed my views to some extent in this connection in regard to the $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the armed services which passed this House a few days ago.

I think we should be very careful, however, Mr. Chairman, as to how far we go in reference to the bill before us today. In my judgment, it is of tremendous importance.

I regard the proposed European aid as national defense. If it is not in the interest of the defense of this country, we have no business undertaking it at all.

It is an attempt to help friendly nations overseas to build up their military power, so that they may have strength enough in a year or two to take care of themselves and to relieve us of the burden which we are now assuming in our own interest and in theirs.

The economic pump has been primed. The military pump has not been primed, and it is vital, in my opinion, that it should be primed.

It is not too much to say, Mr. Chairman, that the future of the entire Western World may hang on whether or not it is possible to build up the military power of these allied nations overseas.

What we do or do not do today, in my judgment, can have a tremendous psychological effect on the success or failure of that endeavor. If we go too far we can play directly into the hands of the enemy.

I, too, recently visited Europe and had a chance to observe the progress there at first hand.

In my judgment, there is a real chance of bringing about the result to which I have referred, of helping the allied nations overseas to build up the necessary military power within the time available.

I think the success or failure of that endeavor more or less hangs in the balance at this moment.

Success is not assured, of course—risk is involved inevitably—but, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, do not want to do anything at this critical moment which in future years I may look back to as having jeopardized this tremendously important undertaking.

I want to cut this bill, just as far as we can cut it with safety. But this, in my judgment, is not the time to cut it. The time to cut it is after thorough consideration by the Committee on Appropriations of the financial details, some of which, I am informed, have not yet been presented to or considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will take no step today that may prejudice the success of the mission, which is now in the very able hands of General Eisenhower. He has achieved greatly in building the morale and the determination of the nations in Europe.

The success of his mission is of paramount importance to America and to all the free nations of the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, as one of the freshman Members of this House, and as one who, it is obvious has not had enough years on this earth or enough seniority in Congress to be even faintly classified as a statesman, I have to refer back to the founders of our Constitution once in a while to find out what a Congressman should be and how he should represent his constituents.

In the Federalist papers which were written with a view toward explaining to the American people the purposes of our Constitution, Mr. Alexander Hamilton and Mr. James Madison brought out the idea that the sense or will of the community will prevail in our type of Government. They said:

> As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers; so there are particular moments in public affairs when the people stimulated by some irregular passion or some illicit advantage or misled by the artful misrepresentation of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterward be the most ready to lament and condemn.[1]

It is with the above viewpoint in mind propounded by our founding fathers that I must examine the Mutual Security Act and its implications. I am of the political philosophy that a Congressman should vote to express the will of the majority of his constituents unless, in his own conscience, he is convinced that such majority opinion would be contrary to the general welfare of the country. In that case, the Congressman voting against the will of the majority of his people would have an obligation to let the people know why he felt the majority opinion was not in the best interests of the country as a whole. In my particular congressional district, on April 30, a civic group, the Citizens Committee for Good Government, conducted a town hall meeting which was open to everyone in the congressional district. One of the questions asked at this meeting concerned the advisability of continuing foreign aid to Marshall-plan countries, and of the hundreds of people in the hall only a scattered minority voted in favor of continued foreign aid. Further bearing out this point, the 551 replies I received in answer to a poll conducted by a well known news commentator indicated 86 percent very much opposed to furnishing economic aid along with military aid to Atlantic Pact nations, while only 14 percent were in favor of this aid. In a continued attempt to check my constituents' reaction to continuation of the foreign-aid program, I sent out approximately 2,500 postal cards to my district and one of the questions was: "As a taxpayer, do you want to continue foreign-aid programs such as the Marshall plan, and so forth?" With approximately a 30-percent return, 77

[1] The Federalist, pp. 393–394.

percent were against foreign aid and only 23 percent were in favor of continued foreign aid.

From talking with constituents during my trips home and from the letters received, there is no question at all in my mind that a great majority of constituents in the Eleventh Congressional District are opposed to further foreign aid and it is my duty to express this opposition by voting against this bill.

I note that the cool and deliberate sense of the community is further brought out by recent developments in that General Eisenhower stated last week that he felt the European countries were not doing their part in furnishing the manpower needs which they had agreed to furnish. I also noted there is a serious split in the Socialist Party in Britain headed by Aneurin Bevan, and that this group is opposed to Prime Minister Attlee's ideas and seem about to wrest control from Prime Minister Attlee. Aneurin Bevan, who is the leader of this group of Socialists had their ideas expressed in the pamphlet, One Way Only, which pamphlet endorsed by Bevan states that America should cut her aid and give $14,000,000,000 of gifts to the world.

As I stated, the cool and deliberate sense of the community—of my particular community—realizes that the Marshall plan foreign-aid idea which was sold to the American people as a temporary aid is now being looked upon as a permanent hand-out.

Recently statistics have come out of Europe showing that practically all of the majority of the European countries have reached an industrial production level of from 110 to 150 percent of their 1939 production and certainly we cannot justify further aid with the excuse of postwar recovery. If we continue to attempt to expend this money we will reach a point where the taxpayers can no longer stand the burden which will result in serious economic disruption of our own country.

On the idea of containing communism, I can best use the words of Mr. John Knight, editor and publisher of the independent Chicago Daily News, when he contended also that "while the flow of American dollars into the war-torn countries of Europe would stimulate economic recovery, it didn't necessarily follow that communism would dry up and disappear. Both of these warnings were borne out by subsequent developments. Much of the Marshall-plan money was dissipated through faulty administration and the failure of foreign governments to face their problems realistically. Nor did communism, a nonpurchasable ideology, wither on the vine. While the European Communists have had their set-backs in national and local elections, the hard core of communism still remains."

With the foregoing evidence in mind and the philosophy of voting to express the will of the majority of my constituents, I do not think we should continue further foreign aid, but should permit the European countries to exert their own efforts on their own behalf if they want to preserve their freedom and liberty.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend my able and distinguished friend and colleague from the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] for his statesmanlike remarks made just 5 minutes ago. He succinctly and clearly stated the problem, which has evidently confused most of the Members on the other side of the aisle and a few on this side.

It would seem from listening to the long debate today that we have been listening to a group of apostles of doom who have no confidence in the future of our Nation, who have no confidence in the ability and strategy of our military leaders.

If we were to cut any further beyond the drastic reduction already made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the military funds for Europe we would in effect humiliate General Eisenhower in the eyes of the peoples and parliaments of Western Europe and the NATO countries. General Eisenhower has been working strenuously now for some 9 or 10 months, for what? The defense of these United States of America.

I happen to be one of the Members of this House who went to Europe some 7 or 8 weeks ago and conferred at great length with General Eisenhower, his staff, and our representatives in Europe. Today we find that most of the members of that delegation who visited the general and some seven or eight countries of Western Europe at that time, only 8 weeks ago, and they were 18 in number, 9 from the majority side and 9 from the minority side of the aisle, are for the full amount reported to the House floor by the Committee on Foreign Affairs for military aid to Western Europe.

You can be sure that the many speeches today, such as the one made by the gentleman from Illinois, who last spoke, will be widely endorsed and favorably distributed throughout the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that those words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read certain words.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the words to which I referred were the one or two sentences directly preceding the words which the Clerk has read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

Mrs. CHURCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. CHURCH. The words to which I objected were the ones in which the gentleman referred to those opposing the bill, or at least, recommending a cut in the bill on the basis of national solvency as being prophets of doom—incidentally, I withdraw my objection to that—but as having been an aid and comfort to the Politburo. I take distinct exception to those words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to propound a question to the gentlewoman from Illinois. Does the Chair understand from her parliamentary inquiry that she did not wish the words taken down that were reported, but that there are other words she does want taken down?

Mrs. CHURCH. The words which I wish taken down are the words that were reported as the gentleman spoke them. My parliamentary inquiry referred to the fact that the words originally read by the Clerk did not contain the sentence to which I took exception.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentlewoman is interested in words other than the ones that were reported by the Clerk?

Mrs. CHURCH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

Mrs. CHURCH. That is the sentence to which I took exception.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, 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. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state as he did on a previous occasion, these are all close and bothersome questions. If we were to hew to certain lines too closely, it would, in the opinion of the Chair, prevent full debate on many questions. However, there is a line of demarcation beyond which debate would be too free. I repeat these words:

> One further thought that I have, Mr. Chairman, and that is we must with this debate and with the utterances of these apostles of doom, be giving great aid and comfort to the Politburo.

The Chair thinks the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] could have conveyed his meaning in words other than those, and upon this occasion the Chair is bound to hold, and the Chair trusts there will be no demonstration of any kind when the decision of the Chair is made because this is not that kind of a question, the Chair does think that these words in all probability cross that thin line of demarcation, and, therefore, must hold that they are a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may withdraw his words, and that he may be permitted to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5113, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill which coming at this time might be, and, in my opinion, will be, a marked contribution toward the goal we seek, and which decent-minded persons throughout the world, whether they are citizens of countries that are not dominated by Communist rulers, or are dominated by Communist rulers, seek—and that is peace—a peaceful world in which to live where nations might work out their normal and natural destiny, and where human beings may live a normal life free from oppression and aggression or the fear of war. I urge my colleagues, without regard to party, to consider seriously the pending amendments in relation to the reduction in the authorized amount in title 1 of the bill. I express the opinion that the next year will detemine whether or not the world is going to be involved in a third world war. Personally, I think the situation has improved materially in our favor during the last 2 years. But I think the next year will be the test—the crystallizing test of what we have done, and it is my firm opinion that the actions we take, and the actions that the free neighbors of ours may take during the next year, will be the determining factor on the question of whether or not the world is going to be hurled into another terrible conflict. So far as I am concerned, if I am going to err, I am going to err on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness. I have said on this floor, and I repeat it because it is firmly fixed in my mind and it cannot be repeated too often, even to the extent of slight irritation, that the only thing Communists respect is what they fear. The only thing they fear is power greater than they possess.

I have been a strong advocate, as have my colleagues, without regard to party, of a strong national defense; first, as a possible deterrent to acts of aggression which might lead into a general war; and second, the event of that unhappy thing occurring, that we will be strong enough to win. Because, after all, we have a duty and responsibility to preserve the country which we have inherited from the past. That duty devolves directly upon our shoulders as Members of the Congress of the United States.

As I view the pending legislation, while relating to the defense of Europe, it is also a part of the defense of America. I voted for this legislation, not to help some other nation alone, solely, but, through helping that nation, I am making a contribution to the national defense of our own country and to the national interest of our country. The purpose of this legislation is to be a supplement to the efforts of any recipient nations and their peoples, in their desire for independence, for liberty, and for peace. This bill is not a substitute for their efforts, but an implementation. In doing this we are acting for our own national defense and for our own national security. It seems to me it is for our interest to make Western Europe strong, under the leadership of General Eisenhower; to make it strong so that it will be a barrier to communism. When we have accomplished that, we can then start the journey back toward liberation of the people who are now enslaved behind the iron curtain.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have one additional minute.

Mr. VORYS. Reserving the right to object, and I intend to ask that the gentleman have five additional minutes, will the gentleman in his further remarks disclose what is at present a military secret; that is, when is it the plan of the leadership to complete action on this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes. I want to ask him a question or two.

Mr. McCORMACK. Make it 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that he may proceed for three additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The other question—I am sure the majority leader did not mean to infer when he said that the decent people of the world would applaud our passing this bill—he did not mean to infer that we who are opposed to the bill are not decent-minded? I am sure the gentleman did not mean that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. I do not think I said that. I said what the decent-minded men and women behind the iron curtain, as well as outside the iron curtain, are looking for is peace. That is what I think I said. If I said anything else, I offer everyone who may be affected thereby my apology, and to the gentleman from Nebraska my apology. But I think the RECORD will show that I did not say that.

Now, on the question of when we are going to close this bill, I do not know. I undertook to give some advice earlier in the day, or at least to make some contribution. Failing in that, I am unable to make any further contribution.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not, assuming that we do not complete it by around 6 o'clock we will go into a night session or will we complete the bill tomorrow? I have been asked by many Members who want to know how to arrange their affairs for the evening and tomorrow; and if it could be determined, I think it would be helpful.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer my friend. I would be very glad to get into a discussion of those things which are usually worked out in a discussion between the leadership on both sides. The gentleman from South Carolina has been given a very difficult task as chairman of this committee, and he is doing a magnificent job.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, also has a very strenuous job and is doing a wonderful piece of work. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts agree that it is desirable to continue debate on this bill until it is completed tonight?

Mr. McCORMACK. I might suggest to my friend that when the 3 minutes of the gentleman from Massachusetts is disposed of, and it must be about over now, the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from South Carolina get into a huddle with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the Speaker and discuss this question. That is the way these things usually work out.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. If I may have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusets asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that a supplemental bill was reported out of the full Committee on Appropriations today which calls for the expenditure of more than $1,600,000,000. That bill will come to the floor on Monday. There is going to be considerable debate on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to get that information.

Mr. JENSEN. And I think the membership is entitled to know that there may be a great many votes on Monday when that bill comes to the floor. We are asked to appropriate more than $1,600,000,000 even before the ink is dry on the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. My extra minute is about up, so I shall put an end to my generosity in yielding by urging the defeat of any amendment which will reduce the authorized appropriation contained in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished majority leader has just said, I think all decent-minded people are very eager to do the right thing about this particular bill, but many of us who want to do the right thing find ourselves confronted with a confused state of affairs and inconsistent thinking on the subject, not only of many outstanding minds, but of our own minds as well. All we need do is look at the great State of Georgia where two of the most distinguished Members are in disagreement on what to do about this amendment. The same thing is true on this side of the aisle; and so those of us who are not informed of the inner secrets and are not able to grasp the astronomical sums that are involved in this thing are forced to look at it from the background of personal experience or in the light of homely similes to decide what we should do in this matter. First of all, I do not share

the pessimistic views of some of our Members about the fighting qualities of our friends in Europe. It was my experience back in World War I to fight in the trenches along with the British and the French; in fact, I was integrated into units of both armies at different times, and I cannot question in my own mind their ability to fight or their willingness to fight if they have the opportunity and if they are properly trained. Likewise, there is not any doubt in my mind that Western Europe is our front line if we can hold it. However, on the other side of the picture there comes the thought that if we overextend or if we overestimate our power to produce, we may hasten our downfall rather than strengthen our position.

We have already seen—in fact, I have seen with my own eyes—arms go astray when we have spent millions to supply allies in the East, where there were untrained troops or in some cases no troops, so that the weapons we desired to go to our friends got into the hands of our enemies instead. I have seen airfields built at a cost of millions of dollars, for example, the airfield in Kweilin, China, just about ready to be used by our own forces, when the Japanese moved in to take the benefits.

So, again, the question as I see it from a purely practical standpoint is, Are there troops now ready in Europe, without arms, that are able to go out and fight to hold that front for us? If there are, we ought to give them arms. But it is difficult to see in the immediate picture how there could be troops ready to absorb effectively five or six billion dollars worth of arms this year.

Now, we must maintain our strength, both at home and abroad. Unless someone can show me and this body the fact that there are such European troops, I shall support the pending amendment. As I say, particularly with regard to the French and British, I have great confidence in their fighting power, but are there such forces awaiting arms now, and if there are not I think we can afford to go a little easy on this appropriation. Unless there is something that can be added to this picture, I am going to support the pending amendment.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Merely as a matter of information and as a matter of public record, General Gruenther testified that there is a tremendous manpower available but there is also a supply problem. In other words, the manpower will be ready when the equipment is ready for the men. The manpower proposition is running ahead of the equipment. They have given us notice that they will have the manpower ready to use the equipment when we send it over.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Are the men trained and ready to go?

Mr. HERTER. Some are trained and some are not. Some of those countries have had military training service from the beginning. Some have had no arms with which to train their men.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. We did pretty well in World War II in training without adequate arms.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that the emotions run rather deep on this bill, as evidenced by the fact that some words have been said that had to be taken down, and stricken from the RECORD. Most of us occasionally get close to the borderline and I have real sympathy for anyone who gets that close because I do it frequently, not intentionally, but because of the deep emotional feeling I have. The people I represent are greatly concerned about the spending under this bill, in fact the spending that goes on in government.

I was here when they had the Bretton Woods matter up, then had UNRRA, and lend-lease. I remember the Marshall plan. A man by the name of Marshall went up to a little New England college and made some remarks about helping Europe. That was the first inkling. Then it bloomed out; it was to stop communism—a fine objective. I voted for the first Marshall plan because I wanted to stop communism. I am sorry now I so voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I was guilty of the same sin back in 1948, and if the good Lord will just let me live and my people let me stay here long enough, I hope to rectify that mistake.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There must be a lot of people who ought to come down to the mourner's bench.

But, did it stop communism? Since the Marshall plan has been in effect communism has expanded from 170,000,000 to over 800,000,000 people, and the end is not in sight, and you and you and you voted for the Marshall plan. You stand up here today and say "Stop communism." In the last election in Italy more Communists were elected to their legislative assembly than in the previous election, and we spent $2,000,000,000 in Italy to stop communism. In France we spent over $4,000,000,000. Do you think those people infested in a diplomatic way, industrially infected, will have a will to fight against communism?

I thought somebody was going to answer me. I heard so much mourning around the Hall. Well, nobody answers me. Do you think they will have the will to fight? I wish the money we had spent had stopped communism, but it has not, and the people I represent are concerned about spreading ourselves out so thinly all over the world, and I know and they know, that the spending of this country has brought us to economic collapse. You can ruin a country through economic collapse just as easy as you can ruin it through military defeat, and I wonder sometimes whether we are approaching that economic defeat.

Now, the other day we appropriated $56,000,000,000 for war. Some of the things in the bill we were not told about, but I have since learned there was a lot of money in the bill for Europe and our troops there. My colleagues, there is a limit in our spending. We appropriated some $7,000,000,000 for air bases, many of them located in and around Europe. A map was published recently showing their locations.

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

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

Mr. BUFFETT. After 3 years of the Marshall plan, has anybody explained why 5,000,000 Frenchmen voted the Communist ticket in June of this year?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it is very difficult. In fact, I read in the paper this morning that Bevin of England said "We do not want military aid; we want some $14,000,000,000 of economic aid for social advances." England insists on trading with Russia. Why do they and this country and those we assist under the Marshall plan send men to fight communism and send military equipment to Communist countries to kill their soldiers?

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I will yield if the gentleman will give me the answer whether this will stop communism.

Mr. JUDD. The fact is that communism has been stopped in Europe. If it had not been for the aid we gave Greece in 1947, they would have gone under Communist rule that year, and Italy and France, as well. There is not a European, I think, who will dispute that statement. The fact that all of the problems in these countries have not yet been solved does not alter the biggest and most important fact, namely, that these countries are today free and independent and they could not have been, without the aid America has given.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How about China that the gentleman represented? Did we save China? Of course, we did not. We have not saved any of these countries, and the gentleman knows it. Communism marches on, we may have made no friends.

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

Mr. Chairman, some Members have said that this bill will not buy us friends. Of course it will not buy us friends. You cannot buy friends internationally any more than you can in your home town. We are not trying to buy friends. What we are trying to do is to help free people stay free. People want to stay free; but some of them who are right up under the Soviet guns know that if they were to be too frank and open in their opposition to armed communism they could be swallowed up at once, so they are cautious, the same as some Members of Congress sometimes are when they run into strong waves of sentiment against their views in the home district.

The people of Western Europe have to play for time while they build strength. Surely it would not be in our interest for them to challenge the Russian bear prematurely and be destroyed. In my judgment, we are doing them a disservice when we complain because they have not been able to accomplish the impossible, instead of being pro-

foundly grateful for the very real gains they have been able to make during these difficult years.

When this bill came before us 2 years ago I joined with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], now chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] in an amendment to reduce by 50 percent the amount to be made immediately available for military aid to Europe. Our main thought was not that it would save us money; but to give only 50 percent at the start, holding back the remainder as an incentive to the recipient countries to do their full part. There was as yet no definite plan; there was no program; the whole thing was merely an idea. We did not know whether it could succeed or not because we did not know how bold and determined the European countries would be. I think that amendment was sound. It enabled us to keep a certain amount of pressure on them by saying, in effect, "The United States is willing to move its half of the line up this far. You move along with your half and then we will go ahead again with ours." It was not an attempt to wreck the program; it was an attempt to make it more effective and thereby more economical.

Now we have a different situation. There is a plan; there is a program; there is a headquarters for the army of Western Europe; there is a staff under the leadership of one of the greatest Americans of the century, General Eisenhower. The program is on the march. There is far less reason to vote to cut this program now that it is moving than there was 2 years ago when it was only a proposal which none of us could be sure would work.

Of course it is a calculated risk. There are genuine risks if we do this; but look at the risks if we do not.

I have the greatest sympathy with the concern so repeatedly expressed today for the solvency of our country. I share it completely. Furthermore, I admit that the Soviet Union has us over the barrel. If we do not help these countries at great cost to ourselves, they go down and we stand alone. If we do help them, there is a point beyond which we cannot go without endangering the very solvency of the United States. Where is the point? The highest statesmanship and wisdom are needed as we try in all good conscience and mutual confidence to determine the line to which we should go in order to hasten the rate of rearmament so we will not stand alone in so dangerous a world, without going beyond it and wrecking the United States of America. We cannot hold them up indefinitely, yet we dare not let them go down.

When General Bradley was testifying before our committee 2 years ago on the original proposal of a billion dollars for the program, I asked him, "if Congress insists on cutting down our over-all defense program by $1,000,000,000, would you suggest that we take it all out of the foreign military-aid program, or cut it out of our domestic defense budget, or cut them equally?"

He replied that if we felt we had to reduce military appropriations by a billion, then cut out the aid to Europe completely. It would be less damaging to our defense to let Europe go than to reduce the military budget here.

That was 2 years ago. This year when asked the same question he gave a different answer. He said that if we had to cut this year 5, 10, or 15 percent, it would be better to make the larger cut out of our own defense budget than out of this Mutual Security Program abroad, considering solely the defense of the United States of America.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, because he was generous enough to yield to me.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has my colleague from Minnesota, a fellow practitioner, ever given any thought to the results of an economic collapse in this country?

Mr. JUDD. Indeed I have.

Mr. MILLER or Nebraska. What are the gentleman's conclusions?

Mr. JUDD. My conclusions are, first that the United States is like a patient whose constitution is so gigantically strong that the doctors can do an awful lot of wrong things up to a certain point, and the patient will still pull through; and second, that we are approaching that point; therefore it is imperative that we get these extraordinary expenditures over as soon as possible. That can be done only when we have security again. And that can come only when we are able to confront the Soviet-dominated world with a coalition of free peoples so strong and so united that the Kremlin must abandon its efforts to conquer the world.

If I thought the cuts proposed today would save us money in the long run I would vote for them. But I am convinced that to the extent they would slow or weaken the strengthening of the free world, they would mean greater ultimate costs, rather than less, for our taxpayers, and greater danger of the economic collapse you and I both fear.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not an attempt to give our allies the will to fight or the desire to fight; it is to give them the capacity to fight. To enable them to defend their own countries is to increase our own security.

Do not overlook the significance of the fact that two of the Members on my side of the House who have spoken against these amendments today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], are two hard-headed Members who went over to Europe just as skeptical about the program as any of you are. They saw the situation with their own eyes. You have heard them differ with the majority of the Members who belong to their party, the Republican Party, on the wisdom of the proposed cuts. You can be sure no Member likes to be against the majority of his own party on any issue. But we are under obligation to report our convictions based on what we saw. They saw things and I saw things in Europe which convinced us this program can succeed and must be made to succeed. If we make a go of it, it will be the best defense money we spend. If the countries needing our help are not able to defend themselves, we will have to furnish not only weapons in larger amount, but more men, too, and at greater cost. So in my judgment this bill is a means of reducing the inevitable drain that would otherwise come upon our economy. It is in the interest of the long-term solvency of our country as well as its defense.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of ascertaining whether some agreement cannot be reached upon limiting debate on the Fulton amendments, and all amendments thereto. I understand from the leadership, it is hoped that we will complete debate on this bill tonight. If that is to be done, we have to be a little realistic on the matter of time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman referred to the Fulton amendments. Does the gentleman mean both amendments—on the economic and military aid?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; and, of course, that would include the gentleman's amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Fulton amendments, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes reserving 7 minutes for the committee on this side.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] had been recognized before the limitation of time.

The gentleman from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly inspired by the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. There is no question but what every person on the floor deeply desires to help all of the free world to bring prosperity and peace throughout the world. There is no question about that, but naturally there is an honest difference of opinion on this floor as to the best method of doing that and also on the matter discussed by Dr. JUDD as to how long America can continue to drain our resources for the benefit of the world. That is a question on which there is an honest difference of opinion.

But there is one matter which has not been touched here in debate.

GIVING AWAY AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the light of truth and reality be disclosed and that we realize the fool's paradise in which we are living. Now I realize that all America would like to see the people of the world happy and prosperous. But for a moment let us face facts.

In your home town, if the citizen who is deepest in debt continued giving much money to those owning less than he, he would be taken before a sanity commission. Today in our United States we

have a per capita debt of practically $1,700—that means that every man, woman, and child has upon him a burden of $1,700—for Government expenditures. Now that is the largest per capita debt of any country on the face of the earth. I want you ladies and gentlemen, to ponder on that fact—we have voted indebtedness upon our people as no other country has dared to do. We have plunged our own fellow citizens deeper into individual obligation of debt to our Government than any other nation.

Yet today we are being asked to appropriate $8,500,000,000 for the aid of foreign countries each of whom has a smaller per-capita debt than we have. Our administration tells us that the same amount will be asked each year for a period of 3 years, making a total of around $25,000,000,000.

In my district there are people living in hovels; there are the needy aged; there are those who are ill; there are those that do not have enough food. Then, too, there is a scarcity of hospitals. We have many bad roads. We have schools that are totally inadequate to train the children who must enroll this fall. Yet in rough figures, the Government is asking each of the 11 counties in my district to contribute on the average approximately $2,000,000 this year to give to foreign countries. On a 3-year basis, they would be an average of $6,000,000 per county.

We have already given away and loaned roughly $115,000,000,000. Of course a portion of this was for lend-lease, but a goodly part has gone to countries that are our enemies and are helping to kill our American boys. It is difficult to figure just how much we have given away. For instance much ammunition that was supposed to be given to Nationalist China was instead dumped in the Bay of Bengal.

Indiana's share of the $115,000,000,000, plus the $25,000,000,000 for which the administration is asking, would average approximately $33,000,000 for every county. That is more than the assessed valuation of some of my counties.

Lenin one time said that they need not worry too much about America, for it would spend itself into ruin. How true was his statement. And a considerable portion of that spending has been given to Russia and its satellites.

While we have been spending this money, as we say, to stop the advance of communism, Russian imperialistic communism has increased from the control of some 200,000,000 people to more than 800,000,000 people. While we were giving away billions to stop communism, communism has increased 300 percent. It looks to me like there must be something wrong with the way we are trying to check it. It is like trying to reduce by eating candy and whipped cream.

I want to make it clear that I am in favor of helping the peoples who need help in the world. I am in favor of helping them to help themselves. That is the American way. But this entire plan is too unrealistic and impractical.

Today we are being asked to vote $8,500,000,000 for this year alone to be given to foreign countries generally. Yet the burden of indebtedness stares every one of our citizens in the face—a burden greater than is given to any other people on this earth.

All of this give-away program sounds to me like more of that "America-laster" propaganda. I cannot subscribe to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] is recognized.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, this is the third time since I have been in Congress that we have been asked to appropriate money for the ECA and for European aid. The first time, in 1949, the administration requested a gigantic sum and the committee cut that appropriation. Then, on the floor, we cut the appropriation by $600,000,000. Last year another amount was asked and the committee reduced that, and we reduced it on the floor by $250,000,000. Each time there has been millions of dollars unexpended and left as a surplus.

I have a letter which concerns me very greatly. I feel that we should in some way endeavor to keep some of our money at home to sustain our own economy.

This letter reads as follows:

UNION LUMBER CO.,
San Francisco, Calif., August 13, 1951.
Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: The following is quoted from the August 10, 1951, issue of the Trade Review of the Timberman, Portland, Oreg.:

"UNITED KINGDOM-RUSSIAN TIMBER DEAL: 250,000,000 FEET PLACED

"It is reported from London that the United Kingdom has contracted for the delivery of 126,664 standards of lumber from Russia, with option to increase the amount by 50 percent by the end of August. A standard is 1,980 feet, making this volume equivalent to 254,755,520 board-feet.

"The price is understood to be £96 per standard ($268) and freight 500s. per standard ($70).

"It is stated that nine vessels will lift 70,000 standards from Archangel and the balance will come from other Russian lumber ports.

"No new United Kingdom orders have come to Canada or the United States of America in recent weeks. It is reported that British Columbia is considerably behind in her delivery schedule of United Kingdom purchases owing to the adverse logging season occasioned by the prolonged spell of fire weather."

It looks as though Great Britain is using our money to purchase large quantities of lumber from Russia. You will note that no United Kingdom orders have come to Canada or the United States in recent weeks. British Columbia may not have wanted the business because of the prolonged spell of fire weather they have had, but the business would have been a godsend to sawmills on the Pacific coast of the United States of America, whose order files are diminishing rapidly and who have been substantial contributors towards funds which have been loaned or given to Great Britain by our Government.

Sincerely yours,

OTIS R. JOHNSON.

The lumber situation in this country is being hampered greatly through Great Britain's purchase of all their lumber during the past few weeks from Russia. In the last 4 weeks there has not been a shipload of lumber leave this country for England. They are buying it from Russia and allowing lumber to pile up in both Canada and the United States.

We have tried to have expended on a harbor in my district $140,000 which would permit ships to go into that harbor and go out fully loaded, but we cannot secure the money to do that comparatively small job to sustain our economy. At the same time, we have demand for lumber shipments from Humboldt Harbor but the harbor channels have not been deep enough for us to fully load and send out the cargoes.

I feel we should reduce this appropriation and spend some of the taxpayers' money here at home. The American taxpayers are paying the bills. Approximately $4,000,000,000 of previous appropriations are still available and unexpended for carrying on this program for support and to rehabilitate these European countries, if this is possible, with American taxpayers' dollars. How far can we go without a financial collapse of our own country and the destruction of the only country capable of stopping the communistic supremacy of the world? If we cannot keep our people working and support our own industries, we may soon find ourselves unable to care for our own citizens, let alone helping others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, not since 1948 have I taken the floor to oppose these international raids on the United States Treasury, although I have consistently voted against them. Since that time I have become thoroughly convinced that no nation can successfully oppose communism by supporting socialism. With this in mind, I challenge anyone here to deny that we are supporting Socialist governments in Europe. There is not a single democracy in Europe. Everyone of those governments more nearly resembles the Communist form of government than our American form.

In sending $7,500,000,000 of our arms, commodities, and production to Europe we will be taking a double-barreled shot at our own domestic economy. First, we will be draining $7,500,000,000 of our production out of the United States, thereby creating shortages here which will keep our supplies from meeting the demands of the buying public. That is, in itself, inflationary; failure of supply to meet demand causes prices to go up. That is not all: We will be printing an additional $7,500,000,000 in currency and flooding it back in this country, adding to the money already in circulation, inevitably causing more inflation. By everyone of these foreign-aid bills that we pass, we further devalue the American dollar. If the European people do not have faith in the soundness of the American dollar, they will, by the same token, lose faith in America's ability to defend herself.

Our security rests in the strength of America—our people, our resources, our Government, and our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is always inspiring and stimulating to spend other people's money, and that has become a habit in this Congress of the United States. I cannot speak for the people in other congressional districts, but I know that my people with these huge taxes are getting fed up with this idea of supporting these foreign nations which have existed for the last two thousand years. Why, we even have a road commission in India; think of it. Paying for that.

But I am thinking today of the money that we are sending over there to support our own people who are going over there. Take the Federal employees who are sent abroad: Free Government transportation for themselves and their families. They are allowed to take overseas their personal belongings, including cars, at Government expense. Medical attention is free. Housing is located for them in the area in which they are assigned at a very low rental.

Here are some of the fancy titles that these men and women employed abroad use when signing their pay checks drawn on Uncle Sam.

Specialist in higher education; entertainment control specialist; organization and methods examiners; organization analysts; employee suggestions specialists; sociological research analysts; social workers; welfare advisers; monuments and fine arts advisers; social economists; youth activities specialists; international affairs specialists; working conditions examiners. Listed are the civil classifications, the salary earned in their jobs previous to their present assignment to a foreign job and the salary being paid to them by the Government and relief in occupied areas. Let there be no delusion that these New Dealers in foreign jobs are imbued with a burning love for their fellow men and are making a sacrifice in salary to serve them. Here is a list of the salaries which persuaded New Dealers to grab these foreign assignments:

Industrial specialists, formerly earned $4,300, present pay abroad, $10,000; statistician, formerly earned $2,280, present pay abroad, $8,887; labor economist, formerly earned $3,700, present pay abroad, $7,381; information specialists, formerly earned $3,880, present pay abroad, $10,000; business economists, formerly earned $3,934, present pay abroad, $10,000; management specialists, formerly earned $3,400, present pay abroad, $10,000; social workers, formerly earned $2,400, present pay abroad, $7,381; welfare specialists, formerly earned $5,900, present pay abroad, $10,000; business analysts, formerly earned $2,600, present pay abroad, $9,177; social work planners, formerly earned $5,600, present pay abroad, $10,000.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this measure because, with a limitation of 4 hours' general debate, like a great many members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I had hoped more time would thereby be available to other Members who desired to speak their piece on this momentous legislation. I wish to call to the attention of the membership that although the legislation was reported by the committee unanimously—less than one-half of the committee members have taken time during debate. Further, only 14 of the Foreign Affairs Committee members have thus far spoken on this legislation.

After 31 days of very arduous sessions and hearings by our committee, after the sincere job that our committee has done in studying every possible cut in the authorization involved in this particular bill, and then listening to some of the debate and argument that has been presented yesterday and today, I could not help but take this time to comment on some of the statements that have been made. I feel just like the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that if you have something on your mind it is a sin if you do not speak your piece.

Accusations were made that since the Denfeld case our military officers are restrained and limited in their testimony before committees. Implications were made that the opinion expressed by the Government and military witnesses were not their own. In other words, they were told what to say.

In my humble opinion, nothing could be further from the truth. In open and in executive hearings the witnesses were very frank and thorough in their presentations. I have no recollection of any witness being reluctant to give his views regardless of whether it was in conflict with the executive department.

Certainly some testimony for security reasons was withheld. Some details were withheld from committee members, and they should not be criticized for such precautions. Only too vivid are the recent transgressions of secrecy on security measures by certain irresponsible Members of Congress. There should be no doubts in our minds of the responsibility which is ours today. If we question the testimony of our military as being dictated by the administration, I ask the members of the committee to read the testimony presented by representatives of private organizations. Please refer to the testimony, among others, of Hon. Paul Hoffman, of the Ford Foundation; Hon. Nelson Rockefeller; Hon. Tracy S. Voorhees, vice chairman, Committee on the Present Danger; and Mr. Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor. They have urged our committee to go even further than it did in connection with this particular phase of the mutual-security program.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant task in these days of stress to voice an opinion in favor of an appropriation. True our financial obligations are enormous; we must take great care and precaution not to overbalance our economy.

No one will deny that $7,800,000,000 is a tremendous amount of money. We must remember, however, that this money is not being wasted, but used to combat communism. It is much cheaper, as we have learned, to try to stop this enemy through advance preparation, consisting of the building up of our and our allies' economic and military strength than it is to accomplish this through fighting.

The Korean war—one instance in which we were forced to stop Communist aggression by force of arms—has so far cost us an estimated $5,000,000,000. This does not include the irreplaceable loss of lives, the unmeasured sorrow and suffering brought to families of those men who died in battle, nor the destruction inflicted on the Korean Republic.

If we can stop communism through other methods than direct fighting—specifically through our cooperation with the free peoples all over the world—each dollar of our expenditures is worth its weight in gold. If we can manage to avoid world war III through strengthening our allies, we will most certainly be saving ourselves, in the long run, many times the amount which we shall authorize for that purpose today.

If the charges that China was lost because our country has given too little, too late, may well be repeated if we shall be negligent by giving too little, too late to our allies now. Ours is a momentous action—we must search our conscience with all sincerity in considering any reductions as proposed by the Fulton and Smith amendments.

I should like to quote from the testimony of Gen. George H. Olmstead, page 1209, of the hearings:

> Our program is getting our allies to a state of self-sufficiency, and that is our time target as nearly as we can give it to you (2 or 3 years).
>
> I would say in our decision now about the 1952 program that a material change will invite a series of disruptions of commitments that have already been made to us by our allies. It will open the door to give them an opportunity to do less themselves because of the claim, "Why organize a tank battalion, or why create an armored division, if the equipment is not going to be available?"
>
> I would say in our own self-interest for the over-all period of military danger in which we are, between now and the time when we actually get strong—in our own self-interest or in the interest of attaining self-help from these countries, the speed of accomplishing this program is important.

Further, General Olmstead as well as other witnesses have testified that if the amounts were reduced, such action would disrupt the supply of equipment and greatly endanger the program of General Eisenhower and the effectiveness of his untiring efforts in building Europe to a point where we could withdraw our military manpower and permit their self-sufficiency militarily and economically.

Our danger has not lessened with the brighter outlook in Korea, even if the negotiations at Kaesong should be successful to the extent of cessation of hostilities in Korea. So much the more must we be on guard to serve due notice to our enemies that we shall be ever watchful and prepared and extend every effort to aid our allies in mutual preparedness.

Strength must be met with strength, particularly when a party in question recognizes or respects only strength. I hope the pending amendments will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I have hesitated to speak on this bill as I am not an expert on foreign affairs. I find some encouragement, however, when as I review our history over the past few years I find that few, if any, qualify in that category. To my mind the question of defending Europe is a question of doing it all or doing nothing at all. We must go all out to meet the projected Soviet deadline or do nothing at all. This bill is admittedly inadequate for the first purpose. It appropriates too little to do the job. It tells Soviet Russia that we will not be ready for 3 years and just how much we are going to appropriate in each year. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was eminently right when he said rearmament in Europe was proceeding so slowly that it was an incentive rather than a deterrent to war. As such this bill is not only dangerous but utterly wasteful. It is dangerous as an incentive to war. It is wasteful because when that war comes, before we are prepared, it will mean the loss of our entire investment of manpower and materials.

It has been said that we must take the calculated risk that Soviet aggression in Western Europe will come before we are prepared. On the basis of this bill it is not a calculated risk. It is not even a gamble. It is a sure thing. We have announced to the Soviet Union how much we are going to spend, what we are going to do and when we will be ready for them. What would we do if Soviet Russia announced a 3-year program for arming and installing air bases in Canada and Mexico? Would we wait for the program to be completed?

This bill is dangerous as a public announcement to the Soviet Union of just what we can do and when we plan to do it. It is a dare to them to attack. For the past few weeks we have heard much about the necessity for secrecy in appropriation bills in the interests of national defense. In response to that argument we have sacrificed the inherent right in a republican form of government of open facts and open discussion. We have just passed a defense appropriation bill involving $56,000,000,000 and few, if any of us, know where all that money is going. Certainly in the national interests the need for secrecy is far greater in this instance than it is in any other. If we were really wise we would pass an authorization bill for twice the amount of this bill and bury the actual appropriation among all the other undisclosed, untraceable billions in the defense appropriations bill. If there was ever a need as far as Russia is concerned to take our thumb off of our nose and hide it behind our back it is here.

Instead of that this provision for military aid openly tied in with the point 4 program and economic aid to European and other countries. In the face of dire national peril we are faced with a political expedient that fears that economic aid will fail if not sugar-coated with the necessities of defense.

Although this bill has to do in large measure with military matters a new and expensive government agency is created to administer it. This is with thanks to a complete distrust of Mr. Acheson on the part of Republicans and Democrats alike. A great deal of money could be saved by putting its administration in the Department of Defense where it undoubtedly belongs.

Much has been said in this debate about America's productive capacity. That productive capacity is useless unless we have the raw materials on which to work. Much has been said about the tax dollar and its waste. If it was only dollars that we were giving away it would be easy. These days they are quickly printed and are worth only 44 cents. But it is not dollars we are giving away. It is irreplaceable American natural resources in terms of iron and steel and forests and top soil. Much has been said that this is a struggle for the minds of men. To be realistic it is more basic than that. This is a struggle for access to or control of the raw materials that make freedom and our standard of living possible in this present-day world of materialistic values. Already America imports over 70 percent of the materials that go to feed our industrial machine. According to the best estimates the great Mesabi range that supplies most of our iron ore has but 10 years left. True we must protect our sources of supply. But there is not one that we can waste. Especially on such a poor and well-announced gamble as this bill represents.

It is time that we dropped all compromises. If we are going to defend Europe and all our sources of raw materials let us say so and get ready to do it on the terms of a wartime economy and wartime sacrifice. Let us tell the American people the real facts not fairy tales about "good old Uncle Joe." This bill as well as the proposed Republican amendments reducing it in amount are equally ineffective and futile. This bill is typical of our foreign policy over the past years. It is too little and too late. It has been a foreign policy that has been timid, undetermined, and vacillating. It has been a foreign policy that is neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring although it is reminiscent of the odor of each in the later stages of putrefaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, hesitate to speak on this bill which I know has had a great deal of time, thought, and intellectual honesty spent on it by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But there are two things I would like to bring to the attention of the House because they seem to have been rather neglected.

First of all everyone who has spoken on this measure has done so as though this were the only money that has been appropriated for defense. It seems to me that I remember within the last week voting for roughly $62,000,000,000 for defense and for installations at home and abroad. If the so-called free world cannot be defended and cannot be maintained for $62,000,000,000, I submit to you that it cannot be sustained or maintained at all.

Secondly, we seem to be arguing on that same old premise that has always failed, that in order to have peace we must rattle the saber and wage war. I lived in Europe for many years during my youth. I saw armament race after armament race, and every time it was carried on in the name of peace, but there was no peace.

I submit to you that instead of going on constantly throwing more money away in the name of peace, while we build for war, it would be better to turn and look back at history and to realize some new way must be found, perhaps some spiritual way, because all else has failed. It is time for our country, indeed, to assume leadership, but our leadership so far seems to me to have been a failure. It has been a failure, because we are not leading, but following a pattern that has always failed.

Russia has never fought outside her own border; that is history. She lets her adversaries carry the war to her and then devours them. I hope we are not going to fall into that trap.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the second portion of the amendment of Mr. FULTON: On page 3, line 16, subsection (2) strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$663,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman the purpose of my amendment is to cut the economic aid conveyed in this bill $672,000,000. Now I know that that sounds like a lot of money. I call your attention to the fact that on the 30th of June this year there were unexpended funds in the ECA account of $1,698,000,000. I suggest to you that in view of that fact certainly a small cut of $672,000,000 leaves a substantial amount in that account.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact further that in the matter of military aid, as I pointed out before and I now stress it again, that as of that date, June 30, 1951, there was $4,782,300,000 in the military account. Now then, why are we concerned about a small cut of $238,000,000 as contained in my amendment?

I submit that in the matter of cutting ECA funds, the countries of Europe are producing today 44 percent more than they did in prewar. Their export trade is 157 percent over what it was in 1938. I suggest that that is sufficient evidence to indicate that those countries in Europe can produce without all of this money for ECA aid. The cuts I have suggested in my amendments are in our national interests. We cannot keep spending as we are doing in this session of Congress. The Democrats have the responsibility for the global spending programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. In addition to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said regarding the funds, there is $1,700,000,000 worth of counterpart funds that are

still unused from previous years. These can be used either for military aid or economic aid, so there are plenty of excess funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the amount originally requested has already been cut by a substantial margin because of limitations on United States productive capacity. Our military witnesses pointed out that the amount of aid which was orginally calculated on the basis of military requirements has already been reduced by over $1,500,000,000 because of the limitations of productive capacity in the United States. They have told the committee that the military build-up for defense against Russian aggression is needed now, not 2 or 3 years from now, and that they would have asked for a much bigger sum for this program if it were actually possible to turn the money into tanks, guns, and planes fast enough. In other words, the aid figures have already been sliced. If we cut the program still further, let us not fool ourselves that the cuts can be absorbed without serious damage. Less money is going to mean smaller armies and less efficient armies. It is also going to mean further delay in building up our strength to face the Soviet threat. It means that we will be wasting the most precious thing we have now, and that is time.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, cuts in programs mean a slow-down on both sides of the Atlantic with only Russia being the gainer. General Gruenther has estimated that the adoption of proposals to spread this program over 2 years would mean the loss of 15 divisions from the number which we plan to have ready by the end of 1952. In time of crisis this could mean the difference between the survival and the destruction of the entire free world. In other words, we have power by our vote here in the Congress to wipe out in a single instant a fighting force more than 10 times as large as the Chinese Communists have yet been able to kill in Korea and to achieve this result without the loss of a single Communist soldier. We have the power to hand Russia, on a silver platter, the easiest victory it has ever won. But, whatever the Russians may hope to accomplish by their "peace talk," I do not think we are going to fall into that trap. When American boys are still fighting and dying in Korea, I do not think the Congress or the American people are going to stand for making Russia a gift of 15 powerful allied divisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the latest edition of the administration's foreign-assistance program. The President asks for $8,500,000,000 to be distributed all over the world largely at his discretion. In addition to these cash authorizations, the bill also provides for spending all moneys heretofore appropriated, which the administration has not been able to spend yet, despite the best efforts of its expert spenders.

That is not all. Secretary Acheson tells us this is only an installment on a 3-year program involving at least $25,000,000,000. You may be sure that other 3-year programs will follow.

That is not all. The distinguished chairman of the committee informs us that since the war—excluding, of course, all lend-lease and other programs—since the war we have expended on our principal foreign programs nearly $20,000,000,000.

Foreign aid alone, between VJ-day and the end of fiscal 1952, will have totaled about $27,000,000,000. The cost to the people of New Jersey alone is about a billion, enough to run our State government between now and 1960.

For 7 years I have been seeking, impartially, I hope, to find a realistic justification for this fantastic flow of our money and materials.

We were told that if we loaned the British $4,000,000,000, we would stabilize that great power, and insure peace. Did it?

We were told then if we adopted the Marshall plan, that would stabilize England, and all of Western Europe, and that this surely would establish peace. Did it?

Are we closer to peace now than before we spent the twenty billion? If we are, why this year's program of seventy billions to prepare for war?

Mr. Chairman, the careful skill with which this bitter medicine has been fed to us in gradual doses is fascinating. First the British loan. Loan, mark you, not gift; and to Britain alone. Next the Greek-Turkey gift, which ushered in the so-called Truman doctrine.

This was represented to us as a unique case, only costing four hundred million. On May 7, 1947, in the course of the debate, I warned that the so-called unique case would "start America on a dangerous journey, and imperialistic adventure to every plague spot in the world." I think events have justified that foreboding.

Then came the Marshall plan. This was to be the cure-all in 4 years. Then came a trifling billion for arms aid. Then Mr. Truman suggested, in his inaugural message, a small shot of technical assistance to backward countries—the point 4 program.

Now, having conditioned the press, the people, and the Congress to all of this, we have the whole works in this bill, admittedly the start of a new $25,000,000,000 program.

ECONOMIC AID

Economic aid goes on and on. And right on top is the unique case, Greece, still on the payroll. And who are the other powerful allies the committee is helping? Austria, Iceland and Trieste.

But no longer do we confine aid to Europe. No longer are we timid about point 4.

Title 2 takes care of the Near East and Africa to the extent of $590,000,000. Here we have extended our world-wide generosity to Liberia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Libya, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan, among others.

We by no means stop there. Title 3 goes on to take care of Asia and the Pacific, including Korea and the Philippines. In a startling reversal of form, the administration now includes Formosa. Indochina, itself in the midst of a colonial war, is not forgotten, nor are Thailand and Malaya; nor of course is India, which spends most of its time fighting us, in the United Nations, and the rest of its time threatening war on Pakistan. Of course, we are helping Pakistan too.

In order to make the program completely world-wide in scope, the committee finally tossed in $40,000,000 for South America, although if the true interests of the security of this country were considered, our neighbors to the immediate south would lead the list. The bill winds up with some miscellaneous items to start rehabilitating the Korea that we are destroying, and there are a few scores of millions for Arabian refugees.

Mr. Chairman, it was not long ago that we were scorning poor Henry Wallace for his plan that came to be known as a quart of milk for each Hottentot. We have long passed that stage. We are not only providing the milk, but machinery to make the bottles, the milk wagons, and cement roads for its transportation. Heaven knows, we could use some more roads in this country, and heaven knows, that in spite of a high level of prosperity, there are many millions of American kids a little short of milk themselves.

MILITARY AID

Military Aid for Western Europe is a far more appealing subject, but it is discouraging to observe on page 14 of the committee report that we are concerning ourselves with Belgium, army 105,000; Denmark, army 27,000; Luxemburg, army 2,000; The Netherlands, army 100,000; Norway, army 32,000. It is more discouraging to note that in rare cases do any of the European countries have compulsory military service half as long as ours.

France, upon whom we must particularly rely has finally increased its 12 months conscription to 18, but its whole professional army is fighting in Indochina, and its parliament is about one-third Communists. We still limit Italy by peace treaty to 300,000 troops, and so far as my latest information goes, Western Germany, without which the defense of Europe is quite impossible, wants no part of it.

This entire program is argued as a build-up, that time is on our side, and that if given enough time we can build defenses to successfully resist the feared attack by Russia. It has never been explained to me why, if Russia intends to attack, it is going to be kind enough, and forbearing enough, and soft-headed enough to sit by and wait until we are ready.

Deliberately in some quarters, unconsciously in others, Russia has been built up as a world-conquering ogre, which has our leaders trembling in their boots. While I have no confidence in the good intentions of the Kremlin, I see no evidence that the Russian leaders are stupid, and stupid they would be if they entertained the slightest intention of a military attack on this country. Of

course, if we look for war all over Asia, we will probably get it.

Mr. Chairman, just last week Congress appropriated over $60,000,000,000 for building up our own defenses. We already have a Navy more than equal to the world's combined navies. We have now, and certainly will have in the immediate future, an Air Force on which we can fully rely. Our Army is capable without the slightest difficulty of resisting the invasion of the Western Hemisphere from any quarter and it will remain so capable if it is not dispersed all over the world.

Our industrial strength is unequaled. We are responsible for 45 percent of the world's industrial output. Russia produces 10 percent. But, as strong as we are, we cannot carry the world on our back. We can, however, if we only will, take excellent care of ourselves and at the same time participate in any reasonable world program for our fellows.

Mr. Chairman, there should be reason in all things. Our present program is getting altogether out of bounds. For example, I have consistently supported all efforts to help and strengthen the United Nations as a world program for peace. I do not regret this, although the results have been disappointing. But I do regret, and I shall continue to oppose a unilateral effort on the part of the United States alone to support with both guns and butter all the rest of the so-called free world, and most particularly so while their concepts of freedom and the democratic process are not remotely close to ours.

I realize the utter futility of opposing the present bill. I am aware that it might be very unpopular to do so. I must, however, vote my conscience. I am sincerely convinced that the welfare of America is being destroyed rather than served by our foreign policies and I am very fearful that the history of the next 10 years will prove it, unless sometime, by some happy miracle, we come to our senses.

I conclude by saying that any program to help others must appeal to our best humanitarian impulses. I have a right to contribute any of my property for these purposes, if I choose. But I seriously doubt that I have either the moral or legal right to contribute the money belonging to the people I represent. I shall refuse to do so, and oppose the bill.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I have read the excellent statement just made by my colleague, Mr. HAND. I am in thorough agreement with the viewpoint which he has expressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that there is not opportunity to discus the full implications of the amendment just submitted by my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. I know that a good many people think we ought not to cut the military provisions of this bill but it is all right to cut the economic. I am sure that is a grave error. The economic assistance provided in this bill is not the economic-recovery program. That finished its job last February except for Greece, Trieste, and Austria. Strictly economic recovery which was the job of ECA would be substantially achieved in the other countries by the end of this year. The economic assistance in this bill is largely a part of the rearmament program. We are trying to build up production capacity in Europe, and that requires plants and raw materials and tools and transportation and power and so on. If we do not give this economic assistance, which would enable them to build plants, and to get the materials and the tools and to build up their transportation and power, then Europe cannot produce enough arms as scheduled and we will be faced with two alternatives. Either, we will have to lengthen and drag out the period of rearmament which, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has pointed out, is the most dangerous course to follow; or we will have to send more of our own arms, and thereby weaken our own defense forces. Surely, to cut the economic aid part of this bill is to take the worst possible course, forcing us either to lengthen the period of weakness and peril in Europe or to drain our own domestic armaments. I wish we had the time to discuss these charts which I now show to you. They show how a little over $500,000,000 of economic aid that we give to Europe can increase their military production by almost a billion dollars. So instead of $1 worth of arms we get for each dollar that we put into a plant in Pittsburgh or Detroit, we can get $2 worth of arms if spent in the countries to be helped.

Look at this other chart for major matériel procurement. Two hundred and ninety-five million dollars of our economic aid will produce in European factories $892,000,000 worth of arms. If we spend it for arms here, we get one for one. If we spend it there, in the form of economic aid in support of defense production, we get back three for one in major items. Surely that is what we are after. So I urge that if there are to be cuts, it would be better to make them on the military aid features than on the economic features because we will be hurting ourselves worst, and endangering our solvency most if we cut further the economic aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I be informed when I have used 3 minutes of my time?

Mr. Chairman, in the closing minutes of debate on this very important amendment, which really cuts the heart out of this bill, because title 1 is the heart of the bill, I want to say I would not be here today opposing this amendment, if I did not feel that my opposition is in the interest of the United States of America which all Members on both sides of the aisle love so well. Much has been said here about economy; much should be said; and much still remains to be said. I challenge anyone to prove that my record in this Congress is not one of economy. But when we talk about economy, and when we consider the $56,000,000,000 bill which we passed here a few days ago, with hardly a word of opposition, I imagine the House was considering what it would really mean if this great country of ours became involved in a war with Russia. The most conservative estimate of the cost of such a war has been that it will cost $1,000,000,000 a day. If that war should last 2 years, with the destruction that can be brought by atomic weapons, the cost could easily be $7,000,000,000 a day, and the result could wreck the economy of this country utterly beyond redemption. It is in the light of that situation, I am sure, that the Congress has without a murmur passed bills here for the defense of America. I believe the Congress will pass this bill; when the Members reason with themselves, they will know that what we are asking here is just as truly a part of the defense forces, and is just as surely dedicated to the security of America, as any like sum in the defense bills that we have heretofore passed.

Members of the House, stop, look and listen. Kill this bill, if you want to, by these amendments and by other drastically crippling amendments, but let the people of America know—let them know that you put your hand to the plow in Europe and you put your hand to the plow all over the world, but you are turning back right here just when we are ready to break the backbone of communism militarily and economically throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has consumed the 3 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues: I would not impose myself upon you at this hour, or any other hour, if I did not feel very deeply that we might make a mistake here this afternoon.

This debate recalls debates in which I indulged in 1939, 1940, and 1941, when many men said: "Why continue the draft? We do not need an army. We are safe from attack from within or without." We extended the draft by a majority of one vote. If we had not extended the draft, those drafted men who had taken their places in the companies, in the battalions and divisions, would have been taken out before we were struck at Pearl Harbor. The world thought we were weak. They knew we were, in men and materials, and we were struck. Talk about money. In less than 5 years we expended $350,000,000,000, shot away and burned up materials that could have been used for the arts of peace for half a century.

In addition to that, thousands upon thousands of our youth died or were mangled for life. Is the risk worth $500,000,000 that these amendments may strike from this bill? Think about it.

It has been my duty to vote twice in my lifetime to declare that the United States was at war. I trust I may never be called upon to do that again; but if I am I want to look my fellow man in the face and say to him, "I did the things

that I thought would make my country strong enough, and those allied with it strong enough, that no international desperado or despot or totalitarian would dare attack my country or those allied with us."

Think it over. Five hundred million dollars compared with three hundred and fifty billions, and if a war comes, because somebody thinks we are weak or our allies are weak because we have walked out on them, in less than 5 years it will cost this country $500,000,000,000, and probably wreck the economy of the world and destroy the civilization that we love so well.

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

All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute to the first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 132, noes 162.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has not that amendment been divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. We are now considering the portion of the amendment that deals with the military title.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read by the Clerk.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 2, line 22, after section 101 subsection (1) strike out "$5,028,000,000" and insert "$4,828,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 127, noes 166.

So the first portion of the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to the second portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 132, noes 159,

So the substitute was rejected.

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

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

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 167.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Subsection 2, on page 3, line 16, strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$1,035,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 144, noes 159.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FULTON and Mr. RICHARDS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 146, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEOGH: On page 3, line 1, after the word "Europe", insert the following "including Spain."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, one could not have listened to the debate today without having a consciousness of the seriousness of the days through which we are passing, and of the great and diligent efforts that have been expended by our great Foreign Affairs Committee, on both sides of the aisle. I pause, therefore, to pay my humble commendation and respects to them and to their distinguished chairman for the great work that they and he have done in behalf of the people of the United States and of the world. Their labors will be enshrined in the pages of history and will be long remembered by the free people everywhere.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the same serious vein I offer this amendment without any sense of capriciousness nor frivolity. I rather do it because you and I know that the art of dialectics and geopolitics are such that times come when you and I use terms that we well understand and which we expect every other reasonable man to understand, but to which words entirely different meanings are imputed.

We are founding and strengthening this program with the hope and the future of the world. Mr. Chairman, we are in this program seeking to insure the safety and the security not only of the United States but of the civilized world, wherever those countries may be; and we who have had any interests in the normalizing of relationships between our great country and the great and historic country that occupies the obviously strategic Iberian Peninsula find it increasingly difficult as we look at a map of the NATO nations, as we look at a map of Marshall plan nations, to explain to ourselves or to any other reasonable man the exclusion of that portion of the Continent of Europe. Great strides have been made in the normalizing of those relationships, strides that I predict will inure quickly and permanently to the best interests of the United States. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for us to be told informally that "Europe" means "Europe," for only last week in another body there was sought to be turned back the progress that you and we have made in the improving of the relationship between Spain and us. Fortunately, that effort did not prevail. So I submit to you that this is an opportunity we have today, as the elected representatives of the people, to say to the world that we are welcoming the friendship, the support, and the cooperation of all those countries that have by their history and by their tradition displayed a willingness, yea, an eagerness to join with us in the liberation and the continued freedom of the people of the world.

We do ourselves a great service today when we say to those who assume to administer this program without delimiting their authority, without narrowing their jurisdiction, that by "Europe," Mr. Chairman, we mean all of "Europe," and I, therefore, urge that the clarifying words of this amendment be adopted. Our military experts have uniformly emphasized the strategic importance to our military that Spain has offered on numerous occasions. They are convinced that Spain is necessary and are further satisfied that Spain will cooperate with us and the rest of Western Europe. I trust the amendment will prevail.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the gentleman he is exactly right and that Spain does not have any Communist officers in her air force as is the case in France.

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment I do not like to oppose. For a long time I have expressed my feeling to the House and to my people that I think Spain should be integrated into the defense plans. I am glad to say that, as evidenced by the trip of the late lamented Admiral Sherman to Spain, a closer relationship between the Governments of Spain and the United States is developing. I am confident that without this amendment Spain will—and should—get part of this military aid. As a matter of fact, under existing law, the President has full authority to transfer as much as about $500,000,000 of the military funds to Spain and other countries in Europe which may be needed in our defense effort.

Remember, also, Mr. Chairman, that by leaving out Spain by name we are not discriminating against that country, Spain; but if we put in Spain by name, we are discriminating against other nations. We are not mentioning it. This

bill does not specify any recipient nation by name. What we want to have in this bill is some flexibility; if each nation scheduled to receive aid under this bill is mentioned, it is going to be much more difficult to get them to exert the effort we would like to have them put forth. Other nations are not mentioned and Spain should not be mentioned.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. In spite of the tragic death of Admiral Sherman, were we not told that the negotiations he had instituted were proceeding as rapidly as possible, in spite of the fact we had no such amendment or no such direction?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the House to understand from the gentleman's remarks, then, that Spain will be taken into consideration in the administration of this bill?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have no definite assurances of that, but it is my understanding that Spain will be taken into consideration. I have talked to no military man who does not want Spain taken into this program, and I assure the gentleman from North Carolina that so far as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is concerned he will take that attitude.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman understand that there is language contained herein which is comprehensive enough to include Spain in the event we want to do so?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no doubt about that. If you will look at section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended by this House last year——

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to say, in corroboration of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said, that that is true—the tragic passing of Admiral Sherman in no wise will delay the negotiations now going on with Spain.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that General Marshall told us he thought Spain ought to get aid?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. And did not General Bradley say that he thought Spain ought to get aid and also General Eisenhower? So it is inconceivable that the President of the United States will not take their advice and transfer funds for the aid of Spain.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; and I hope the House votes down the amendment.

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

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whether I am to understand, as he has indicated, that the use in line 1, on page 3, of the word "Europe" that the committee intended that it be Europe as we all understand it to be Europe, including the Iberian Peninsula and the isles off the continent?

Mr. RICHARDS. Well I will say to the gentleman from New York that I cannot tell what the committee understood about the language on the page mentioned. The gentleman from New York has worked conscientiously on this question for a long time. I have been more or less in accord with his idea. The only thing I can guarantee here is that the President does have authority to use military funds for Spain, and that all of the military people who appeared before our committee said that is what they thought ought to be done.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I submit I was recognized on the Keogh amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That was vacated by the withdrawal of the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill, H. R. 5113, back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 4, line 8, after the period, insert the following: "No part of any appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph, and no part of any unexpended balances of appropriations continued available pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph, shall be allocated to any country which permits any of its nationals to engage in the manufacture, storage, or transportation, for importation into the United States in violation of the laws of the United States, of any narcotic drug (as defined in the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act)."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will understand that there is not the remotest desire to interfere with any substantive thing he wants to do about a subject that is close to every Member, including myself. But this is a foreign-aid bill directed to a specific issue. It is a very late hour, and we are all trying to get through with it tonight, and I hope, therefore, that the Chair will hold in this particular connection that this amendment is not germane. I make that explanation in deference to my colleague from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia imposes a limitation and is entirely in accord with the provisions of the act that it is intended to amend. It is, therefore, germane.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is clear to all of my colleagues. It, in no way, limits the authorization of H. R. 5113 for military aid to Europe under the provisions of title 1. It does, however, place a definite limitation on the use of funds authorized for purely economic aid under the same title 1.

I have before me an exact transcript of section 1 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act:

That when used in this act—

(a) The term "narcotic drug" means opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine, opiate, or any salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine, or opiate; and the word "isonipecaine" as used herein shall mean any substance identified chemically as 1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester, or any salt thereof, by whatever trade name designated; and the word "opiate" as used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in section 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code.

You are aware of the shocking revelation of the extent of this growing menace of narcotics to our Nation—particularly to our youth—as these facts have been revealed in hearings of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

You have read these reports in the newspapers; you have listened to, or observed, radio and television broadcasts of these committee hearings which prove conclusively the hook-up of this drug traffic with an international crime ring with its center of activities in Naples, Italy, where undercover agents of our FBI have definitely traced this illicit drug traffic to the activities of "Lucky" Luciano, deported former New York gangster, now living in Naples.

I have before me a transcript of the testimony of Mr. Harney, Acting Chief of the Narcotics Bureau, before the Senate investigating committee this past Wednesday, and I read from his testimony. The questions are being asked by the committee counsel; the answers are Mr. Harney's:

Would you give us an estimate of the amount of opium that is produced annually in the whole world?

It's about 2,000 tons.

Could you now give us an estimate of how much of this 2,000 tons is necessary for the medicinal requirements of the world?

About 500 tons.

In other words, a ratio of 4-to-1, you would say?

Right.

The actual output of the world is four times that of the medicinal requirements of the world?

Yes, sir.

Would you now tell us what the principal sources of opium in the illicit traffic are?

The principal sources of illicit traffic in the world are Turkey, Iran, Communist China, India, and Mexico.

Have any of these countries actually taken steps to prevent production of opium?

The production in Mexico is prohibited. That country has made superb efforts to destroy clandestine poppy cultivation by surveying the growing regions with airplanes and destroying the crops, using troops wherever necessary. The production of opium in China has always been prohibited and it is hoped that in a country where it constitutes a grave social danger, there will be no legalization of the traffic.

Could other countries in addition to Mexico and China outlaw the production of opium? Or, have they taken any steps?

Well, most of the opium used in the world for medical purposes comes from Turkey, Iran, and India. For the past 40 years or more these countries have enjoyed a rich opium trade but have shown no disposition to cooperate to the extent of limiting their opium production to the medical needs of the world. Regardless of any world plan to limit production, it is the considered opinion of Commissioner Anslinger, United States representative on the U. N. Narcotic Commission, that it would be utterly impossible for these countries to compel the licensed farmers to deliver their total opium crop to the Government monopoly.

To make this clearer, we've been discussing the growing countries. Those countries that grow opium. I understand the conclusion of the Bureau of Narcotics to be that the growing of opium cannot be completely and effectively controlled. Is that correct?

That's right. Because there is a vast leakage in Turkey from the growing farmer to illicit sources, there is a vast leakage in Iran, which has a tremendous local opium-smoking problem. The situation in countries of that type is such that leakage from a legitimate to illicit traffic cannot be prevented.

Mr. Harney, these drugs that have been brought in from Italy lately, you consider that a temporary situation?

Absolutely. The ones that some of the witnesses have indicated have come through the Luciano gang.

You think that it's a temporary thing, that it can be stopped? Is that correct?

The Italian Government can control that, and undoubtedly will when the machinery is perfected.

Is the Italian Government working now on controlling it?

They are.

Mr. Harney, do you agree with the testimony that has previously been given the committee that the situation in Italy can be traced to Luciano, or a substantial portion of it. I don't, of course, undertake to say the percentage, just some portion of it.

The indications are, and my judgment is, that that situation is attributable, in part at least, to Luciano.

The question you must decide by your vote on this amendment is shall we continue to use American tax dollars to build up the economy and living standard of the Italian people through our economic aid, and, at the same time, permit Italian citizens, whose activities are known to their Government, to debauch and degrade the American youth through the illicit importation of these drugs into the United States. There can be but one answer and that is the approval of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 35, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

After "United States" line 8, page 3, strike period and add: "and for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, or the Communist-dominated areas of Germany and Austria, either to form such persons into national elements of the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance is important in the defense of the North Atlantic area and of the security of the United States."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon, the majority leader made the statement that we, and the free world, have to become strong, but that eventually the satellite countries would have to be liberated. I think, unless we arrive at that latter conclusion, we have to look forward only to an interminable garrison state for the entire world. But in order to give some substance to the idea of eventual liberation of the satellite countries, we must begin to take some steps in that direction, and not merely build up the military defenses of ourselves and of the Western World and create only a world military stalemate for many decades.

The purpose of this measure, calling for appropriation of $7,000,000,000, is because of the Soviet threat. That threat exists because of the enslavement of the satellite states. As long as Eastern Europe is held by Moscow, this threat will continue. This measure, and other measures that we passed, will mean nothing more than an armaments race. So, we must begin to move in the direction of eventual liberation of the eastern nations of Europe. The Achilles' heel of Soviet power in Eastern Europe is the fact that that power does not have any real basis in the people. There are tens of thousands of individuals who would be capable of military service—there are tens of thousands of them in Western Europe who came from the eastern European nations. Think of the great potential for liberty in General Anders' army. Apart from the 25,000 that may come into the American Army, there is no other way practicable, as yet, in which these people can be used.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Are they not now recruiting an army of aliens in Europe under a law passed by the Congress recently?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that they may be recruited into the American Army to the number of only 25,000.

Mr. MORANO. Yes, that is what I have reference to.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. But, in addition to that, it is my idea that all such people, and there are many times that number, who presently are and in the future could be aavilable for the eventual liberation of Eastern Europe.

Mr. MORANO. Do you mean that your amendment will provide another army of occupation in addition to the ones recruited into the American Army?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It will permit those individuals to be formed into national units.

Mr. MORANO. Behind the iron curtain?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. No. In front of the iron curtain; to be attached to the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. MORANO. I think that is a good idea, and I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. The other day I talked to a high military officer and he said this, that in the event of conflict between East and West Europe and Soviet Russia, in going back into Czechoslovakia, for example, if that became the situation, one battalion of Czechs and Slovaks would be worth an entire division of American, French or British forces. Anyone can see the psychological advantage of that situation. We should not wait, but we should begin to form such organizations now. These people should be utilized.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to support the gentleman's amendment, but I just cannot see it. This is a kind of foreign legion you would set up?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. RICHARDS. As the forces are now set up, will they be made up of national forces? Who is going to support this group you are talking about?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think that part of these funds could be used for the support of such individuals.

Mr. RICHARDS. Do you mean General Eisenhower?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think they should be attached to the American Army. The very provisions of this bill reads: "for the economic unification of Europe," and for the eventual "political unification of Europe." These people who are in Western Europe but whose origin is in Eastern Europe, should participate in the defense of Western Europe and eventual liberation of their homeland.

Mr. RICHARDS. That could be done under existing law if General Eisenhower thought it should be done, but, as a matter of fact, it never has been advisable to do that under any military man. The only Foreign Legion organizations that have ever been successful are colonial groups of the home army.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that under your amendment these aliens who are in Germany, for example, could be integrated into a German army?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. MORANO. And could be supported by the funds authorized in this bill?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Certainly. In response to what the chairman of the committee has said, I would like to say this: Just imagine the United States had been taken over by the Communists, and there were 100,000 young Americans available for military service outside the country. What a magnetic force that would be for the eventual liberation of this country. That same situation exists in Poland, in Hungary, in Rumania, and in Bulgaria. Those individuals could be utilized and have some kind of insignia, decided upon by NATO, and they would have a tremendous psychological effect for eventual liberation of their countries. Today they are just being kicked around Europe. They have no status. If they could look forward to the eventual liberation of this country, then this entire measure has direction and objective. Otherwise, it is nothing more than an armarment race, and a building up to a world stalemate of military power.

My amendment contemplates the possibility of aiding the underground organizations that may now exist and may come into existence in the future. It could give such underground organizations direction so that they would not be abortive.

It gives a major part of the job of the liberation of Eastern Europe to the eastern Europeans themselves.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very significant amendment. It seems to me that the gentleman from Wisconsin has laid befor us something of tremendous importance. He called our attention to the utilization of a great many people, refugees from behind the iron curtain who really have something to fight for, the freedom of their homelands.

If you will pardon a personal reference, in late 1949 I made a survey of the refugees in Western Germany, in all three of the western zones of the occupied areas. I visited personally numerous camps of the refugees. In company with American officials, civilian and military, in the occupied areas, I interviewed leaders of these national groups who had escaped from Soviet Russian tyranny. Repeatedly we heard words of pleading from those people that we permit them some day to help fight for their own freedom.

I say to you that this will be a step forward in the psychological war that we need to wage at the same time that we strengthen the sinews of war with tanks, guns, planes, that have been stressed in the discussion of this bill. In our pursuit of strength to oppose communism, we have placed too much reliance upon the expenditures of money. The fight against communism will be won not simply by the expenditure of money but by winning the hearts and minds of people behind the iron curtain. This is a good place to start—with the people behind the iron curtain. By this amendment, they will be encouraged to come over to our side, and fight with us. I really believe that if we encouraged them sufficiently we could get thousands of them to desert and join the forces of freedom. The reliance that Joe Stalin is placing upon those satellite troops in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, and Eastern Germany, would melt away. The very heart of his program would be cut to pieces if we pursue this psychological warfare vigorously.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that in this last war the free army of Poland acquitted themselves splendidly in their fight to gain back their homeland when they fought in Italy?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is exactly right.

Let me illustrate this matter. Recently my wife and I went to Norfolk to attend the Confederate reunion. We met on that trip a very charming lady, the wife of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI]. That lady, born of noble blood in Poland, said to us: "The people of our country have little to look forward to except a third world war, unless you give them the assurance that some day they may help fight for their own freedom." I heartily agree with that statement. I think we should be setting up a legion of freedom. Let us not call it a foreign legion. These refugees from Soviet domination are not foreigners; they belong there; we are the foreigners over there. So let us invite them to protect themselves and us.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Are not most of the refugees in the three zones of Germany, the British, French, and American, of German origin?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No. I did not refer to the German ethnics; I referred to those who have escaped from behind the iron curtain.

Mr. COOLEY. I was leading up to this question: The gentleman said we should work them over to our side; does the gentleman mean we shall induce them to leave their homelands and come into Germany for the purpose of joining a foreign legion?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Actually I will say to the gentleman that I think we should do that very thing. I believe we should offer this opportunity to them.

Mr. COOLEY. Would not that aggravate the refugee problem in the western zones of Germany?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I mean, of course, to encourage only military manpower that we could utilize. I remind the gentleman that every one of the able-bodied men could take the place of an American man now being drafted off the farms or from the industries of the United States.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, having referred to my wife?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am happy to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. My wife, whom the gentleman met at Norfolk, was born in Poland, was in the 1939 bombing, left at the time of the uprising in Warsaw. She advised a member of General Bor's staff, that Poland was being played as a sucker by Molotov and Stalin. I am sure there is another part of the story the gentleman would like to know.

They will come over on our side, but let us make sure there is not any repetition of the Warsaw slaughter; if you want them to be with you, be sure you have the stuff to protect them with; do not do what Stalin and Molotov did in 1944.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him for his courteous remarks.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a few questions of the sponsor of this amendment. This is a very intriguing and interesting amendment, but I was just wondering why the gentleman left out certain countries behind the iron curtain whose people love freedom as much as the countries that were named. I refer specifically to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I certainly think they should be included. I thought they were included by the general term "Soviet Russia." If they are not, I think they should be.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In other words, what you would be doing if you mentioned only the named countries it would be construed as excluding the countries not named. Certainly it would be a shock to the people of those countries behind the iron curtain; they would feel that for some reason we singled them out as not worthy of our interest.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will permit, it does name every country in Eastern Europe and it also names Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia should include Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and I think if necessary they should be added.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I am trying to get at this amendment. As I understand the amendment, it is permissive.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is not mandatory?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It is not mandatory.

Mr. RICHARDS. Somehow or other I believe there is some good in this amendment and so far as I am concerned I will accept it.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to ask a question. I believe on page 4 there

is provision for people of this description. Section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, says that $30,000,000 of these funds may be expended for that purpose. Am I wrong? Is that not exactly the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. That section is in there at the suggestion of the gentleman now occupying the chair and is to take care of the skilled manpower and the surplus population in the various countries and allow emigration out of those countries. These funds could be used for that particular type of emigration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is my understanding it was for refugees and moving the population around.

Mr. VORYS. If, however, some of these displaced persons and refugees should choose to go into such organized liberation forces as the gentleman from Wisconsin has provided in his amendment, that would be a good thing and would lower the need for the $30,000,000; is that not true?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely. I have not prepared a substitute, and I am wondering if the gentleman from Wisconsin will ask unanimous consent to have his amendment changed to include these other countries behind the iron curtain. I know of the fine work he has done and the thought he has given to this entire field. I am sure he would be the last person who would want to hurt any other people.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I agree to that amendment to the amendment so as to include Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and other countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. VORYS. We still recognize—and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and it might be well to refer to those countries by name.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Specifically. That is why I am asking the gentleman to so amend his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to change it to read Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and any other place absorbed by the Soviet Union?

Mr. MORANO. I would like to ask the gentleman to include Poland.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Poland is in there. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in this amendment Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and any other country behind the iron curtain.

Mr. DONDERO. That includes China?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That includes China.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should put his amendment in the form he wants the Committee to vote on it.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin: After "United States" line 8, page 3, strike the period and add: "and for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist-dominated areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union, either to form such persons into national elements of the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance is important in the defense of the North Atlantic area and of the security of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 3, lines 3 and 6, after the word "President", in both instances, insert the following: "with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, some of the Members have thought that perhaps this lengthy debate has been unfortunate in possibly giving encouragement to people in other sections of the world because it might show some disunity on our part. On the contrary, I think this is a most healthy thing that we can demonstrate to the world that we can debate and go into these matters and come up with a firm policy. It seems to me what has come out of this present debate is the fact that we have two enemies: One is Soviet Russia and the other is the threat of insolvency of our own Nation. On this side of the aisle we seem to feel that insolvency is the greatest enemy that we face, and I happen to agree with that particular position. On the other side I suspect that they feel that the greatest enemy is Soviet Russia. I think most of us recognize both those enemies, and that we must resolutely face not one alone of them, but both.

I want to make this comment. General Eisenhower said this, and this has to do with our enemy, Soviet Russia:

The material, spiritual, technical, and professional resources available to the free world are so overwhelming as compared to what the iron-curtain and satellite countries have, that it is almost ridiculous for us to be talking in terms of fright and hysteria which we often do.

That is General Eisenhower's statement of just a week ago, and I think we all ought to bear that in mind when we start running the Russian tanks through the well of the House in these debates.

As far as insolvency is concerned, I only want to make this comment: We are all aware of inflation, and inflation is directly the result of our approaching insolvency, and I submit that that enemy is breathing right on our backs.

As far as my amendment is concerned, it is a relatively simple one, although it may be controversial. The particular provision requires that the President, when he determines that he is going to give money to another country not under the Atlantic Pact, must have the advice and consent of the Senate. The reason for that is, in my opinion, this is a constitutional requirement. If we are going to enter into agreements with another country we are, in effect, entering into a treaty with that particular country. It is provided in the Constitution that the President can only make a treaty with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Page 24 of this bill sets out the provision for eligibility to any country seeking our assistance, and vests this treaty-making power, that used to be and should be in the hands of the President and the Senate, in the hands of an administrator. Under the provisions of this bill it is the administrator who would be making the terms of the treaty with any country that has no treaty relations with us, such as the Atlantic treaty, whether it is Spain or Yugoslavia or any other country. It seems to me that we in this Congress must guard our constitutional duties and our responsibilities jealously. It is for that reason that I offer this amendment to provide that if the President decides to give money and enter into an agreement with a country he shall do it with the advice and consent of the Senate. This will further insure, as our constitutional forefathers sought to provide, that we shall have a little more open diplomacy openly arrived at.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fine spirit in which the gentleman offers this amendment, but I want to point out its possible application to the matter we discussed only a few minutes ago.

Let us take the case of Spain. Let us take the situation where it was decided after the steps and negotiations that have been described to include Spain. Suppose there were in the other body a die-hard who was against having Spain receive aid in response to the military activity. Then you might have a filibuster which would prevent something happening which all of us feel should happen.

We are going to hear a little later about some of the problems that are exclusively those of the Chief Executive, the chief of state, and some which are not, but on this sort of thing, under the advice that he has, as provided later in the organizational sections of this bill, we should leave it as it is and certainly not drag in for this strictly executive and military function the advice and consent of the Senate.

It might be a wise thing to have the advice and consent of the Senate on the way a battle is to be fought, or something like that, but the time element involved and the complications are such that, of course, we would not think of bringing in that cumbersome procedure for such a matter.

I think this goes far beyond the sort of advice and consent that is contemplated in our Constitution. I do not mean that it would be unconstitutional, but it is far beyond what our founding fathers had in mind when they wanted the Senate to have control over the appointment of ambassadors and over treaties. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say that is exactly why our founding fathers did put that in the Constitution. If this country is going to enter into an agreement which is a treaty with another sovereign government, be it Spain, Yugoslavia, or any other country, our forefathers deemed it wise that the Executive not alone be allowed to do that, but that he do it with the advice and consent of the Senate. I submit that when you go into a treaty like the Atlantic Treaty, that was confirmed by the Senate, and the terms under which those nations might receive United States funds are well defined, a similar treaty should apply if you are going to make it with Spain.

Mr. VORYS. As far as treaties are concerned, of course the Constitution applies and the advice and consent of the Senate will be necessary, but we are talking here about an executive action. For instance, in case it is found impossible to get Spain in as a member of NATO, the treaty organization, the question would be whether we would want to bar the President from extending aid to Spain until he had secured the advice and consent of the Senate in such a matter. If he made a treaty, of course it would have to go to the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield to listen to some language from the bill? Here are the conditions under which a country that will receive aid, and that is not under NATO, must agree to: I am reading from page 24, beginning line 20 of the bill:

Unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting and maintaining world peace and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

I submit those are the broad terms of a treaty.

Mr. VORYS. We have spent a great deal of time in former years on this floor debating as to what is a treaty and what is an executive agreement. All I can say is that if it is a treaty, of course you need the advice and consent of the Senate. If you have an executive military agreement you do not, and I do not think you should put in that requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) there were—ayes 45, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNSON:

On page 3, line 8 after "United States", strike out "In addition."

And on page 3, line 14 strike out "and to be consolidated with" and insert "the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1951 will be deducted from."

On page 3, line 23 after "as amended", strike out the words "In addition."

On page 4, line 2 after "1952", strike out "and to be considered with" and insert "the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1951 will be deducted from."

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes a very simple change effecting economy at this particular point in the bill—economy with the surgeon's scalpel rather than the hatchet. Reading in the report of the committee on page 61, I find the following statement:

This bill requests $6,013,000,000 for military assistance. A sum of this magnitude was given the closest scrutiny and required most thorough explanations from the witnesses, particularly since there was under the 1951 military-aid program an estimated unobligated balance of $456,000,000.

That is in the military end of this bill. That $456,000,000 is the amount of money which has been appropriated, and which has been available and which it was impossible to spend. Of course, we all know that there is a similar amount of money, in unobligated balances which exists under the provisions of the economic-aid program. I bring these points up because there have been times in this debate when the gray area between those of us who may have some degree of disagreement, has been somewhat neglected and when the proponents of the bill have stated rather definitely that every cent of this money must be appropriated or the whole program is lost. On the other extreme, there are those who have advocated absolutely no aid and absolutely no military help. I plead with you to look in the area that lies somewhere between these two poles. Surely there is a place in between where we can find the point that is best for the national interest.

MANY PEOPLE WHO DISREGARD OUR NATIONAL INTEREST HOLD DOLLARS TO BE UNIMPORTANT

I believe it is only fair to note that we are not only spending dollars in this program. I tried to do a little quick long division, which I trust is correct, to illustrate the effect of this bill on the workers of our country. Figuring a 40-hour week at $2 an hour for 52 weeks a year, the $7,800,000,000 we are sending overseas in this bill represents 1,870,000 man-years of work. That is exactly what we are exporting. We are exporting the work of American labor which is taken from our workers in the form of taxation to be exported in this manner. In a sense, this often represents involuntary servitude, or slavery, because there are many in my district who do not voluntarily contribute either their hours of work or their dollars to the degree required in this bill.

In 1950 we took every fourth dollar earned by the American people in taxes for Federal, State, and local government. In 1951, it is every third dollar—what it will be tomorrow depends on the courage and the wisdom of this Congress. This matter is particularly in the public mind since the $7,600,000,000 tax increase passed by the House is more than swallowed up by this one bill alone. This bill will cost my State of Indiana about $20,800,000 and will cost my district over $3,400,000, as it stands.

I think it is only fair to point out in the taxpayers defense that in the last 6½ years, from May 1, 1945, to June 20, 1951, we have collected from our people—this is collected from our people in Federal taxes, we have not only appropriated—but we have collected $260,400,000,000. This sum is $12,000,000,000 more than all of the taxes which were collected from 1789 through June 30, 1945. In other words, in a little over 6 years our President has collected $12,068,000,000 more than all of his predecessors, including the late President Roosevelt, collected in 156 years.

There is a happy medium in the national interest. A mean between our obligation under our treaties and agreements with our allies abroad and our obligation to our own people and our own cities and our economic strength.

I was very interested to read a statement from Sir Hartley Shawcross, Chairman of the British Board of Trade, who announced day before yesterday that Britain would not abandon trade with Eastern Europe. The president of the Board of Trade challenged the United States Congress to start making American foreign policy in Washington and to cease letting it be made in London. That is one challenge from one British lord that I am happy to accept.

I ask that in the consideration of this bill this committee consider, when it comes to the time for recommitting this bill, the possibility of easing this load on the American people as much as it can possibly be eased. I ask that this committee make it possible for many of us who feel that military aid, economic aid, and economy are all important to our national interest to vote for this bill by accepting a reasonable cut in the motion to recommit.

I have spent 5 years in the military service. I have been overseas since the European aid program was in operation and never once have I seen a military operation or an ECA operation that could not have been cut 10 percent in funds with resulting improvement in the efficiency of the operation.

Unfortunately, in this bill, we are not dealing in tanks and guns and planes. I wish we were, because I would feel more secure if the veil of military secrecy could be lifted so we knew what we bought. We are dealing in administration, too. We are dealing in personnel. We are dealing in red tape. I cannot believe that we cannot effect economies in these programs nor can I accept the committee figures as sacred, inspired, or inviolate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] has expired.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

SEC. 201. In order to further the purpose of this act by continuing to provide military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $415,000,000 for furnishing assistance to Greece and Turkey pursuant to the pro-

visions of the act of May 22, 1947, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1401–1410), and for furnishing assistance to Iran pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604). In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for assistance to Greece and Turkey, available for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the act of May 22, 1947, as amended, and for assistance to Iran pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

SEC. 202. Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this act, he may provide assistance, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to any country of the Near East area (other than those covered by section 201) and may utilize not to exceed 10 percent of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) pursuant to section 201 of this act: *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistance is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United States.

SEC. 203. In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $175,000,000 for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East in areas other than those covered by section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1502). Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and of the act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557).

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: Page 6, line 12, strike out "$175,000,000" and insert "$140,000,000."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts the $175,000,000 to $140,000,000.

The purpose for the expenditure of part of this $175,000,000 according to the report of the committee is this:

What is proposed in our assistance to this area is not a solution of the balance-of-payments problem, not an attempt to make over existing economies and institutions on our model, not an attempt to raise markedly the standard of living; but rather a series of projects, planned and executed by skilled technicians and administrators, designed to demonstrate, by action, possibilities for still broader development to be conducted by the countries themselves.

I cannot believe that we are going to spend this money merely to set an example to these countries, some of which are ruled by an oligarchy, which they might follow in the future themselves. I believe in military assistance to this area and that it is a good thing, but I do not think that we can afford in this country to raise the standard of living of all the people all over the globe who might be subject to the lure of communism because of a low standard of living.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the gentleman fully understands the situation. From this $175,000,000 is to be deducted the $100,000,000 which is covered by section 204 and section 205, which follow.

The program is a seventy-five-million-odd-dollars program for that area and includes, I might tell the gentleman, $24,000,000 for Iran which has had a long-standing problem with which the gentleman is familiar, I am sure. We find, therefore, that there will be about $50,000,000 left to be distributed amongst all the nations in that area. I think that throws a little different light on the picture.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand that not more than $100,000,000 of this money is to be given under sections 204 and 205. I support this expenditure for this purpose—for the settlement of refugees in Israel. But I believe that the remainder of the program is not well planned.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it leaves a very modest amount for this program.

Mr. KENNEDY. I say it is impossible for us to think of raising the standard of living of all the low-standard countries of the world. I believe the funds provided in section 203 can well be cut by the amount in my amendment. The cuts can be applied proportionately to the programs affected.

Therefore, I ask that the House accept the cut from $175,000,000 to $140,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, as pointed out, the $75,000,000 is the total sum that is left over for these technical assistance programs, and not $175,000,000. It includes a proposed $24,000,000 to Iran. We all know the strategic importance of Iran to the world today. That leaves approximately $51,000,000 for the remaining countries of the Middle East. Strategically the Middle East is the land bridge between Europe and Africa, and these programs will show the way in one of the most backward areas of the world. If we believe in technical assistance, in the point 4 program, the least we can do is to implement it so as to raise the living standards of the people in that area of the world.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 75, noes 85.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. KENNEDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 141.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be contributed to the United Nations during the fiscal year 1952, for the purposes, and under the provisions, of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556): *Provided*, That, whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the purposes of the said United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, he may allocate any part of such funds to any agency of the United States Government to be utilized in furtherance of the purposes of said act: *Provided further*, That no amount may be so allocated unless it will be credited by the United Nations as part of the United States contribution to the United Nations Palestine Refugee Agency.

SEC. 205. In order to assist in the relief of refugees coming into Israel, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be utilized during the fiscal year 1952, under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 7, line 9, strike out all of section 205.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this amendment, I assure you that I am not blinded by any fond partiality nor am I prompted by sinister impulses. No narrow prejudice clouds my clear vision or fetters my reason. I know something about the great problems here involved and the far-reaching ramifications of the decisions which we are here about to make. I have considered the matter diligently. I have weighed the facts and circumstances impartially and I am led irresistibly to the conclusion and to the honest belief that our policy in Palestine has not been in the interests of peace. In support of my conclusions I need only read to you a brief statement from the committee report:

The relationships of the United Nations, the United States, and the United Kingdom with the Arab states have been adversely affected by the Palestine conflict. There still remains the opportunity, however, to find a basis for understanding and sound future relationships with these countries, once they are convinced that it is our intention to deal impartially with them.

It is not so much the "Palestine conflict" which has so adversely affected our relationships with the Arab States, but it is our policy and our attitude and our conduct which has resulted in a loss of prestige and friendship among and with the people of the Arab world. We not only recognized the State of Israel, and

I certainly had no objection to such recognition, but through the Export-Import Bank, a loan of $100,000,000 of American taxpayers' money was made to the new State of Israel. We did not make a similar loan to either or to all of the Arab states. Certainly, a part of the $100,000,000 loan has been used by the people of Israel in the prosecution of their immigration program, and in their resettlement program, and certainly a part of it has been used in the housing and building program. Neither you nor I were in any way consulted, and none of us had an opportunity to pass upon or decide whether or not the loan should be made. That, of course, is water over the mil'. Whether the granting of the loan was wise or not is not of great concern to us at the moment, but whether we make this $50,000,000 grant is a matter of immediate and vital concern to all of us.

I know at least a little about the sad situation in Israel. In the outset I want to commend and to congratulate the Jewish people upon their magnificent achievements in that far distant land of Israel. My first visit to Tel-Aviv and to Palestine was in the spring of 1947; in fact, I was in Bethlehem on Easter Sunday morning. The city of Tel Aviv is a beautiful monument to the ingenuity, to the industry, and to the thrift and great determination of the Jewish people. While I commend all of the achievements of the Jewish people, I cannot condone any of their acts of aggression, nor am I willing to become a party to any expansion of territory which is to result from violence and bloodshed. I have observed conditions, and I know whereof I speak.

I have seen many horrible sights in my life; I visted Naudhausen within a week after VE-day, and I saw Dachau. I saw the crematories and the dead and dying people who had served as Hitler's slaves, and I thought all of that was a horrible sight. But when they were once liberated, even though they were dying of starvation, liberation brought to them hope and faith and courage. Last October I visited a concentration camp on the sand dunes by the hills of Jericho, and I know that I saw there the most awful sight my eyes have ever seen. There on the burning sands of the desert were 60,000 human beings, helpless and hopeless. They had been driven from their farms, their shops and their homes, out on the desert to die. At Gaza there were over 200,000 poor and helpless souls in a similar situation. They were suffering from just about every disease known to the human race. They were receiving only slight medical care and attention. They had no homes, no farms, and no workshops—they had nothing to do but to nurse their woes in hopeless despair. For them there was no tomorrow, with sparkling waters and green pastures. They went to bed at night knowing that tomorrow would only add to their sorrows.

But for the generosity of this great country, all of those homeless and helpless refugees would have died and would have been buried beneath the blistering sands of the desert. This is only part of the story. There are 875,000 Arab refugees, and thousands of them in other parts of Palestine who do not even have shelter, but are forced to live in caves in the ground like rats and wild animals, and with only meager sustenance. The committee's report indicates that we should not be partial, and the implication is that the program here provided is impartial, but what are the facts? Certainly, we have provided generously financial aid and assistance to the State of Israel, and some relief, of course, is provided for Arab refugees, but the program here contemplated for the resettlement and rehabilitation of refugees certainly is not equal or impartial.

The program contemplated is one of great magnitude. This is only the beginning. A large number of Arabs are to be resettled in the Sinai Peninsula. The plan is to make that part of the world blossom and bloom again as it did in ancient times, but with the use of American money. Only the small sum of $200 will be allowed for the resettlement of each Arab, whereas, for the resettlement and rehabilitation of each Jewish refugee, $2,800 will be needed. This amounts to fourteen thousand American dollars for each Jewish family of five. In this connection, let me remind you of the fact that until August 14, this Congress had only authorized operating loans to American farm tenant families for rehabilitation a maximum loan—not a grant—of only $3,500 per family, and here you are asked to approve a program which contemplates the expenditure of $14,000 per Jewish family in that far-away place of Palestine. Perhaps you wonder about the accuracy of these figures. The figures are amazing, but frankly, I am afraid they are accurate.

Yesterday I had in my office for a conference the following persons from the State Department: Mr. John D. Tomlinson, expert on Palestine refugees; Mr. George Warren, adviser on refugees and displaced persons; Mr. William L. Sands, Division of Near Eastern Affairs on Refugees; Mr. Lawrence Dawson, United Nations Affairs Bureau, Division of Refugees and Displaced Persons; Mr. L. I. Highby, agricultural products staff in State Department; Mr. C. M. Purves, Department of Agriculture, OFAR; and Mr. J. R. Fluker, State Department, Office of South Asian Affairs.

At this conference I obtained current and, I assume, accurate information as to the matters here involved. With me at the time were my colleagues, Congressmen WILLIAM ROBERT POAGE, of Texas; CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas; and HENRY TALLE, of Iowa, and each of them participated in the discussion. If my information is inaccurate, then I challenge any member of the committee to give us accurate information. I challenge all the members of the committee to give this House one scintilla of evidence which contradicts the statements which I have made concerning the costs involved in resettling and rehabilitating Jewish refugees. Frankly, I must confess that I was shocked and amazed when I was told that it would cost 2,800 American dollars per person to resettle and rehabilitate Jewish refugees. You might be interested in knowing something about the number of Jews that have been going to Jerusalem.

In April, according to this report, more than 30,000 Jews went to Israel. Certainly, some of them were refugees. On the other hand, I know that some of them went to Israel from all parts of the earth merely because they wanted to go to the promised land. Certainly all of them were not refugees; certainly all of them were not persecuted; and certainly all of them were not well advised about conditions in Israel. The open immigration policy was and is to the effect—come one, come all from all parts of the earth. We will welcome you in Israel. I know that all of them are not persecutees or refugees. I saw them boarding the planes in Bagdad, 150 packed into one plane which was built to take only 50 passengers—they were packed in those planes with nothing but knapsacks on their backs and they were landed at Tel-Aviv Airport only to become charges upon the charity of the people of this country and upon the charity of the people of other parts of the world who believe in this movement of the Jewish people.

Israel does not have an agricultural back country sufficient to support the people who are already there. The State of Israel does not have means or money to support its people. So why should we encourage the policy of come one, come all from all parts of the world?

This great committee of ours apparently realizes that we have lost friends—world without end—in the Arab states, and here is an effort to regain some of our lost friendships and some of our lost prestige, but the committee emphasizes the fact that we must deal impartially in this sad situation. We are dealing impartially when we provide $2,800 to rehabilitate a Jewish refugee and only $200 to rehabilitate those poor, distressed, and discouraged people over yonder in Jordan and on the deserts by Jericho?

Mr. Chairman, some of the best friends I have in this world are Jews, and I have discussed with them the situation which today exists in Palestine. When I visited Palestine I visited with and was cordially received by the Jews. I was also cordially received, and I visited with the Arabs in Old Jerusalem, and I had an opportunity to see both sides of the picture. It is a deplorable situation. In discussing this matter I want to make it perfectly plain and crystal clear that I do not now have, and never have had, the slightest prejudice in my heart against any race on this earth. I have nothing but compassion and sympathy for both Jewish and Arab refugees, but I do believe, however, that we are dealing with a dangerous situation. To give to the Jews of Israel this $50,000,000 might even prove to be disastrous to them, since certainly they will be encouraged to carry on their program of open and unrestricted immigration. The desert sands of Palestine can, of course, be made into green pastures and fertile fields, but this cannot be accomplished by the mere waving of a wand, nor can it be achieved in a very brief space of time.

While my heart goes out to the displaced persons, to the political persecutees, and to the refugees of this world, and while I am perfectly willing to be generous and charitable, I cannot get the consent of my conscience to believe sincerely that the program of the people of Israel is either right or proper under all of the circumstances existing. Why cannot these people live in peace, one with the other? Why cannot they settle their differences and disputes? Why cannot they be tolerant one with the other, as the people of peace want them to be?

I wish that every Member of this House could witness the things I have seen, and then I am sure that no one of you could question my sincerity. If my information is inaccurate, if my observations are not compatible with the facts, then I am regretful; but be it said to my credit, I have not permitted political considerations to come into my deliberations nor to influence my decisions.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. These 800,000 or whatever they are, who cannot get back to Palestine, are referred to as Arab refugees.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. The testimony was that 10,000 of them are Christians.

Mr. COOLEY. They are Arabs. They are Arabs, but they are Christians. The point I am making is this. This is a stupendous program. Are we going to let the world know that they can bring Jewish refugees into Palestine, world without end and without limitations and without number; and that we are going to pay for their rehabilitation at the rate of $2,800 per person? It will take the net income, or more than the net income of the average farm family of this country, to resettle and rehabilitate the families of Jewish refugees that go into Palestine.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman presents a challenge to the sense of fairness, and the integrity of honest men.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I am in dead earnest about this. I saw this thing first hand. I know we have a burden now that is hanging on us heavily, and the question is if we give this $50,000,000 to Israel, what is it going to be used for? Do you know that they have the most ambitious building program in the city of New Jerusalem that you can possibly imagine? They are building capitol buildings, and other buildings there which would do credit to any of the main streets of Washington, New York, Boston, or Baltimore. They are going to move the capitol from Tel-Aviv to New Jerusalem. How can they spend $2,800 to rehabilitate these Jewish refugees except by putting them up in high class apartment houses such as they are now building? They are bringing in the Yemenites. They are bringing them in for heavy labor. They are bringing people in from all parts of the world. I tell you now, when you cast this vote for $50,000,000 for Israel, you are going to lose 50,000,000 friends in the world. I doubt if we can ever regain our prestige and popularity in that part of the world. If you do not believe it, just communicate with some of them.

Another thing I would like to ask the committee to answer on their own time is to tell us what you know about the military plans and the military machine that is being built in Israel today. I understand that it is a secret, and that it is confidential information, and it is not made available to us. I venture the assertion if you put this $50,000,000 into Israel blood will flow in the Holy Land within 90 days of the time they receive the money. If you are going to bring about a conflict, we ought to stop, look, and listen, as the chairman of the committee says, before we allow the Jews of Israel to strengthen their armed forces to the point that they can drive hundreds of thousands of other poor Arabs on the deserts to die and into the lap of our own charity.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to give us the authority for the $2,800 figure which he cited.

Mr. COOLEY. I had a conference in my office yesterday with people from the Department of State who are experts on the Jewish refugee situation, and on the situation generally with regard to the refugees and with regard to the food problem which exists in that part of the world, and we received those figures actually from the mouths of representatives of the Department of State.

Mr. HERTER. I think if you check on those figures you will find that they are not generally applicable in any way whatsoever, but they do have to do with the aid given reclamation projects, in which a certain few individuals were being aided and somebody tried to make them applicable to the entire refugee problem.

Then, will the gentleman kindly advise how there have been resettled in the last 3 years in that country over 800,000 immigrants on that basis?

Mr. COOLEY. I will ask the gentleman, Did the State Department, with all of its experts, recommend this action? No.

Since the State Department definitely did not recommend this gift of $50,000,000 to Israel, and since apparently no other agency in the executive branch of the Government recommended it, naturally we should wonder why it was included in this bill. For your information, I would like to read a little more from the report:

THE ARAB REFUGEES (SEC. 204)

Some 875,000 Arab refugees from Palestine remain in a precarious condition. These unsettled people constitute the main source of unrest in the area and the principal obstacle to peace between Israel and the Arab states. Failure to provide for them would result in most serious consequences.

The United Nations has initiated steps looking toward a resettlement of many of them. About 60 percent have a rural background; it may therefore be estimated that about 500,000 will have to be resettled on the land. That solution is dependent, however, on a number of factors, among which are the availability of land and water and the willingness of neighboring countries to provide a hospitable place of settlement. Pending a final determination of these problems, there appears no alternative to measures for relief financed in large part by the international community.

Last year the United States contributed $27,450,000 to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. The committee heard testimony from those representatives of the American Friends Service Committee and the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, which have been working among these people. There is no question in the minds of the members that the relief programs already undertaken must be continued. But relief is a stopgap measure. Only a portion of this sum is planned for that purpose. The balance is programed for the establishment of permanent settlements for the refugees. For that reason the committee recommends $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952.

IMMIGRATION INTO ISRAEL (SEC. 205)

The establishment of the State of Israel has resulted in an influx of more than 600,000 Jewish refugees.

According to information placed before the committee, there were 101,622 immigrants between May 14 and December 31, 1948; in 1949 there were 243,538; in 1950, 169,831; in the first 4 months of 1951 there were 79,719; in April 1951, alone, 30,202 refugees came into the country. These immigrants included most of the remaining Jewish displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Large numbers came from eastern Europe. According to the testimony, most of what was left of the Jewish communities in Germany, Austria, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yemen, Iraq, and Cyrenaica have now immigrated to Israel. As of May 1, 1951, the committee was told, 273,355 or almost half, had come from Yemen, Iraq, and other countries in the Near East and North Africa.

Section 205 of the bill, to meet this problem, authorizes the utilization for the relief and resettlement of refugees coming into Israel of not to exceed $50,000,000 of the $175,000,000 authorized for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East. The President is to prescribe the terms and conditions governing the furnishing of aid for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel. This amount should materially assist in meeting the serious refugee problem confronted by the new state.

I believe that the Members of this House know that I have supported every foreign-aid program. I am certain that most of the Members of this House know that I was a member of a special committee appointed by the Speaker of the Eightieth Congress, our beloved colleague, the distinguished Republican, JOE MARTIN, and that that committee studied the economic problems of the countries which received aid from the Marshall plan. I was for the Marshall plan, the British loan, the loan to Turkey and Greece—yes, and I was in favor of the point 4 program, and just about every foreign aid and assistance program which has been proposed, and I would be in favor of giving $50,000,000 to Israel if I thought it was in the interests of peace. Let us face this situation objectively and realistically, and in viewing it let us be free from political persuasion.

The Jews in Israel are moving too fast. While we may wish them well, let us be reasonable and prevail upon them to be tolerant, and let us let them know that we cannot, either in the name of humanity or in the cause of defense, underwrite

the ambitious program upon which they have embarked. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted, but even if it is not adopted, I am constrained to vote for this bill on final passage. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

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

Section 205 in the bill was my amendment offered in committee and adopted by a substantial majority. I accept full responsibility for it. There are fairly simple reasons why I believe we should authorize this sum for aid to refugees coming into Israel. But, I think the United States is as responsible as any country in the United Nations for the partition of Palestine. Whatever the reasons that motivated our Government, it took the lead, and it strongly pressured others to vote for the partition. That led to some 800,000 Arab refugees from Israel. Some say they left voluntarily. Some say they were driven out. Some say they left to escape the fighting which took place. In any case, there are more than 800,000 Arab refugees.

Our committee last year sponsored a bill for $27,500,000 to help the United Nations to take care of these Arab refugees. Much of the aid has been administered by American church and charitable organizations, such as the American Friends Service Committee and the Catholic Welfare Counsel. There is $50,000,000 in this bill to continue that work. I hope we can make greater headway in getting them resettled and restored to normal life. Then the Arabs began to demonstrate they had pressures which they could exert. One was oil, which they are using as their weapon against the west in Iran. Another was closure of the Suez Canal to ships to Israel ports. No oil can come through from the Persian Gulf to the refineries along the Mediterranean shores of Palestine.

A third measure was pressure on Jews living in Arab countries, where there have been large Jewish populations for centuries. As a result some 50,000 Jews fled from Yemen to Aden and then were transported to Israel by air. Not a single Jew remains in Yemen where they had lived for tens of centuries. In Iraq, there have been Jews since the days of Nebuchadnezzar. After the captivity in Babylon, most of the ancient Hebrews went back to Palestine, but a good many stayed, and they have been there ever since. In the spring of last year the Iraq Government gave the Jews 12 months in which to leave. It was later extended by 60 days and more than 100,000 have fled to Palestine.

The same sort of emigration has taken place from Egypt, and Arab countries of North Africa. It has now started in Iran and it is expected 60,000 will try to get to Israel within a year, some of them having fled to Iran from Iraq. More than 600,000 refugees have come to Israel in the last 3 years, almost half from the Arab countries and the rest from the ghettos and DP camps of Europe.

This bill as proposed by the administration provided $50,000,000 for assistance to the 800,000 Arab refugees from Palestine. What about the Jewish refugees from the Arab countries? If we are to prove ourselves impartial, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] wants us to be—and I suggested some of the language in the report to which he referred—it seemed to me a reasonable contribution by us would be $50,000,000 for the Jewish refugees to roughly balance that for the Arab refugees.

There was already in the bill $23,500,000 for economic aid to Israel. There was $23,500,000 for economic aid to the six or seven Arab countries. The bill in its present form provides $50,000,000 for the 800,000 Arab refugees; and $50,000,000 for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel, to help take care of the more than 600,000 who have already come to Israel and those who are coming at a rate as high as 30,000 a month. I believe we should keep the bill as it is.

Where are these people going to go if not to Palestine? I commend the young Republic of Israel for sticking to its declared principles of maintaining a haven for refugees no matter how great the burden. Its population was doubled in the first 3 years of its life. It is now about 1,200,000, and it probably will have 50 percent more added by 1954. Most of its founders had themselves been the victims of persecution, and they are so committed to providing asylum for refugees who understandably seek to escape the memories of murder and torture in Europe or persecution elsewhere, that despite the obvious difficulties and problems involved in trying to absorb such rapid increases from the outside, they are faithfully adhering to their open immigration policy. That means taking thousands of refugees who have TB; thousands who are aged; it lets in the halt, the maimed, and the blind. These people are not an economic asset; they are an economic liability to the country; they increase its burdens and cannot contribute much, if anything to its production, but they are being taken in. I commend the republic for it and believe we should help these refugees as we are helping the Arabs.

But, in my judgment the major reason why we should provide this authorization in this bill is not humanitarianism; it is concern for keeping peace in this region. The most explosive area in the world right now is the Near East. This is the spot where the Russians have the best chance to do the most damage to the security of the United States of any of the four regions, Latin American, Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East, with which the bill deals. If we are not impartial, if we do not help both Israel and the Arabs with their economic problems and their refugee problems with sound, rational plans, we are indeed playing with fire.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How can the gentleman say we are being impartial? The gentleman knows there were 875,000 Arab refugees and you are allowing $50,000,000 for that situation. There were 600,000 Jewish refugees and you are allow- 50 plus 23.5 for Israel.

Mr. JUDD. No.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. How can you say that is fair when the Israelis are getting $73,500,000?

Mr. JUDD. The $23,500,000 and the $50,000,000 are for different problems and different purposes. We are talking about the refugee problem, and the bill provides $50,000,000 for each group of refugees; the Jewish group will be the larger within about a year.

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

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. I did not seek this extra time, but I am glad to have it to try to explain the point so we can know what we are doing.

Mr. COOLEY. I will just say this: It is all right for the people of Palestine to want to have open immigration; but I say that they ought to slow it down; they ought not to step it up to 30,000 a month at our expense and expect us to bear the burden.

Mr. JUDD. They were taking up to 30,000 a month last spring because those were people coming largely from Iraq before the deadline there.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I stood in Iraq and Iran and I asked our own Embassy people there if these people were being forced out and driven out and carried out. I found they were not under the slightest pressure; they were going out of their own accord. There were Jews there to see Jews off on the planes; there was a regular holiday atmosphere.

Mr. JUDD. There was a fixed date by which time they had to be out of the country if they were leaving. You will find that in the early stages the refugees were largely Jews from Europe. Some wanted to go to Palestine to help build up Zion. Others were just seeking to escape Europe. But the great bulk of the refugees in recent months has been from the Arab countries. Almost all of the Jewish refugees and DP's in Germany, Austria, and Italy have been removed already. There are still Jewish communities, particularly in Rumania, Hungary, Poland, and Russia, whose members are seeking to go to Palestine; and, actually, from the standpoint of money involved, helping with refugees in Israel rather than providing for them in DP camps, will cost less than we have been putting into the refugee problem through the IRO, something like $70,000,000 a year. That will not be needed after this year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that even in the DP camps of Europe, in Germany and other places that the Jewish refugees in those camps even if they are given an opportunity to come to this great country of ours still prefer to go to Palestine?

Mr. JUDD. I know that some have felt that way; but there were may others who have not felt that way. As I recall more than 50,000 came to the United States. I wonder if our Government would have accepted more.

Mr. COOLEY. And they were people with no agricultural or cultural background, yet they went to build up the population of the cities of Israel.

Mr. JUDD. There is one consideration the gentleman tends to overlook, I believe. We recognize frankly that this is primarily a power politics bill because we live in a power politics world. The Arab countries are not yet well organized or united; and they do not have efficient military establishments. We know that the young country, Israel, does have a tough and efficient army. It has demonstrated its military capacity in ways that I regret, but it has nevertheless proved its ability to fight; and it has the only trained army there is in the whole Middle East except Turkey's. And look at the military as well as economic aid we have given to Turkey. What are you going to rely on, I ask the gentleman, to try to stop the forces of disintegration and ruin which are operating or threatening in that part of the world? I do not think that this ought to be the major reason for this grant for refugees, but it is a reason.

In my book the most urgent reason for this assistance is to try to quiet this area. There is more dynamite lying around loose there waiting to be touched off and blow the whole place to smithereens, than anywhere I know. Let unrest increase, passions build up, fighting break out due to troubles within or between states, and the Soviets will have the Middle East, strategic crossroads of the Eastern Hemisphere, containing half the known reserves of oil in the world. They will be able to split East from West and seize the bridge across to Africa on which we are dependent for so much of our atomic as well as other strategic materials. Then indeed we will be in trouble. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the best and most useful thing we can do here is to keep this bill with a balance of both equal economic aid, and equal refugee aid to the two sides in order to help quiet the area down at a time when otherwise it is likely to explode.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If you cannot even let an airplane go from the Jewish territory to the Arab territory, how could you expect to utilize the strategic army of Palestine to resist communism beyond the Iranian border? You could not drive them across, you could not get them across the Arab territory to fight an inch.

Mr. JUDD. No one visualizes the Palestine army fighting to defend Iran. But if there is peace in the area and then there should be a threat coming down from the north, I think there would be a greater effort on the part of the Arabs to resist it than exists today. We are having trouble in Iran over oil and national prestige. Although the Iranian Government insists on the nationalization of the big oil companies, the Iranians, outside of the Communists, are not primarily as basically anti-American or anti-English or pro-Russian. Quite the contrary. They know that for centuries their historic enemy has been not England or America but the Russian Bear to the north. If we can get the quiet tension relaxed within the area, we can expect that the Iranian and Arab strength as well as Israel's will not be aimed so much at each other as they are today; they will be aimed where they ought to be, against that one enemy which would overthrow them all if given the opportunity.

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

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

Mr. PICKETT. With all this fine army we have in Israel, whose side are they going to fight on? If the gentleman says ours, how does he know?

Mr. JUDD. They will fight on the side of their freedom, not on the side of losing their newly won freedom to Russia; and as I said this afternoon, that is what serves our interests too. The key thing from the standpoint of our security is not that they be pledged to fight for us, but that they remain free.

So, because our Government helped produce both refugee problems in the Near East and the human need is great, because the cost is no greater than it would be to provide for the same refugees in Europe if Israel had not taken them, because it is of vital importance to the peace of the world and our own security to help both sides impartially in this explosive area and get it quieted down in order to concentrate on the real enemy of all free peoples, I urge that the amendment to strike out the section be voted down.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be defeated. This particular matter has been very carefully gone into by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I know something of the history of it and I know that the provisions of the bill, with equality of consideration in relation to the refugees, the Jews and the Arabs, have been given very profound consideration, not only by the committee but by responsible officials outside of the committee and by responsible Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I know that because I had considerable to do in connection with some of the aspects of the bill which brought about the resolution that the committee agreed upon and as expressed by the committee in the provisions under consideration.

We must realize that the Near East, as the gentleman from Minnesota said, is a very dangerous spot. The tension there is very keen. As a matter of fact, we have got to realize that the Nation of Israel, without saying that we could not rely upon others, is one nation in the Near East that in case of a crisis we could rely upon. The institution of government of this new nation is essentially along the lines of our institution of government. The gentleman from Minnesota referred to the vast part played by the United States in the formation of this new nation. Both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party in their 1944 platforms pledged support to this nation. I was chairman of the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Convention, and one of our planks was that the Democratic Party pledged itself to a free and independent Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, and in the same year the Republican Party in their convention adopted a similar plank. We must remember that 6,000,000 Jews, human beings, were exterminated by Hitler during the last war. I do not consider racial origin in my consideration of a fellow man, nor do I consider what a man's color is in forming my opinion about my fellow men. Their color and racial origin is a matter of their birth and their religion is a matter of their conscience. What appeals to me is the mind of a person, a nice mind, a nice person. If there is one case where there is justification for this authorization, it is in the case of the infant nation of Israel, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, as you know I am one of those Members that has looked at the current bill and tried to cut it where I thought it should be in title I. The small amount provided for the Near East should not be cut, and it has been my view that this is the place where the bill should be increased. I remember when the general officers of the Department of Defense of this country came up before our committee, they said that it would be extremely hard to hold Europe unless the free world could hold this lower flank of the Near East. We know that this area is the explosive place in the world. We know that the oil production of both the free world and the iron curtain countries is centered there, and we know that we in the United States vitally need friends in that area.

Israel has been a good friend of ours. She has democratic traditions, and will stand up against oppressors of any kind. When you say "why are the refugees going to Israel?" we should listen to this: Poland's prewar Jewish population of 3,250,000 was reduced to 80,000 by 1945. In Eastern Europe 800,000 Jews remain of a population of 5,000,000. These refugees know persecution. The Government of Greece itself has spent $150,000,000 in 1950 on resettling these immigrants, many of whom are former dis-

placed persons from IRO camps. Six hundred forty-two thousand five hundred and sixty-three refugees have come to Israel in the period from May 15, 1948, to June 30, 1951, and another 600,000 refugees are expected because of persecution, unsettled conditions, and antagonisms. If there are 1,200,000 refugees as the total already in sight, it certainly is not costing any figure like $2,500 a person to resettle them. Such an estimate is clearly erroneous.

Do not forget that there is an Israel army that is good. It has approximately 100,000 experienced men in it, and they are good fighters. For the defense of our country and our legitimate interests, as well as excellent humanitarian reasons, I want to have Israel on our side as a loyal ally and partner with the free world. Let us be friendly with all of the countries in the Near East, and help their people progress. Let us treat them with even-handed justice and show that we can be cooperative with governments who will move toward progress, democracy, and freedom. Let us help this country of Israel develop—she has made tremendous strides and has a great future ahead.

I might comment on the attitude of Iran, because that question was raised here. On July 7, 1951, Iran closed its consulate in Israel because of the nationalist and extremist trouble at home. The Arab News Agency recently has indicated from Damascus there would be further trouble, that Iran was considering the compulsory repatriation of all her Jews to Israel. This would cause the exodus of the 80,000 Jews now living in Iran. Israel needs help in her valiant struggle with her refugee problems and needs it now. I strongly oppose the cut proposed in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me in the prescribed time at my disposal to express the intensity of my opposition to the amendment that is now being considered.

The discussion up to this minute has all been on the political aspects of the legislation. Might it not be wise to look into the moral aspects? Most of us who are Members of the Congress profess the Christian faith. How then can we forget the continuity from Judaism to Christianity? Does not our moral law and ethical concepts come to us on a direct line of descent from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and David? Did not our own Savior select to be born of the Jewish faith and of a Jewish maiden?

Should we now forget that for 2,000 years those who have professed Judaism have been humbled and persecuted? Driven from land to land, country to country. Oceans, deserts, or mountains offered them no security. History recalls the slaughtering of their young and aged. They have seen their family life disrupted and nearly destroyed. Education and financial independence were kept beyond their reach. Their sacred houses of worship were defamed and they themselves caluminated. All of these miseries and oppressions were visited upon them in every land they reached despite the great cultural and ethical contributions they made to what we choose to call civilization. All of this despite the fact that wherever they settled their charitable nature was manifested by the erection of hospitals for the poor, homes for the aged, infirm, and parentless. Everywhere they have given of their time, effort, and money for the erection and maintenance of institutions that could be used for the alleviating of the ills of all of God's children, irrespective of faith, creed, or color.

Going through a 20 centuries' vale of tears it was most natural that they should yearn, hope, and seek for a homeland of their own; a place that would provide them with the security for which they longed; a place where they could revitalize their ancient traditions.

The homeland has been founded. The traditions are once again being established but it is surrounded by elements that are unfriendly. Too, it has been founded at a time when the world is seeing its greatest unrest. These people and this new land need our help. We too were once weak and needed friends. Let us now extend the hand of brotherhood to this young nation. Give them our help and they will not fail to embrace our democratic principles and thus make their contribution to the dignity of mankind.

My time is almost expired. If you do not care to look at this as a moral issue and desire to keep it on a political plane let me leave you with this thought. This young nation is situated at the most dangerous crossroad in the world. Here the future course of civilization may be decided. Politically it is to our advantage to help these people. It is there that we may soon need help and friends. Stop and think. Are we again going to give too little and too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, let me answer briefly two items that have been mentioned by my very good friend from North Carolina: First of all, this question of the $2,800 per person. The actual figures are that the refugees, some 700,000 of them that have come into Israel in the last 4 years, have had all their transportation paid, have had all of their health requirements, and they were extensive, paid for, and have had their initial clothing given them, and have been fed and sustained. They passed through the camps in Marseilles and other parts of Europe. They passed through the reception camps in Israel. Their food, their clothing, their transportation, their medical care were paid for. They have been resettled and started out on a new life of freedom and dignity in Israel, and it has cost about $300 a person. I do not know where my friend from North Carolina got this $2,800 figure.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield? Let me tell him again.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. He says from somebody in the State Department. But I can only say that in talking to the State Department for many years over this problem and knowing a good deal about it, because I have visited this country, and have been interested in this problem for a long time as all humanitarian Americans have been, I have never heard this $2,800 figure once mentioned.

On the question of housing, the fancy apartments the gentleman refers to, I have seen these new fancy apartments. They are made out of cement blocks that are manufactured in Israel. They are one-room-per-family apartments, with a corner set aside as a kitchenette and one bathroom that is shared by a lot of other people. That is the kind of fancy apartment the gentleman opposes, but I do not think you could ask decent people to live in much less than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it was the greatest disappointment of my life when I visited Tel-Aviv in Jerusalem. I have never seen anything more distressing. I do not know who originated the idea of bringing all these people into Israeli. It is a barren country, and it is a desolate-looking country. I rode from Tel-Aviv to Jerusalem. I visited with both armies. We had to get a special permit to do so. I listened to the people in Tel-Aviv, and listened to the Arabs talk. There is a situation there that will go on, and those that have spoken here today about explosions will see an explosion. There is going to be an explosion. The Jewish people would have never been successful there without the aid of arms which were carried into that country in some manner from these United States. They will perish should the generosity of the Jewish people in America cease, and the contributions of the United States Government stop. I listened to the fancy programs of bringing that country into fertile fields and blossom. I saw the fields. I saw the olive groves and the farms from which the Arabs were driven laying in waste with the trees dying and the fields untilled. It is a sad condition. I have the greatest sympathy in the world for all races of people, but whoever brought this situation into being, will some day regret it. As I say, there is going to be a terrible explosion. The people in the Arab country tell you, and they tell you frankly, they will never forget and that some day vengeance will be theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the refugees in Israel resulted, I would like to state from the bestiality and brutality of the Hitler era in Europe, and now also from blindness and fanaticism among a few Arab leaders in the Near East. That is the tragic fact. But that towering injustice does not mean we, ourselves, should inflict further injustice and deny to these same people an opportunity to gain sanctuary.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield? Did the gentleman address his remarks to me?

Mr. JAVITS. My remarks were not directed to the gentleman in any personal way at all.

Mr. BONNER. Since the gentleman addressed his remarks to me, I say that when you take this step, then be prepared to go on for years to come to furnish arms, supplies and ammunition to support those people.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the people of Israel have shown from the early days when they fought alone with rifles that they were able to defeat aggressors who sought to drive them into the sea.

Now the analogy in respect of the hard core of defense that is Israel, can be very exactly drawn with Greece. Greece was the hard core of resistance to the Communist drive in the Balkans despite the fact that she had 7,000,000 people as against 35,000,000 other peoples in the Balkans. That showed their military capacity and their spirit. They need help but they are self-reliant.

Those were the people who were determined for freedom. Their small population, just as Israel's relative population to the Arab states, was enough because of their capacity and spirit. The same is true in Israel. They are the people who are determined for freedom. Therefore, in the fundamental strategic interest of the United States, this is the hard core of resistance in that area of the world.

The proponent of this amendment said something about the fact that Israel will now be dependent upon the United States Government's generosity. The gentleman knows, and I think every Member knows, that the greatest drive for fund-raising that has probably ever been carried on by any organization of private citizens has been carried on among the Jewish people of the United States, who have raised hundreds of millions of dollars to aid in Israel. These drives have been going on and are being continued. But the problem is just too big even for that kind of scraping of the bottom of the barrel which they have done.

Someone asked if the Israeli Army would fight on our side. Our military people have given the best answer to that. Right now there are a considerable number of Israeli officers training in military schools in the United States. Do you think our military people would permit that for a minute if they did not have confidence that this new State of Israel was indeed an arm of the defense of freedom in that area of the world?

We are dealing with both Arab and Jewish refugees in this bill and the treatment of both grave problems is even handed. The great need of the Near East is a firm peace and common efforts at economic progress. Israel, as the Arab States, is a part of the Near East and its future is bound to the future of that area. It is these common objectives which the bill is designed to serve.

I ask that the House defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, on this matter of international justice, let me give you a little arithmetic. There are four titles in this bill. The per capita economic aid for title I, Europe, was $7.22, as proposed by the administration. That has been cut to about $6. They are to provide military production out of that.

In title II, Near East and Africa the per capita aid proposed was $1.03. In title III, Asia and Pacific, 69 cents; and title IV, American Republics, 16 cents per capita.

In the name of equal justice, here is what is in the committee bill. The Arabs got $73,500,000. That is $1.90 per capita. The Jews get $73,500,000. That is $52.50 per capita. When we refer to refugees, let us remember that all the people in this area are generally Semitic in origin. The term "Arab" is a loosely used term. Jew is not the name of a race. Judaism is a religion. That is why I referred to the fact that of these eight or nine hundred thousand who cannot go back to their homes in Palestine, and are therefore refugees, all are not Arab Moslems, but 100,000 of them, according to testimony before our committee, were Christians.

So let us bear in mind as we look at this world-wide picture the per capita economic aid we are rendering, and see whether it is 50–50 to render to one group $1.90 per capita and to the other $52.50 per capita, and see whether that is the way to obtain peace and justice in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment for a number of reasons, some of which have been eloquently stated by my colleagues on the floor of the House during the course of this debate. As I indicated early in the debate, I was amazed that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] should have used a figure with respect to the settlement of immigrants in Israel which I cannot reconcile with any information received by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I therefore hope that no one will be influenced by the use of that figure.

In my opinion, the State of Israel has done an extraordinary administrative job in setting up a new country in a small area of land with very limited natural resources. In recent months, the economic pressures on Israel have been tremendous, not alone because of the problems inherent in the establishment of any new nation whose revenues must of necessity be very small until such time as the country has built up its industry but, likewise, because of the great pressure of immigration. Since Israel's policy has been to keep her doors open to all of the Jewish faith who wish to settle there, she has been pledged to take within her borders the many refugees who, in recent months have left, often precipitantly, Yemen, Iran, Iraq, and other Arab states. It is to help with this strain on the immigration problem of Israel that the committee voted the amount which appears in the bill.

Together with a number of my colleagues, I endorsed a bill for a larger amount of economic aid for Israel at this time. However, the amount provided for in the committee bill will be of tremendous help to Israel in meeting its very serious problem.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am against the amendment that would cut down the aid to Israel.

It is necessary for America and the free world to have a strong friend in the eastern Mediterranean. The bond between Israel and America should be strong.

Judeo-Christian civilization is the civilization of the free world.

The Israel Army has demonstrated it is capable of defending its people.

The people of Israel are a potential strong bulwark against the threat of atheistic communism that would take over this vital area of the Near East.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY), there were—ayes 65, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, one would imagine that Jews fleeing into Israel were there on a jaunt. No. They go to Israel because they have been in the main driven from and uprooted from their native lands—driven and uprooted by Communist dictators and feudalistic rulers. They have been made stateless. Their fate seemed like one on a sea without a shore, until Israel welcomed them. Hungary has ordered them to leave on a few days' notice. Iraq has pillaged and plundered them, and after denuding them of their possessions, forced them to make the trek to Israel. Tonight in Iran, Jews, ousted from their homes, are compelled to sleep in cemeteries. There are no places where they may rest their weary heads. Unspeakable conditions in Morocco, Tunisia, and Algiers renders their presence in those parts highly dangerous. They are forced from Russia and Rumania into exile and wandering.

Where are these unfortunate refugees to go? The blinds are drawn, the doors are closed all over the world. Our immigration quotas preclude their coming here. Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], author of the amendment, would have them go to limbo. I ask again, "Where are they to go?" If funds are not available to defray the costs of transporting them to and into Israel, plus costs of food, shelter, and

raiment, then the program of Israel to resettle these refugees would fail. Israel alone offers surcease from sorrow and travail.

The Knesset, Parliament of Israel, has stated that any Jew seeking asylum in Israel may receive it. Without that asylum thousands of Jews will perish. Hitler and his jackals destroyed 6,000,000 Jews. The gentleman from North Carolina perhaps would like to forget these martyred dead. If this money is not appropriated thousands more Jews will be martyred. The same gentleman, perhaps, seals deliberately his mind against such a thought.

Israel is the only anchor to windward as far as democracy is concerned, that we and western democracies have in the Near and Middle East. The little and brave Republic of Israel is definitely oriented toward the west, and against the east. Should we not support that democracy? Israel has consistently comforted and voted with western democracies in the United Nations.

I ask the sponsors of this amendment, "Did the Arab nations support the United States and western democracies in the United Nations?" Emphatically, no. The Arab nations voted consistently against the United States and western nations. For their refusal to label the Communists aggressors in the United Nations, the gentleman from North Carolina would reward the Arabs. Because Israel voted for the United Nations aggression resolution, and perhaps because Israel sent medicines and supplies and a medical contingent to the U. N. forces in Korea, Israel is to be refused aid for her refugees. Assuredly if we shall not punish our enemies at least let us reward our friends. Israel is our friend.

Israel asks no questions of those seeking entry. The halt, the lame, feeble, young as well as old, may come. Some 25,000 Jews, a hard core, many of which are sick and crippled and enfeebled, are still in displaced persons camps in Germany. We maintain these camps at considerable expense. No country will take these unfortunate ones—save Israel. Israel will empty these camps and thereby save the United States great sums of money.

Eight hundred thousand refugees have already gone to Israel from all over the world. Six hundred thousand more will enter in 3 years. Israel must have help to integrate so many into her economy.

I rarely have heard remarks that have been so contrary to fact. For example, the figure of $2,800 given by the gentleman from North Carolina as to estimate of dollar allowance for each immigrant into Israel is fantastic. I defy him to give any tangible proof. He said he had a conversation with someone in the State Department. Who? He does not identify the individual. His other statements, particularly, about luxurious houses in Israel as homes of refugees are just as fantastic.

Thousands of these unfortunate people in Israel live in tents, thousand of others have only the dome of the sky as roofs over their heads. I, too, was there. I saw these people. I have seen the lines of suffering on their faces. But there is no self-pity. There is hardly a family that death has not visited. They put 100,000 men and women in the field as fighters. They can now put 200,000 in the field. They are the only fighters on whom we can rely in that area—an area that has slumbered for centuries due to Arab neglect. The Jews have awakened it and are making the desert blossom.

Israeli fighters have recently worsted six Arab nations with vastly superior numbers. The Arabs were bent upon forcing the Jews into the sea. The Arabs suffered ignominious defeat. They will get a second trouncing, if they try again. The Israeli fighters have proven themselves worthy descendants of the Maccabees and of those who fought at Massada.

I hope the amendment is overwhelmingly defeated.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC

SEC. 301. In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) the provisions of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1604 (a)), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $530,000,000. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1602-1604), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds appropriated pursuant to this section (excluding balances of appropriations continued available) may be accounted for as provided in subsection (a) of said section 303.

SEC. 302. (a) In order to further the purpose of this act through the strengthening of the area covered in section 301 of this act (but not including the Republic of Korea), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $237,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of such area which the President deems to be not under Communist control. Funds appropriated pursuant to authority of this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557). In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1547), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

(b) The third proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 is amended by inserting "and of Korea" after "selected citizens of China" each time it appears therein.

SEC. 303. (a) In order to provide for the United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, established by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 1, 1950, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $11,250,000. In addition, unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1543, 1551, 1552), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

(b) The sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be contributed from time to time on behalf of the United States in such amounts as the President determines to be appropriate to support those functions of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which the military situation in Korea permits the Agency to undertake pursuant to arrangements between the Agency and the United Nations Unified Command. The aggregate amount which may be contributed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the value of goods and services made available to Korea by any department or agency of the United States for relief and economic assistance after the assumption of responsibility for relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

(c) The provisions of subsections 304 (a) and (b) of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556 (b)) are hereby made applicable with respect to Korean assistance furnished under this section.

(d) Unencumbered balances of sums heretofore or hereafter deposited in the special account established pursuant to paragraph (2) of article V of the agreement of December 10, 1948, between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea (62 Stat., pt. 3, 3788) shall be used in Korea for such purposes as the President determines to be consistent with United Nations programs for assistance to Korea and as may be agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

SEC. 401. In order to further the purpose of this act through the furnishing of military assistance to the other American Republics, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $40,000,000 for carrying out the purposes of this section under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided*, That such assistance may be furnished only in accordance with defense plans which are found by the President to require the recipient country to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Any such assistance shall be subject to agreements, as provided herein and as required by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1573), designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and after agreement by the Government of the United States and the country concerned with respect to such missions, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance with such agreement.

SEC. 402. In order to further the purpose of this act among the peoples of the American Republics through the furnishing of technical assistance, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $22,000,000 for assistance under the provisions of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) and of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 281).

TITLE V—ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 501. (a) There is hereby established, with its principal office at the seat of the Government, an agency to be known as the Mutual Security Administration, hereinafter referred to as the Administration. The Administration shall be headed by a Mutual Security Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be responsible to the President. The

Administrator shall have a status in the executive branch of the Government comparable to that of the head of an executive department, and shall receive compensation at the same rate.

(b) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Mutual Security Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the same rate as that payable to an Under Secretary of an executive department. The Deputy Mutual Security Administrator shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Mutual Security Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Administrator.

(c) Officers, employees, agents, and attorneys may be employed by the Administrator for duty within the continental limits of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, of such personnel, not to exceed 100 may be compensated at rates higher than those provided for grade 15 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and of these, not to exceed 25 may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such General Schedule, but not in excess of $15,000 per annum. Such 100 positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Persons employed for duty outside the continental limits of the United States and officers and employees of the United States Government assigned for such duty, may receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), as amended, may receive allowances and benefits not in excess of those established thereunder, and may be appointed to any class in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff in accordance with the provisions of such act, and assigned to duties for the Administrator.

(e) Alien clerks and employees employed for the purpose of performing functions under this act shall be employed in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purpose of this act, the head of any Government agency is authorized to—

(1) detail or assign any officer or employee of his agency to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency: *Provided*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government; and

(2) detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization in which the United States participates, any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organizations.

Any such officer or employee, while so assigned or detailed, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned or detailed, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this act.

(g) Experts and consultants or organizations thereof may be employed as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and individuals so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $50 per diem.

(h) No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Administrator or the Secretary of State under this act for a period to exceed 3 months unless (1) such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Administrator and the Secretary of State, and until the Administrator or the Secretary of State has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, after full consideration of such report, he believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of Government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views; or (2) such individual has been investigated by a military intelligence agency and the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing that he believes such individual is loyal to the United States and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This subsection shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nor shall it apply in the case of any officer or employee previously investigated and certified.

GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 502. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, there shall be transferred to the Administrator the powers and functions conferred upon—

(1) the Administrator for Economic Cooperation by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended;

(2) the Secretary of State under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act; and

(3) the President by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, the Act for International Development, and the act of May 22, 1947, as amended, except the power to conclude international agreements, the power to make appointments by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, such other powers as the President may reserve to himself or delegate to the Secretary of Defense, and the powers enumerated in section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The following agencies and offices shall cease to exist:

(1) The Economic Cooperation Administration and the offices of Administrator and Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation;

(2) The office of United States Special Representative in Europe and of Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe created by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended;

(3) The office created by section 413 (a) of the Act for International Development;

(4) The offices created by section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Any personnel, upon the certification of the Administrator and with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such personnel are necessary to carry out the functions of the Administrator, and all records and property which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in the administration of the powers and functions transferred to the Administrator by this act, shall be transferred to the Mutual Security Administration.

SEC. 503. In order to strengthen and make more effective the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States, and to carry out the purpose of this act—

(a) the Secretary of State, the Administrator, and the Secretary of Defense shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other;

(b) whenever the Secretary of State believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Administrator is inconsistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States, he shall consult with the Administrator and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision;

(c) whenever the Secretary of Defense believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Administrator is inconsistent with the military-security objectives of the United States, he shall consult with the Administrator and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision; and

(d) whenever the Administrator believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense in performing functions under this act, is inconsistent with the purpose and provisions of this act, he shall consult with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense as appropriate, and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

MEMBERSHIP IN OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 504. (a) Section 4 (a) of Public Law 171, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (59 Stat. 512), is amended by striking out "Economic Cooperation Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Mutual Security Administration" and by striking out "Administrator for Economic Cooperation" and inserting in lieu thereof "Mutual Security Administrator."

(b) Clause (6) of the fourth paragraph of section 101 (a) of Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting after "Munitions Board," the following: "the Mutual Security Administrator so long as the Mutual Security Administration shall continue to exist,".

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARDS

SEC. 505. (a) The Boards provided for by section 107 of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, and by section 409 of the Act for International Development shall advise and consult with the Mutual Security Administrator.

(b) The Administrator may appoint such other advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to effectuate the purpose of this act.

REGIONAL MUTUAL SECURITY REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 506. (a) There shall be a United States Mutual Security Representative in Europe who shall (1) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (2) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), and (3) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. He shall be the representative of the Administrator and receive his instructions from him, and such instructions shall be prepared and transmitted to him in accordance with procedures agreed to among the Administrator, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense in order to assure appropriate coordination as provided by section 503 of this title. He shall coordinate the activities of the chiefs of such special missions provided for in section 507 of this title as may be placed under his jurisdiction by the Administrator. He shall keep the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the chiefs of the United States diplomatic missions, and the chiefs of the special missions provided for herein, fully and currently informed, concerning his activities. He shall consult with the chiefs of all such missions, who shall give him such cooperation as he

may require for the performance of his duties under this title.

(b) There shall be a Deputy United States Mutual Security Representative in Europe who shall (1) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (2) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946; and (3) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy shall perform such functions as the United States Mutual Security Representative in Europe shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Mutual Security Representative in Europe during the absence or disability, or in the event of a vacancy in the office, of the Representative.

(c) The Deputy United States Representative North Atlantic Council and the United States Mutual Security Representative in Europe shall keep each other fully and currently informed concerning their activities.

(d) When necessary to carry out the purpose of this act, the President is authorized to appoint not more than three additional Mutual Security Representatives for other regions in accordance with the applicable provisions of subsection (a) of this section. Any Mutual Security Representative appointed pursuant to this section shall be entitled to receive the same rank, compensation, and allowances as the highest ranking chief of any United States diplomatic mission in the region.

SPECIAL MUTUAL SECURITY MISSIONS ABROAD

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, the Administrator may establish in each country receiving assistance under this act a special mutual security mission under the direction of a chief who shall be responsible for assuring the performance within such country of operations under this act. The chief shall be appointed by the Administrator, shall receive his instructions from the Administrator, and shall report to the Administrator on the performance of the duties assigned to him. The chief of the special mission shall take rank immediately after the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in such country; and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946, or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 501 (d) of this act, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate.

(b) The chief of the special mission shall keep the chief of the United States diplomatic mission fully and currently informed on matters including prospective action arising within the scope of the operations of the special mission and the chief of the diplomatic mission shall keep the chief of the special mission fully and currently informed on matters relative to the conduct of the duties of the chief of the special mission. The chief of the United States diplomatic mission will be responsible for assuring that the operations of the special mission are consistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States in such country and to that end whenever the chief of the United States diplomatic mission believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the special mission is inconsistent with such foreign-policy objectives he shall so advise the chief of the special mission and the United States Mutual Security Representative. If differences of view are not adjusted by consultation the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State and the Administrator for decision.

(c) With the approval of the Secretary of State the Administrator may if he deems it appropriate direct that the functions of the chief or deputy chief of the special mission in any country be assumed by the chief of the United States diplomatic mission or any other member of the mission in that country. The member of the mission so designated shall report to the Administrator, and shall receive directions from him, with respect to carrying out functions relating to the purpose of this act.

(d) The Secretary of State shall provide such office space, facilities, and other administrative services for the United States Mutual Security Representatives and their staffs, and for each special mission, as may be agreed between the Secretary of State and the Administrator.

(e) With respect to any of the zones of occupation of Germany and of the Free Territory of Trieste, during the period of occupation, the President shall make appropriate administrative arrangements for the conduct of operations under this title, in order to enable the Administrator to carry out his responsibility to assure the accomplishment of the purpose of this act.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 508. (a) No military, economic, or technical assistance (other than assistance provided under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) shall be supplied to any nation in order to further military effort unless the Administrator finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting and maintaining world peace and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension. Such agreements shall include appropriate provisions for such country to—

(1) fulfill the military obligations which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party;

(2) make, consistent with its political stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world; and

(3) adopt all reasonable military, economic, and security measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities and to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States.

(b) No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the Administrator finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace, and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SEC. 509. In the case of aid under this act for military items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall procure and furnish such military items and related technical assistance and advice: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Administrator, shall determine the priority in which military items shall be allocated. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the fiscal year 1952 the Secretary of Defense may furnish (with or without reimbursement from the President) all or part of such military items out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this section in excess of 11 percent of the aggregate dollar value of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense for the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1950. For the purposes of this section, (1) "value" shall be determined in accordance with section 402 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and (2) the term "materials of war" means those goods, commonly known as military items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under 1,500 tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 510. (a) After June 30, 1954, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, none of the authority conferred on the Administrator by this act may be exercised; except that during the 12 months following such date commodities and services with respect to which the Administrator had, prior to such date, authorized procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a participating country, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this act may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be deemed to extend the period during which any powers under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be exercised beyond the date specified for its termination by section 122 of that act.

(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority of the Administrator under this act may be transferred to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, and personnel of the Administration may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE BY PRESIDENT

SEC. 511. If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation—

(1) is no longer consistent with the national interest or security of the United States or the policies and purpose of this act; or

(2) would contravene a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations; or

(3) would be inconsistent with the principle that members of the United Nations should refrain from giving assistance to any nation against which the Security Council or the General Assembly has recommended measures in case of a threat to, or breach of, the peace, or act of aggression,

he shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this act. The function conferred herein shall be in addition to all other functions heretofore conferred with respect to the termination of military, economic, or technical assistance.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 512. All provisions of this act except subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 502, and sections 615, 617 (3), and 618, shall take effect upon the date of its enactment. Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 502, and sections 615, 617 (3), and 618 shall take effect on such date, not more than 60 days after the date the Administrator first ap-

pointed takes office, as the President shall prescribe.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 513. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, with respect to those countries eligible to receive assistance as provided herein, funds shall be available as authorized and appropriated to the President each fiscal year.

SEC. 602. Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purpose of this act, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available under any title of this act may be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available under any other title of this Act in order to furnish, to a different area, assistance of the kind for which such funds were available before transfer. Whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. In the case of the transfer of funds available for military purposes, he shall also forthwith notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 603. In order to promote the increased production, in areas covered by this act, of materials in which the United States is deficient, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 not to exceed $55,000,000 to be used pursuant to the authority contained in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522).

SEC. 604. The Administrator shall require all countries participating in any United States aid program or in any international organization receiving United States aid to so deposit, segregate, or assure title to all funds or property allocated to or derived from any program so that the same shall not be subject to garnishment, attachment, seizure, or other legal process by any person, firm, agency, corporation, organization, or government.

SEC. 605. (a) In order to bring about the availability of international resources to further the purpose of this act and to reduce requirements for assistance under this act, the Administrator shall ascertain through the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems whether there can be established, and to make recommendations to the Congress on the establishment of, organizations or corporations affiliated with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to assist in financing, where adequate financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, essential public works and productive enterprises in economically underdeveloped areas.

(b) The Administrator is requested to recommend to the Congress such action as will in his judgment be desirable to eliminate the barriers to, and provide incentives for, a steadily increased participation of private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act. The Secretary of State is requested to undertake, after consultation with the Administrator and the Secretary of the Treasury, negotiations with the representatives of foreign governments looking to the early removal of such obstacles and barriers as now exist to the maximum participation of private enterprise in such development.

SEC. 606. (a) As used in this section—

(1) the term "invention" means an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States, and

(2) the term "information" means information originated by or peculiarly within the knowledge of the owner thereof and those in privity with him, which is not available to the public and is subject to protection as property under recognized legal principles.

(b) Whenever, in connection with the furnishing of military assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act—

(1) use within the United States, without authorization by the owner, shall be made of an invention, or

(2) damage to the owner shall result from the disclosure of information by reason of acts of the United States or its officers or employees,

the exclusive remedy of the owner of such invention or information shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for reasonable and entire compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by any defendant in a like action.

(c) Before such suit against the United States has been instituted, the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government, which has furnished military assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement with the claimant, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States hereunder.

(d) This section shall not confer a right of action on anyone or his successor or assignee who, when he makes such a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or who, while in the employment or service of the United States, discovered, invented, or developed any invention or information on which such claim is based.

(e) Except as othewise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement of a patent committed more than 6 years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action, except that the period between the date of receipt by the Government of a written claim under subsection (c) above for compensation for infringement of a patent and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the 6 years, unless suit is brought before the last-mentioned date.

SEC. 607. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended—

(1) The Administrator shall have responsibility for representing, before the authorities in the executive branch of the Government charged with the administration of title I of such Act, the needs of all countries receiving assistance under this Act, and of such other countries as the President may direct, for United States materials and facilities.

(2) Whenever allocations under such act of United States materials and facilities for foreign countries receiving assistance under this act, and for foreign assistance programs in such countries, are made on an over-all, and not on a country-by-country, basis, the Administrator shall have the authority and responsibility of apportioning, among such countries, the United States materials and facilities so allocated.

SEC. 608. The President, from time to time while funds appropriated for the purpose of this act continue to be available for obligation, shall transmit to the Congress, in lieu of any reports otherwise required by law, reports covering each 6 months of operations in furtherance of the purpose of this act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. The first such report shall cover the 6-month period commencing on the date this act becomes effective. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

SEC. 609. (a) Upon a determination by the Administrator that it will further the purpose of this act, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to section 203 of this act and not to exceed $25,000,000 of funds made available pursuant to section 302 of this act may be advanced to countries covered by said sections in return for equivalent amounts of the currency of such countries being made available to meet local currency needs of the aid programs in such countries pursuant to agreements made in advance with the United States: *Provided*, That except when otherwise prescribed by the Administrator as necessary to the effective accomplishment of the aid programs in such countries, all funds so advanced shall be held under procedures set out in such agreements until used to pay for goods and services approved by the United States or until repaid to the United States for reimbursement to the appropriation from which drawn.

(b) In order to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds made available under the authority of this act for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), may be used to acquire local currency for the purpose of increasing the production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

SEC. 610. Funds realized from the sales of notes pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for making guaranties of investments in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 111 (b) (3) and 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, in any area in which assistance is authorized by this or any other act to be furnished under any provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 611. Funds made available for carrying out the provisions of title I of this act shall be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of all of the titles of this act, including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations and expenses in the United States in connection with programs authorized under the act for International Development. Any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with assistance furnished by the United States may be used by any agency of the Government without reimbursement from any appropriation for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purpose of this act. Funds made available for carrying out the purpose of this act in the Federal Republic of Germany may, as authorized in subsection 114 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1512 (h)), be transferred by the President to any department or agency for the expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

SEC. 612. The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) In section 11 (c) by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) From the funds made available under authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 for assistance to be provided under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), not less than 20 percent shall be

provided on credit terms as specified in that act."

(2) In section 115 (b) (6) by—

(A) inserting in the second proviso thereof after "wealth" the following: "for the encouragement of emigration pursuant to subsection (e) of this section";

(B) adding in the last clause of the second proviso "and operating" after "administrative";

(C) striking from the last clause of the second proviso "within such country"; and

(D) adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of the funds deposited in the special accounts of the 'participating countries' (as defined in section 103 (a) hereof) in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production in such 'participating countries.' The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned."

SEC. 613. (a) Section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1573), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(e) Guaranties by such eligible nation that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state."

(b) Section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1580), is hereby amended by adding in the first proviso thereof, after the words "of which it is a part," the words "or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures," and by changing the figure at the end thereof to "$500,000,000."

SEC. 614. The proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1574 (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That after June 30, 1950, such limitation shall be increased by $250,000,000 and after June 30, 1951, by an additional $450,000,000."

SEC. 615. Section 104, subsections (b) and (c) of section 105, and sections 108 through 110 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 616. (a) In order to effectuate the purpose of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is authorized to appoint and, in accordance with the provisions of that act, fix the compensation of such professional and clerical personnel, in addition to those authorized by existing law, as may be necessary to enable the committee to oversee the performance by the executive agencies concerned of their duties, responsibilities, and functions under this act in the interest of an efficient and economical administration of this act.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman.

(c) In every 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 fulfilling the purpose of this section shall be charged to such local currency funds to the extent available.

SEC. 617. The Act for International Development is amended as follows:

(1) By adding before the period at the end of section 404 (b) the following: ": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such contributions from funds made available under authority of sections 101 (a) (2), 203, 302, and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 shall not exceed in the aggregate $13,000,000, and the use of such contributions shall not be limited to the area covered by the section of the act from which the funds are drawn".

(2) By adding at the end of section 407 a new paragraph:

"(d) Participating countries shall be encouraged to negotiate agreements with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, or otherwise, to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations."

(3) By repealing sections 413 and 414.

SEC. 618. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "Department of State" wherever it occurs in section 5 and inserting in lieu thereof "Mutual Security Administration"; and

(2) By amending section 8 to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Mutual Security Administrator shall have authority to detail employees of the Mutual Security Administration to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine, and the Secretary of State, upon the request of the Mutual Security Administrator, may detail employees of the Department of State to the Institute: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail."

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill from this point, title III, be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD, and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 16, lines 23 to 25, inclusive, after the word "Senate", strike out the words "such other powers as the President may reserve to himself or delegate to the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this is in title V in the bill which sets up the new organization. In this section we transfer powers to the Administrator which were held by others; and then we list the exceptions. In section 3 you will see that we transfer powers which the President had under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act except, beginning in line 21: "the power to conclude international agreements, the power to make appointments by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Then comes this language my amendment would strike out: "Such other powers as the President may reserve to himself or delegate to the Secretary of Defense."

We also reserved to the President the powers enumerated in section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Act which referred to a 10-percent transfer between titles.

This language which my amendment would strike out, reserving such powers to the President as he may wish to keep or delegate to the Secretary of Defense, were put in late at night. We did not realize that perhaps we not only had marched up the hill and marched down again, but that possibly we had marched up the hill and jumped off a cliff. What we were trying to do here was to set up through this whole title V a new organization to replace the disorganization that now attempts to administer these three or four different laws. We all concede the power of the President under our Constitution. Section 501 provides that the new Administrator shall be responsible to the President, but we want the President to attempt to work under the organizational structure set up by this bill and worked out with such great care by our committee. A number of us feel that in this section we made a mistake in leaving him such powers as he might reserve to himself, because we do not know what that might mean. That might mean the recreation of ISAC, the organization we are attempting to supersede. It might mean reserving powers and turning them over to the Secretary of State. We do not want that to happen. Also the reservation of his power to delegate to the Secretary of Defense is no longer needed because of amendments we put in section 509. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] offered amendments there which make it unnecessary to leave any general delegation of power by the President to the Secretary of Defense.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. We made a mistake when we put this language in. We can clarify and rectify the mistake by taking out this reservation of Presidential power in this organization.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that when the committee was considering this bill section by section it voted to strike this out originally; then on the last night, when we were in a hurry to get through before a dead line so everybody could get away, it was reinserted by a close vote? But the committee did in its consideration vote for the amendment that the gentleman now proposes?

Mr. VORYS. The same proposal was weighed earlier and found wanting. It later got in late at night, and now it should come out late at night.

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

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

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman consulted with his colleagues on the majority side in reference to the amendment he has proposed?

Mr. VORYS. I would not purport to speak for the majority members of the committee, although I know that some of them feel as I do and as many of us do about this. I feel this amendment will not change the fundamental responsibilities of the President. It will just simply make it clear by leaving this out that we want him to use the new organization created with great care and labor by our committee.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that Paul Hoffman told us that the one thing above others which enabled him to succeed was the fact he had Cabinet status

and he had security in the performing of his functions so that he could go ahead in full knowledge that the President or anyone else in the executive department could not come along and take this or that away from him? He could go to the European countries and present a program and they knew he was the final word. They were, therefore, willing to play ball with him, and he made great headway.

Mr. VORYS. We are not going to get anywhere by building up a new organization, then tearing it right down again.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] quoted Mr. Hoffman about the importance of this new Administrator being of Cabinet rank. These few words here in no way remove the Cabinet status of this administrator as created in the pending bill. It simply says that with regard to the Mutual Defense Act those powers given to the President under that act, and it does not refer to any of the other acts like ECA, but only to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, the President can reserve to himself or delegate to the Secretary of Defense.

Now, actually the President can, under an interpretation of these words, reserve to himself only those powers which he is going to personally exercise or delegate to the Secretary of Defense to exercise for him. He could not, in accordance with these three lines, set up another ISAC, and I refer you to section 301 of title III of the United States Code which says:

> The authority conferred by this chapter shall apply to any function vested in the President by law if such law does not affirmatively prohibit delegation of the performance of such function as herein provided for, or specifically designate the officer or officers to whom it may be delegated.

The other point is this: This military job must be run by the Defense Department insofar as the end items are concerned. They must coordinate the production in this country; they must coordinate the requirements of our overseas Allies and our own requirements for national defense. These words do not take away from the new administrator the responsibility to carry on the coordination of the military aspects of the program with the economic problems in each country. They do not take away from this new administrator his responsibility to stimulate the new military production in each country and to coordinate the military production of Western Europe, so that we do not have a lot of duplication country by country.

There is a third point. The organization of this mutual security program, as I see it, must be flexible enough so that if we get into a war—and God help us if we do, and the whole purpose of this is to avoid war—but if we get into a war we must have a flexible enough set-up so that the responsibility of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense will immediately come into play. If you take the military powers, under this act and give them completely to the administrator, then there is no functional way in which the voice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of General Eisenhower's headquarters can directly come to the administrator except through the Secretary of Defense and the coordination provided in other sections of the bill.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I emphatically agree with the gentleman that the military matters must be handled by the military, the allocation of end items, and so on. I do not understand why it is necessary to have this language in the light of the language in section 509.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] at the end of section 205.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to section 303 of the bill before us. This section contains the appropriation authorization for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

This is the Agency which we and the other members of the United Nations have set up to help the people of Korea—first, by providing the bare necessities required to keep them alive, such as food, clothing, medicine, and shelter; and second, by helping toward the repair of the terrible devastation of war. Our experts and those of the other members of the United Nations have agreed on the shares which they should ask their legislatures to authorize and appropriate.

The contribution which this new Agency needs from the United States is $112,500,000 of new funds plus the transfer of certain old funds already appropriated to the ECA but not spent. I am sure that no one who has seen or read about the destruction in Korea will doubt that at least this much money is needed from the United States to kelp the Korean people.

There is one major point, however, which must be considered and which was specifically considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee: that is the fact that during the continuation of hostilities the major part of the relief work will have to continue to be the responsibility of the military authorities in Korea and the United Nations agency will be able to work in only a limited scope. For this reason the committee concluded that it was not necessary at this point to authorize the full sum needed and that the smaller sum of $11,250,000 of new money when added to the sum to be transferred from ECA would be enough as a temporary, partial action.

I would prefer that the entire sum be authorized now so that the necessary appropriations could be made from time to time as needed without the further authorizing action of the Congress. A full authorization now would be a clear indication to the other participating nations that the United States Congress is prepared to contribute our full share and would be the best way to call upon them to contribute their full shares.

Nevertheless, despite my own preference, I cannot contend that the proposal of the committee is completely unreasonable and I am prepared to acquiesce in it and I have no doubt that the House will sustain the committee's recommendations. In doing so, however, I feel that the Members of the House, the people of Korea, and our friends in the United Nations who are with us in the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency should very clearly understand what our attitude is and why we are handling this authorization in this manner.

I am confident that it is the firm intention of the Congress to join with other members of the United Nations to help the Korean people to survive and to rebuild their country. I am confident it is the intention of the Congress to authorize and appropriate the full share of the United States for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. The people of Korea who are looking to us for help and the nations who are joining with us to help them should understand that the sum authorized in this bill is intended to be only a down payment on our full contribution and that the rest will be made available when it is needed. I believe this is the intention of the committee; I believe this is the intention of the House; and with this understanding, I will vote for this section.

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

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years I have been calling attention of the House to the increasing danger of the deterioration of our State Department and Foreign Service because of overlapping and duplication by other agencies of our Government which has resulted in the bypassing of our chiefs of mission abroad.

We are now considering H. R. 5113 authorizing the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I feel sure that unless title V of the bill which deals with the organization and administration is amended, our Foreign Service will be further bypassed and made ineffective. The cooperation of our Economic Coordination Administration and the State Department was so serious up to a year ago that the President by Executive order instructed clearance of these economic and political activities through the chiefs of our missions. I do not feel that sufficient language is contained in this section to assure this cooperation. The language contained in the section follows very closely the language contained in the present ECA Act. At the local level it requires the Secretary and the new Administrator to keep each other informed with the right of appeal to the President in case of disagreement and at the country level it requires the Ambassador and the representative of the new

Administrator also to keep each other informed with right of appeal to the Secretary of State and the Administrator in case of a disagreement.

The language in the present ECA Act has worked fairly well but only after the President approved an interdepartmental agreement last February which provided that the two representatives abroad must constitute a team under the leadership of the Ambassador. It is my feeling that this language is inadequate when it is applied to the new agency because ECA now has a limited field. It distributes money for recovery purposes and asks the recipient countries to do very few things which they do not want to do. Therefore, the administration of the ECA programs does not require many decisions involving foreign policy.

On the other hand, this new agency will cover a broader field. In addition to economic aid, it will have a strong voice in determining the amount and kind of military aid and will cover a large number of new countries under the point 4 program. In many countries, especially in Europe, it will require governments and countries to do many things they do not wish to do such as raising their defense budgets, military service, military production, curbs on inflation, revision of tax laws, wage scales, land reforms, and so forth. In some cases, especially in the case of North Atlantic treaty countries, these negotiations have to be done within the framework of the NATO. There are other problems—world security pact rights to air and other bases, and other negotiations and matters which require the highest kind of diplomatic skill constituting an inseparable part of carrying on our foreign policy.

While ECA has been headed by two men with unusual willingness to cooperate, there is no assurance that this will continue to be true in the future. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that even if the ECA language in this new bill is followed in every instance, the mere exchange of information is not adequate to insure that the new administrator or his country representative will not run off with the ball and in substance direct our foreign policy. It would seem far wiser to build on the present set-up of perfecting the operation of the International Security Affairs Committee which has done a remarkable job in spite of the fact that it has been in existence only since early in 1951. The least we can do is to amend H. R. 5113 so that the President has power to make further provisions to insure coordination if, as seems possible, difficulties develop.

Partly for this reason I call your attention to the following excerpts from the Brookings Institution Report, which was released recently and which expresses considerable concern regarding these matters. In a report prepared for the Budget Bureau by the Brookings Institute, dated June 1951, page XX, sections 7 and 8, of the Summary reads as follows:

PORTIONS OF THE BROOKINGS REPORT

7. All existing programs of military and economic aid should be directed toward the same goal in the present national-defense emergency. The current diffusion of such programs, with variety in objectives as well as in administrative arrangements, is no longer appropriate. All forms of foreign aid should so far as possible be conceived, authorized, and carried out as one program, with a single controlling declaration of policy.

8. The administration of a unified program of military and economic aid should be carried out jointly by the Department of Defense, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Department of State. Some form of central coordination or direction must be provided, but the method by which this is to be done with sufficient effectiveness is a matter of great difficulty and complexity. It is our conclusion that effective authority to direct the operations of all three agencies in a unified program cannot be vested in any one of them, in view of the magnitude and importance of the tasks to be performed by each of the several agencies and their status as coequals.

It may be possible, nonetheless, to secure successful program administration while relying primarily upon voluntary interagency agreement through the existing mechanism of the International Security Affairs Committee, of which the Department of State holds the chairmanship. The test of the effectiveness of this device, however, is whether three important conditions are met. One such condition is clarification of relationships between the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Department of State. Another is continued activity on the part of various units of the Executive Office of the President in support of coordination at the departmental level. A third is sufficient unity in the Government as a whole to make it possible for the Department of State to exercise effectively the leadership responsibility that has been assigned to it.

If some or all of these conditions cannot be met, it may become necessary to give further consideration to the possibility of appointing a director of military and economic aid in the Executive Office of the President. Consideration should also be given to the possibilities inherent in the further development of the National Security Council through the establishment of a full-time vice chairman with responsibility under the President for executive leadership in the coordindation and execution of all phases of national security policy, including the unified program of military and economic aid. Meanwhile, the existing arrangements in the form of the International Security Affairs Committee and the Director of International Security Affairs in the Department of State should not be lightly upset. Basic policy underlying the program should continue to receive the attention of the National Security Council in the preparation of recommendations for approval by the President.

Also on page 231 under Administration of Military and Economic Aid, the report reads:

In the present period of national defense emergency, there can be no doubt that all of the existing programs of military and economic aid should be directed toward the same goal. The goal is to strengthen the free world against the possibility of Communist attack or subversion. The current diffusion of foreign aid activity, with a variety of objectives at least partially inconsistent with each other and with equal variety in administrative arrangements, no longer seems appropriate.

We therefore reaffirm the conclusion of our preliminary report in December 1950, that all forms of foreign aid should so far as possible be conceived, authorized, and carried out as one program, with a single controlling declaration of policy.

As we said before, this does not mean that the entire administration of a unified program of military and economic aid can or should be carried out through a single executive department or agency. The Department of Defense must continue to be responsible for a great part of the unified task. The Economic Cooperation Administration should be continued and should likewise be responsible for a great part of the unified task. The Department of State already occupies an important position in the efforts that have been going on in recent months to bring about a greater unification of the existing programs; it should continue to have major responsibilities in the unified task.

But there is question as to the exact extent of the appropriate responsibilities of the Department of State, as indicated by the previous discussion in this chapter under the first issue. In our preliminary report, we favored arrangements along the lines presented in this chapter as the fourth alternative under Issue 1. Those arrangements, while recognizing major responsibilities of all of the agencies concerned, would have made specific provision for centralized leadership above the departmental level through the appointment of a director of military and economic aid in the Executive Office of the President.

And on page 256, under Relationships Among Overseas Staffs, the report reads:

There are many other issues arising out of the fact that the United States now has a dual representation in countries where the Economic Cooperation Administration has established special country missions. This has produced some anomaly in relations with the countries concerned, and has at times created uncertainties as to where contact with the United States should occur. The area of uncertainty has increased as the Economic Cooperation Administration has become increasingly influential in politico-economic and mutual-defense questions.

Misunderstandings have arisen in part from the fact that a separate line of communications flows to and from the Economic Cooperation Administration missions. By law the ambassador is entitled to be kept "fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of the operations" of the country mission, and most country mission chiefs have been careful to keep him informed wherever he has shown an interest. A similar problem arises with respect to the Ambassador keeping the Economic Cooperation Administration mission chief adequately informed. Such difficulties appear to be decreasing with the development of better relations between the missions.

Some discontent has prevailed among Foreign Service personnel because of the feeling that an activity was going on in their midst that bore a close relation to what they were doing yet about which they were not fully informed. This feeling has also stemmed in part from the fact that the country mission chief ranks in all places next after the ambassador and above the career service, and in part from the fact that the Economic Cooperation Administration missions have included substantial numbers of high-ranking and highly paid personnel.

The problems of acquiring and reporting economic information have not everywhere been successfully resolved. In some instances the point of friction has had to do with the functions of the office of the economic counselor of the embassy. The introduction of large research and reporting staffs in the Economic Cooperation Administration missions has duplicated in some degree the functions of the economic sections of the

embassies, as has the establishment of contacts with the economic agencies of the foreign governments.

Some ambassadors have been eminently successful in overcoming difficulties by displaying ingenuity in staff arrangements, and by developing a sense of teamwork to meet emergency conditions. In Rome, the counselor of embassy for economic affairs is economic policy adviser to the Economic Cooperation Administration country mission chief. In Brussels, the economic counselor is at the same time the Economic Cooperation Administration deputy mission chief.

Both of these devices have worked well. In a few places, there has been a degree of duplication and cross-purpose which has worked to the disadvantage of both the embassy and the Economic Cooperation Administration mission. The Department of State and the Economic Cooperation Administration are currently seeking to overcome this duplication and confusion.

With United States military and economic aid programs both directed to the same goal of increasing the strength of friendly nations, close relationship between the Economic Cooperation Administration missions and the MAAG's is an obvious requirement. Thus, although the decision to operate independent economic aid missions appears to have been wise at the time from the standpoint of accomplishing rapidly the European recovery program, changes which have since occurred in the world situation suggest that it may be desirable to review this decision before accepting the present arrangement as a permanent basis for handling foreign economic aid.

I sincerely feel that title 5, page 12, organization and administration for mutual security administration, section 50, if adopted, will result in the deterioration of our foreign service and will continue making the chief of the American Mission the third important American official in the foreign field. If the House insists on keeping this section in the bill, it should be amended to give the President the power through executive order to coordinate all of the foreign activities through the regular chief of American Mission. This order was issued the first time by the President a year ago and, in my opinion, was made necessary because of the confusion that existed in the bypassing of our chief of foreign service by representatives of other agencies of the American Government.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska on the statement he has presented to the House, because I think he has hit on one of the weak points of this new administrative agency which this committee has included in the bill. I had the same fear as the gentleman, that the person who should be the senior member of any combination of missions in any one country, namely, the Ambassador, is going to be bypassed, and a very critical situation will arise as the result.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that this was completed in the last hours of the hearings, and very hurriedly; that amendments were offered, which were turned down, which would require the coordination of all of these very important political problems through the leadership of our chiefs of mission abroad.

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

Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], as I read it, is to avoid the type of situation for which this entire organizational set-up is in the bill. The purpose of it is to have a clear line of operative responsibility through the single administrator.

The great difficulty in the set-up that was evolved in recent months was that the money which was appropriated to the President for the very purposes specified in this act was all transferred to the Department of State. The Department of State then parceled out to the Secretary of Defense, or to various other agencies of the Government, whatever amount of money the Department of State saw fit to parcel out. It was at that point that the full responsibility granted to the President was transferred to the Secretary of State. That same thing could be done, if the wording that is in the bill is left in it, and is not stricken out. The only purpose for striking it out is to complete a type of organization which every outside agency, and every outside witness, who came before the committee, recommended strongly as the most effective operating type of organization.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Nebraska is the first Member of Congress who has recommended the ISAC structure.

Mr. HERTER. It so happens that the head of ISAC and the deputy ISAC are constituents of mine and close personal friends of mine. Both come from the city of Boston, and are very fine, able gentlemen. One of them is a former president of the United Fruit Co. In spite of that fact, I am afraid the organizational set-up which they head is not in the interest of efficiency.

We are doing nothing that goes beyond the ECA organization. I think I have been to almost as many foreign missions as the gentleman from Nebraska, and I have never seen any conflict between the ECA Administrator and the head of our foreign missions, or our foreign service officers except where it was a question of personalities. The lines of responsibility remained entirely clear.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. In this reorganization, we keep exactly the provision in ECA for consultation between the Secretary of State, the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and in case of a dispute, the matter goes to the President.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite right. We are not taking away any authority from a single foreign officer.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Under the bill, the representative of the Administrator can appeal to the Administrator. The diplomat in the foreign field can appeal to the Secretary of State. And if they do not agree, both of them go to the President. By that time, the damage has been done.

Mr. HERTER. No, from the practical point of view today, all of this is being done by the foreign missions, every one of which is headed by an Ambassador. There has never been any effort either by the military or by the ECA to take from the Ambassador his primary responsibility as the chief American official in any foreign country.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very interested, as the gentleman knows, that there be no interference with the handling of the military end items by the Department of Defense. Does the gentleman feel that the other provisions of this bill are sufficient, and that this reservation is not necessary in order that the Department of Defense may handle the military end items throughout the bill?

Mr. HERTER. The intent is perfectly clear. The way this is drafted, the President can reserve to himself rights which upset all the rest of the intent of the bill.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that on this recent subcommittee trip to Europe in every country we asked our Ambassador whether our ECA or military representatives carrying on this program had interfered with his functions as chief of mission and chief spokesman for the United States, and whether there had been in fact two voices speaking for the United States, one the voice of the Ambassador and the other the voice of the ECA, stronger because he had the money bags, and in every single case they told us that had not been the situation? We are not trying here to weaken our foreign service. We are trying to get a short-term, hard-headed, efficient organization which can carry on this as a business operation.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct. I know of one case where an American Ambassador was in trouble continuously with the ECA representative, and, I am frank to admit, that that particular Ambassador has long since been replaced, and should have been replaced long before the trouble arose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT as a substitute amendment: On page 16, line 24, strike out the word "or" and substitute the words "for personal exercise such other powers and functions of a military character as the President may."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the arguments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], they fear that the present language would permit the President of the United States to delegate authority to the Secretary of State and through him set up another agency. My amendment completely eliminates that possibility, because he says he may reserve to himself "for personal exercises." In other words, he can only reserve those powers which he personally is going to exercise, or such other powers and functions of a military character as the President may delegate to the Secretary of Defense. That takes care of Mr. KEATING's problem, which I think all of us are in agreement with, that the Secretary of Defense must run this military program.

Let me just touch on that proposition for a second. I look upon this NATO army as in effect just another one of our armies in the defense of the freedom of the world. I think the Secretary of Defense has the prime responsibility which no other official of the Government ought to have anything to do with, when it comes down to arming that army. It is not going to be worth anything unless it is properly equipped. The only service who can properly equip it is our Defense Department and our military services.

I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] might accept this wording. Would the gentleman consider accepting this amendment, because I have limited these powers which the President has reserved to himself only to those which he will exercise personally, and such other powers and functions of a military character as the President may delegate to the Secretary of Defense? I think I have met the gentleman's objection.

Mr. VORYS. I have only had a brief time to consider it, but so far I certainly would not agree. I will explain my reasons in my own time.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. When the gentleman speaks about exercise by the President of his own personal power, would that not mean that he could delegate within his own office, turn over all the money to Harriman to spend as his personal representative?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. Under the section that I read before, the President cannot turn over to Mr. Harriman or to anybody, unless the Congress of the United States has written it into the legislation. Here we say that he cannot reserve any power except that which he is going to personally exercise. That does not mean personally exercised by Mr. Harriman or it does not mean personally exercised by anybody else in his office. "Personally exercised by the President" means just what it says. I cannot agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the majority whip if he can inform the House as to the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to comply with the request of the distinguished minority whip.

On Monday we will have the Consent Calendar. Following the Consent Calendar the supplemental appropriation bill for 1952. I believe it was pointed out earlier in the day that this is a rather important supplemental appropriation bill, and it is quite likely that there will be one or two sharp controversies. I mention that in order that Members may know how to govern themselves on Monday with reference to this supplemental appropriation bill.

On Tuesday we will have the Private Calendar and following that Senate Joint Resolution 42. That is an interstate oil compact.

The rule provides, I believe, for 1 hour of general debate. Of course, there are primaries in the State of New York on Tuesday, and we would expect if a record vote were requested on this joint resolution or any other matter for that day to ask unanimous consent that the roll call go over until Wednesday.

Following this legislation, Mr. Chairman, we shall undoubtedly get the conference report on the Defense Housing Act. I understand that the conferees hope to reach an agreement so that it can be filed about Monday. Then, of course, we may get the civil-functions appropriation bill conference report. That will then leave two other conference reports, Armed Services and State and Justice, that have not yet been passed by the Senate. Should they be passed and come out of conference during the week, we would, of course, get those conference reports also. If they are not, we would expect later in the week to propose a continuing resolution for those departments whose appropriation bills are not yet out of conference.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the majority whip. I was very hopeful that we could get all these things cleaned up by the middle of the week.

Mr. PRIEST. I assure the gentleman that we will get through them just as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are hearing again the same euphonious arguments in favor of this bill that have been dished up for the last 2 years.

Look at the cover to the report on this bill. What does it say—Mutual Security Act of 1951. Well, first of all how "mutual" is this security? How much mutuality has been demonstrated in Korea? Let the figures speak for themselves—less than a thousand dead listed for the countries that even claim to be fighting with American troops in Korea. And how much mutuality has been demonstrated in financing that war? The United States has footed the entire bill and we are told again this afternoon that we will probably be called on soon to gouge out of the American taxpayers' pockets another $5,000,000,000 to finance what was stupidly called a police action when it started more than a year ago.

And then we read this title to the bill:

> To maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.

Who, from some sweet land of milk and honey, dreams up the lyrical titles to these huge spending bills? And then we read on through this bill to find more verbal tripe, attempting to justify the spending of billions so that the nations receiving this dole may, and I quote, "meet their responsibilities."

When, I ask, is this Congress going to begin thinking in terms of the responsibilities that are being loaded on our own Americans, their children, and the children yet unborn?

Beyond the high-sounding words in this bill and in the report I find nothing describing how ECA money was used to build a gambling casino in France and a plush night club in Italy.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Daily American, an English-language newspaper published in Rome, which describes a cocktail party for a newly arrived American pooh-bah in the Italian capitol. The date is April 1, 1951—so it is not ancient by any means.

A friend of mine, who made this available said:

> I think you will be amused by this guest list at a cocktail party given upon the arrival of a new American official in Rome. I believe its the longest one ever printed in this paper. About 80 percent of the guests were Embassy, military, or ECA people in Rome.

Then my friend adds:

> It's easy to throw parties like that when you can get diplomatic booze for $1 a bottle and cigarettes at $1 a carton.

Social life in American diplomacy, he says, apparently has picked up again.

Yes, no matter how well American taxpayers' pockets are being emptied to pay the bills, social life for the American policy makers in foreign lands must go on as usual.

I have listened to most of this debate and I haven't heard any of the proponents of this measure describe the progress that is being made by the ECA spenders in building of roads in the jungles of British Africa, the French Cameroons and the Belgian Congo. Additional millions of American dollars are going into road building in French Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, New Caledonia, and the British East Indies. This

while the people of our own States and municipalities are bonding themselves to build roads and whooping up property and other taxes to pay the bills.

And how many foreign troop divisions, in being, are we going to get out of the billions we are now spending on arms and equipment for them? How many have been produced to date? The net results for the billions already swept down foreign drains are virtually nil, except to provide jobs for a bunch of high priced foreign experts and consultants of every stripe.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] says in effect that Eisenhower is trying to force European countries into building an integrated army. Are we sending American boys to Europe to fight communism who may have to depend upon that quality of troops for help? If that is true, then we should lose no time in withdrawing our troops to the continental United States instead of sending more of them abroad.

And the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] says the question is whether we will stand up with these foreigners.

It is never a question with the internationalists of whether the people of other countries will stand up with us.

How much longer do we propose to listen to the siren songs of these internationalists? How much longer is it proposed to make chumps of the American people?

I say there is no better time than right now to cut off this so-called ECA spending and limit military assistance to the support of our troops now in Europe.

Not another dime and not another American soldier until these foreign governments and the people of these foreign countries show a complete willingness to work and, if necessary, fight for freedom and justice in the world.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, listening to the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York I was struck by the words that the President may reserve something to himself for personal exercise. I was afraid it would refer to a naval base at Key West. I was opposed to it right then and there, because I did not think we should reserve anything to the President for personal exercise.

Reading a little further into it and considering it more seriously, I still think that it does not accomplish what we had in mind. You will remember that we turn over with certain exceptions the powers of the President in the MDAP law to the new Administrator. That law is 22 pages long. I shall not attempt to read it to you here, but if we leave in the original language, and I fear if we leave in the language of the substitute we may find that we have turned over to the President a lot of things that we expected the new Administrator should do. I therefore hope, Mr. Chairman, that the substitute will be defeated, and that the amendment taking out this general reservation of powers of the President in this 22-page bill will be adopted.

My friend from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in his opposition to this amendment is very frankly opposing all of title V for reasons that, of course, were very valid to him. Were conditions otherwise I might be inclined to join with him because I look forward to the day when we shall have a department of foreign affairs, when all of these matters will be under one head. But for the present, since the President himself wants to continue the ECA head as an independent executive, and since this bill proposes the MDAP head as an independent executive, I do not see any possibility of arriving at the form of organization which the gentleman from Nebraska contemplates. Overseas, as well as in this country, this organization of title V is precisely the same as now exists under the ECA law; in fact, much of the language is copied from that law. So I hope the House will help us rectify what I feel was a little mistake we made in the drafting of this bill so that the bill can go back to the form which the committee considered and reconsidered so carefully before it hastily adopted the language which my amendment seeks to strike from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my substitute be read again.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Roosevelt substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 66, noes 126.

So the substitute was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were ayes 134, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 26, line 16, after "July 1", strike out "1950" and insert "1949."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is purely a correction of a clerical error so as to make the language of the bill conform with the clearly expressed language as shown in the report. I am sure there is no objection to this amendment by the chairman or the members of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is a correct statement, and I join with the gentleman in that request.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have grave misgivings about H. R. 5113, not because of its objectives, but because I have serious doubts whether this bill, as part of a longer-range program, will keep us from becoming involved in world war III.

Our foreign policy to establish the North Atlantic Pact was determined by the executive branch of our Government. It was consumated by our signing a treaty with certain countries of Western Europe. This treaty was only confirmed by the Senate, and the House of Representatives had no voice in establishing this policy.

Under article IX of the Atlantic Pact it was agreed to set up a council of the nations involved whose duties are to plan for their common defense and security. This resulted in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization commonly called NATO. They in turn proposed plans for the defense of Western Europe. The United States was then asked to give military and economic assistance to the NATO countries. The House of Representatives was asked to implement this program and only then did we have an active voice in determining whether we approved of such a policy.

The authorization for such a program was submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. In 1949, Congress approved giving military assistance of a limited amount to the NATO nations. At that time, in a minority report, several members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, including myself, questioned the effectiveness of such a program and expressed grave doubts whether we could establish a ground defense in Europe that would be successful against the Soviet's well-known power in that respect.

In our report we suggested alternative courses of action and argued that the emphasis for defending Europe should be on air power strategically based and maintained in a constant state of readiness to meet the impact of sudden aggression. It seemed to us there was a very real danger that after pouring into Europe billions of dollars of economic aid under the Marshall plan and billions of dollars of military assistance we still would not be strong enough in that area to prevent Russia and her allies from overrunning Europe and nullifying all our efforts.

In my considered judgment that is still the situation today. How can anyone judge the Marshall plan and our military assistance up to date as a success with this great threat confronting us?

But now we must consider what is best to do under existing circumstances and face the facts as they are today. It does no good to say that one prefers another foreign policy which is nonexistent. For example, many believe the best way of maintaining the peace and our own security would be to make ourselves strong at home and not attempt to defend all the critical areas of the world from communistic aggression. It is

thought by attempting to do so we would place such an economic burden on the economy of our country that we would weaken ourselves at home. By spreading our military strength over a great many strategic areas of the world, we would weaken our strength to such an extent that we would make ourselves vulnerable to the forces which confront us in a number of vital spots around the periphery of Russia and her satellites.

But wishful thinking does no good. We are confronted with actualities. No one can deny the fact our foreign policy has been determined primarily to defend Western Europe from aggression and to assist so far as possible the countries friendly to ourselves. No one can contradict the fact the President, the State Department, the armed services, and the Chiefs of Staff have agreed to furnish for the defense of Western Europe six divisions and the accompanying divisional slices. This means 400,000 of our men are going to be sent to Europe and England. Three hundred and forty thousand of them will compose the six divisions and their supporting units. Sixty thousand will be in our Air Force. We have also committed our naval forces to the Baltic and Mediterranean areas. Already three divisions are in Europe, plus a large percentage of our tactical and strategic Air Force.

The question then arises, What are we going to do about the situation as it actually exists? Does it do any good to say that our policy should be to withdraw from Europe and make ourselves strong at home? Does it do any good to advocate the policy some of us wish, that we rely chiefly on air power? The fact that our men are in Europe and our military strength, tanks, guns, and other matériel are being poured into that area nullifies such a contention.

Therefore, those who would take the position that we should not have attempted a foreign policy to defend Europe, by means of ground forces in Europe, are faced with the reality that the administration's policy to rely on ground troops is actively being carried out—and there is no practical way to stop it.

This program has already been in active operation for 2 years, and there is not the slightest doubt that this bill, giving aid for the third year, will pass. We are, therefore, confronted with a Hobson's choice—no choice at all. With our boys and matériel in Europe, we are faced with the responsibility of, first, whether we should abandon them, or, second, the uncalculated risk of going ahead with the program and furnishing all the assistance possible as quickly as it can be done.

As I said before, this is a Hobson's choice—no choice at all. But I can see no alternative, as long as the policy has been established and our boys and military strength have been committed, but to take the one course that is left—even with its admitted danger, risk and possible disastrous result—and give every possible assistance to our own forces and our allies.

As I have indicated, I thought this task an almost impossible undertaking; and while I would not be a forecaster of doom, I would not prophecy, on the basis of present information, that the administration's policy will be successful. However, since there is apparently no other alternative course, I see no way out but to attempt the almost impossible and hope for the best. We have successfully faced crises in the past. We can do so again.

At the request of General Eisenhower, a number of members of Congress from the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee were sent to Europe for a quick survey of actual conditions. I think it was generally agreed by those who made this trip that General Eisenhower is making a prodigious effort to unify Western Europe and is urging the NATO countries to make the maximum effort in their common defense. I feel he has made real progress in this regard despite the many obstacles with which he has been confronted. But there is still a great deal left to be done.

We had an opportunity to see at first hand some of the cooperative effort that is being made for our mutual defense. In England I was impressed with the way the English and ourselves are working together in the field of strategic air defense. Their fliers are learning to use our planes and seemed to be working with us in the closest harmony.

We also saw the efficient way the French and Italians operated our tanks, artillery, and other equipment.

The basic question in my mind has always been and still is whether, in spite of our prodigious efforts, the great economic burdens we are assuming with increased taxes, which we will be compelled to pay, and the obvious hardships upon our people that will be incurred, will be sufficient to attain the peace we all so much desire; or will it result in a fiasco beyond the comprehension of any previous disaster in the course of history. That is the question I asked time after time of our military and civilian leaders in Europe; namely, if we are fortunate enough to be able to complete the program which has been agreed upon, and which admittedly will take time, would it be adequate and successful in defending Western Europe. I was repeatedly assured that it would.

Of course this program is primarily designed for the defense of one area; namely, Western Europe. Danger could break out in other critical places of the world which might by necessity cause us to divert our maximum effort from the NATO countries to other areas.

As I have indicated, I am willing to support this military program even in spite of the grave doubts I have of its ultimate success. I do believe that time is on our side and that every day that goes by our military strength increases. I do believe that we need allies and if we can bring about unity of thought and purpose and a genuine determination to bring peace and security to the free world, we strengthen our own security. I believe strength begets strength; and that strength is the only weapon for peace Russia will recognize.

But I now turn to the situation that gives me even more concern than the military phases of this bill. It is proposed to spend almost $2,000,000,000 for economic aid and point 4 aid under this bill to help almost every country in the world. Admittedly there are many backward countries that need our economic assistance. Admittedly there are many backward countries that need our technical advice. But when we are confronted with a military exigency, that is, in my opinion, the most dangerous that has confronted this country since the American Revolution, whether it is economically feasible to go forward as in normal times with programs to assist almost every area in the world seems questionable. I am very doubtful of the wisdom of such a course.

Even conceding the objectives of such a program of economic aid are worthy, it seems to me there are limitations on our own economy to carry out these programs when we are confronted with such an enormous military program.

Already the House has approved almost $69,000,000,000 for our own national defense. Now we are asked to add close to $7,500,000,000 for an additional military effort and economic aid in Western Europe and other areas.

All through the testimony we were told how beneficial this aid would be to the countries involved, but we had no witness who exclusively told us what the economic impact would be on this country. This seems wrong.

While our committee, under the able leadership of our colleague, Mr. RICHARDS, did make a cut from the amount requested by the administration of $651,250,000, I do not feel this is sufficient. But even if we are not successful in securing a larger cut than contained in this bill, this savings would still pay the salary of the 435 Members of this House for almost 120 years.

Undoubtedly some of the point 4 programs could be set aside for more normal times when the strain on our economic resources would not be so great.

With perhaps one or two exceptions, there is no question the countries of Western Europe which have been so greatly aided by ourselves could do without further general economic assistance. According to a report of the ECA issued July 30, 1951, Western Europe's industrial production has increased by 44 percent over 1938 levels; their exports have increased 15 percent. None of them are devoting to their military effort more than 7 percent of their gross national product. Under these circumstances, how can we justify continuing general economic aid?

We have conditions here at home which certainly require our attention and need Federal assistance. While I am perfectly aware that the extra military effort on the part of the countries of Western Europe is an additional strain on their economy, I maintain that this additional burden should not be absorbed by us because we are also straining our economy to the last notch when you consider we are taking from our people $54,000,000,000 in taxes this year and will impose additional tax burdens for this foreign-assistance program.

This bill has in it $840,000,000 of economic aid to compensate for the extra military effort of these countries. That means the United States is assuming

most of the additional burden. It is certainly questionable whether we should even go this far, but rather make them assume the additional defense effort. We are all equally concerned about our mutual security and the other countries should make as much of a sacrifice as we are making.

If we give them this additional economic aid because of their extra defense effort, we are in reality paying for their defense effort. But more than that, when we furnish these countries $840,000,000 because of that effort, we create almost that amount of counterpart funds that is available for their use. Certainly under these conditions very little extra effort is required from these countries. This should not be the case.

In passing I do want to comment on a few of the provisions of this bill which I believe are constructive.

First. I feel that the setting up of an independent agency which will have under its jurisdiction military, economic, and other assistance to our allies, under a single administrator, is a step in the right direction.

Second. I firmly believe that the provisions of this bill which make it obligatory to make 20 percent of the economic funds available as loans and not grants is sound.

Third. I believe the provisions of this bill in respect to point 4 program and technical assistance which require that the recipient countries put up at least the same amount we are spending will be most helpful in preventing unjustified hand-outs.

Fourth. The fact that 11 percent of our own defense production of military end items can be transferred to our allies, if our Chiefs of Staff deem it to our own best interest, may help to speed up our common defense. If we do take this method of getting the necessary matériel to our allies, it will not be an additional burden upon the taxpayers of this country, but will be in lieu of. Because to that extent, it will not be necessary to carry out the additional programs requested in this bill. Whatever is furnished from our domestic stocks will be deducted from the amount authorized in this program.

Therefore, in conclusion, I believe when we take up this bill under the 5-minute rule, we should scrutinize section by section the amounts requested and so far as it can be done, without revealing security secrets, we should justify the military provisions of this bill.

So far as the economic and technical part is concerned, I cannot help but believe, from some of the testimony I heard, which was some 1,600 pages that was made public and 1,700 pages taken in executive session, that a great many further cuts can be made in the economic part of this program. Every dollar authorized should be fully justified and if not justified, it should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 13, line 6, strike out "one hundred" and insert "sixty" and in line 9 strike out "twenty-five" and insert "ten."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, you will observe in the bill before us with respect to the organization of this Mutual Security Administration, it is provided that there shall be an Administrator, a Deputy Administrator, and that the Administrator may hire as many employees as he deems proper under the Civil Service Act. It further provides that not to exceed 100 may be compensated at rates higher than grade 15, which means from $11,500 to $14,000, and 25 not in excess of $15,000 per annum.

I have been unable to determine how many people they are going to employ under the mutual-assistance provisions of this act. Somewhere between four and five thousand are presently employed under the ECA, most of them at higher-than-average salaries. How many more will be employed under this bill, nobody seems to know. I have tried to find out, but they say that has to be determined after the organization is set up.

I am calling attention to a thing that has appeared almost identically in many other bills. These people say they will hire employees under the Civil Service Act but "we will put in a few more at a higher salary." Then they tell you they are unable to secure persons qualified for some particular job, and therefore they have to go above-ceiling salaries. The number here is 100. Rather than strike the whole thing out, I have offered a compromise, so that with respect to the 10 instead of 25 they will get as high as $15,000, and with respect to the remainder, which I have cut down to 60—and this is mild—they would get somewhere between $11,000 and $14,000. This bill involves an additional charge against the people of this country of an average $250 per family per year across the Nation, that a comparative little item does not seem to amount to very much. But it could be as much as $100,000 per year. I am talking about the principle of the thing. We can get along without these extra people here at $15,000 a year.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who knows more about this legislation than most of us.

Mr. JUDD. I offered essentially the same amendment in the committee, except that I made it 75 instead of 100 and left the 25 as is. We had the same provision in the ECA Act. They used 43 people. They have had authorization up to 100. This seems to me a standing invitation to go out and get super-duper people who are not necessary. I think the 25 figure should stand, because I would hope that the Administrator would get as the chief of mission in each of these countries the highest grade fellow he could get, and he cannot do it really for less than $15,000. I wish the gentleman would strike out the first portion of his amendment, which reduces the 25 to 10, and then I think we would go along with him on the reduction from 100 to 60.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do appreciate your statement and I wish I could go all along with you, but we are still letting them have 10 at $15,000, which is enough. The others will still get a pretty good-sized salary. They will get between $11,000 and $14,000, and that is a pretty good-sized salary for appointees that are appointed without demand for particular qualifications except as the Administrator sees fit to appoint them.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That is equal to the compensation of the Members of this House, and they get that position without going through a political campaign.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are purely appointees, that is correct.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that if the gentleman would just apply his amendment to the second part of it we would go along with this. This provision in this bill was taken bodily out of the old ECA Act, as to the administration of the ECA Act. But remember, with the Administrator provided for herein you have to cover a lot more territory than the old Administrator did. He has military aid, he has international development under point 4, and he has economic aid. You cannot hog-tie him to the extent the gentleman has just suggested. If the gentleman will accept the modification to the extent suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota, we will go along with it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This paragraph reads as follows:

Officers, employees, agents, and attorneys may be employed by the Administrator for duty within the continental limits of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

So you may employ these people within the limits of the United States, the people we are talking about in this particular paragraph.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. What is the reduction that is made in the first part of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is comparatively small, but it totals a few thousand dollars.

Mr. COX. How much?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am asking them to cut down the number who get $15,000 from 100 to 60 in this bracket. They are asking for 100 and they had 43 in ECA.

Mr. COX. Why not bargain with the gentleman and suggest 75.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should like to. I would be happy if I could, but it is a compromise I am offering now.

Mr. COX. Would 75 be satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to, but I think we ought to strike the whole thing out. I am just bargaining to this extent.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes an authorization to spend an additional $7,800,000,000 for what is described as mutual assistance for foreign countries. Approximately $2,500,000,000 is for foreign aid and $5,000,000,000 for military assistance to other countries, including European countries, also in Asia and some in South America.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind you that this authorization of almost $8,000,000,000 is in addition to the billions of dollars already expended to European and some Asiatic countries. This legislation is in addition to $56,000,000,000 that this Congress appropriated only recently for the military defenses of this country; and in addition to $5,700,000,000 earmarked for military construction; and in addition to $4,500,000,000 we have expended in Korea. This makes a total of $72,000,000,000 authorized or appropriated within a period of a few months. This in addition to an unexpended balance of $1,500,000,000 of ECA funds on hand, and military money for Europe of $3,000,000,000.

I would remind you, too, that the military authorities have the right, if they can justify such expenditure, to spend as much as 11 percent of the $56,000,000,000 for military aid, for assistance in Europe and other foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I supported legislation providing for billions of dollars for defenses in this country, and because of commitments made with certain European countries, I have also supported a considerable amount of funds to carry out such commitments. I think, however, there must be a time when we should call a halt in the authorizations and appropriations against the people of this country, especially in consideration of tremendous sums already appropriated.

Our country at this moment is facing insolvency. America cannot withstand aggressors, no matter who or where they are, if she herself is not solvent.

Do you realize that since the beginning of foreign-aid programs, the United States has given, granted, or loaned foreign nations more than $125,000,000,000? We are told that in order to stop the spread of communism, it is necessary that we spend billions more. This bill is an authorization of approximately $8,000,000,000. The plan is for 3 years. That makes an obligation against this country of $24,000,000,000. I would remind you that the mere appropriation of these billions of dollars from an insolvent Treasury is not the answer to the problem. I should add right here, too, that this measure is surrounded by some mystery. Certain facts, they say, must be withheld from Congress.

Let me read the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It says, and I quote:

> The bill authorizes an appropriation of $5,028,000,000 to Europe in fiscal 1952. This figure was arrived at by careful consideration by the committee of detailed programs for each country, of the items of equipment to be received, and the cost of transporting such equipment and the necessary training expenses. These facts cannot be presented for security reasons.

Will the future employees of this organization be better security risks than Members of Congress? There is no one in Government any more entitled to the facts than the elected representatives of the people. The mystery surrounding the programs of military and economic assistance should be lifted. Russia will know all these things in due course. Why should the American people be refused information which up to the present time has been not only common knowledge, but been used time and again for educational purposes by the Voice of America?

Mr. Chairman, I remind you again that I have voted for a strong and efficient Air Force costing millions and billions of dollars. I have voted for other billions for the defense of this country and for the prosecution of the Korean war.

There must be a limit somewhere. Let me repeat, this legislation is in addition to fifty-six billion appropriation for defense only a few days ago. It is in addition to five billion seven hundred million already earmarked for military construction and is in addition to four and a half marked for Korea. I remind you again there is approximately $5,000,000,000 already appropriated and not yet expended, most of which is for Europe and Asia. I also remind you again that 11 percent of the $56,000,000,000 above mentioned, may be expended for the military in Europe and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I think we had better look the situation over pretty carefully before we proceed to authorize and expend more billions of dollars of the taxpayers of this country. Of course we want world peace, but we cannot expect to achieve that objective entirely by exhausting our country's resources and sending them to foreign countries. You cannot buy friendship in this manner, especially when you are bankrupting our own country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman's amendment lend itself to a division so that we could vote separately on the two parts?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two parts to the amendment, and it is divisible.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that it be divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first portion of the amendment be read, so that we will know what it is we are voting on.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 13, line 6, strike out "one hundred" and insert "sixty."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas), there were—ayes 114, noes 97.

So the first portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the second portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

> Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 13, line 9, strike out "twenty-five" and insert "ten."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas), there were—ayes 109, noes 115.

So the second portion of the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 38, strike out line 15 and insert the following: "state;
>
> "(f) guarantees by the eligible nation that it will notify the United States whenever it ceases to use any equipment or material furnished to it under this act (other than equipment or material furnished under terms requiring the nation to reimburse the United States in full therefor) for the purposes of this act and that it will transfer title to, and possession of, such equipment or material to the United States (1) for return to the continental United States for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of the United States."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered by the Committee on Expenditures from a subcommittee of which I am chairman. The idea of the amendment arose during the investigation of surplus property given by the United States Government for rehabilitation purposes to the countries of Europe, our allies, during the last World War. During the hearings on our investigation, it was found that much of the material that we had given to our allies in Europe was sold to surplus-property dealers and returned to the United States and sold within the States, some of it actually sold to the national defense for fabulous profits.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have been listening to the gentleman carefully, and I know the good work which his committee has been doing. I have studied this amendment and we have looked it over and I believe you have a good amendment and we will accept it.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate that very much, but I would like to say one more thing about the amendment and the purpose of the amendment.

We are really shipping abroad our national resources, and unless some of this material is returned to be used for the purpose of scrap in this country, some day we will find out that Europe has much of the things that we should have that we do not have on account of our generosity. I doubt very much whether it would be returned in the same spirit and manner as we are now sending it abroad.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. As a member of the gentleman's subcommittee, may I com-

pliment him on the presentation of this amendment, and also thank the chairman of the committee for accepting this amendment which has been so carefully worked out and which I hope will result in safeguarding the money which we are about to offer on a blank-check basis.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDS. I wonder if we cannot get some agreement as to time on this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman ascertain how many amendments are proposed, and then button it down to so many minutes per amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. According to the last report, there are 10 amendments on the desk, and they are still coming in. There are now 12.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 1 hour. That will give 5 minutes for each amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask if there will be any allowance for those who have amendments so that they will be able to speak on their amendments?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would think so; I believe the Chair will take care of those who have an amendment, if they were on their feet, for 5 minutes apiece.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman consider cutting it down to 15 minutes instead of an hour?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that if he makes the time an hour and 20 minutes and there are 12 amendments at the desk and the author of each amendment has 5 minutes that will leave only 5 minutes for the rest of the House to oppose the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, why do you not suggest that the time be divided equally in favor of and those opposed to each amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I might say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I have been informed by a Member on our side that he intends to demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. If that happens, I think, of course, it would be impossible to engross the bill and read it tonight. Whether or not that will make any change in the situation tonight I do not know.

Mr. RAYBURN. If we stay here and complete the bill tonight and the reading of an engrossed copy is demanded we can vote on the engrossed copy tomorrow, and we certainly would have to go over until Monday to get an engrossed copy and vote on it, if we do not complete the bill tonight.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. What is the consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has not submitted a request.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask certain questions of the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, not in an attempt to embarrass him in any way, because Mr. RICHARDS and I have been friends for a long time. Rather, I am making a most earnest and serious endeavor to bring out for consideration by this honorable body phases of the program to be set up by ECA which, to my mind, will lead our Nation into an unwarranted and undemocratic intrusion into the internal economic and political affairs of those European nations allied with us in the struggle against communism.

I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the members of that committee and the Members of this House, to a press release by ECA under date of July 28, 1951—a couple of weeks ago. I wonder if the chairman and the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have seen that press release. It deals with what it announces to be ECA's major new productivity drive in Europe.

The contents of that press release prompted me to seek further and more detailed information about the so-called production assistance drive to be carried out by ECA with funds provided for by the Congress under the terms of this legislation. I obtained from the State Department an official copy of the outline of the plan—which quite properly could be termed a directive, I believe—sent to the field officials of ECA throughout the European nations affected.

So that I could be fully informed about what appeared to me to be a plan so staggering in its implications of intrusion by our Nation into the internal affairs of others, I studied carefully the details in the official documents provided me by the State Department. The more I studied, the more convinced I became that, if the plan were carried out, this great democracy of ours could justly be accused of overstepping the bounds of international propriety and of failing to respect the sovereign rights of our allies and friends in Europe. I cannot conceive that any Member of the Congress would condone any such plan, yet we have before us legislation which, I believe, will do just that, and more.

Let us, then, consider some of the language of the directive sent out to the ECA officials in foreign countries, the purpose of which, it says, is—and I quote—"to state the objectives, policies, methods, and organization to be utilized in mobilizing ECA's resources for an intensive program in the field of production assistance and productivity improvement."

Consider, if you please, the implications in this language in the ECA directive. I quote:

> ECA is to modify its general policy of working only with and through governments and will be in direct touch with trade unions, individual firms, individual managers, trade associations, labor leaders, and especially will be working in individual plants. We will, of course, be working with the concurrence and, hopefully, with the help of the governments of the participating countries, but not exclusively through those governments.

To me that clearly indicates the intention of ECA to bypass the Government and take over the virtual direction of a nation's economy to a great degree. It ill behooves us, who have most pressing and momentous economic problems of our own, to attempt to control the economy of any other nation, going even to the extent of bypassing its government. Some of the European nations, I am reliably advised, already have offered objections to such an invasion of their sovereign rights and violation of their national dignity.

Let us consider further some of the language of the ECA outline of its plan. Again I quote:

> Direct productivity personnel should continuously be aware of the fact that the effort to achieve forced draft improvements in applied technology is not just an engineering problem, but also a problem of ecomics, social institutions, psychology, and politics in the broadest sense, and should develop their program accordingly.

In view of that language, can there be doubt of our intentions? Can any other inference be drawn than that we propose direct interference in the affairs of another country, including its economy and its politics? May I suggest we put our own house in order before dipping into the internal politics of other nations.

What sort of international relations will such a policy on our part create? ECA, itself, recognizes that there may be trouble ahead, as witness this next statement from the official document. I quote:

> This plan will have two major advantages. First, joint sponsorship by the European governments concerned and the United States will minimize any charges of intervention or any criticism that the program is designed indirectly to benefit the United States rather than the citizens of the country. Second, it is highly desirable to organize the program in such a way that complete responsibility for it can be taken over by the local government in 2 or 3 years' time.

Are we to become the world's most malign meddlers? In 2 or 3 years, we may, if it pleases the management of

ECA, permit a country to run its own internal affairs. To me, that sounds like an unjustified and brazen impugning of a nation's integrity. We may trust them to run their own business later. It takes no stretch of the imagination to know what we would reply to such a proposal made to us by another nation. We are, however, more forthright than the Communists who seek the same objective through infiltration and other sinister methods. I, for one, want no part of any such plan, no matter how high sounding the name.

Not content with meddling in the economic and political affairs of the other nations, the ECA plan would tinker with the taxation structure of the participating countries. Listen to this. I quote:

> The organization should seek to achieve necessary improvements in governmental and trade association and labor union ground rules affecting positive and negative incentives to productivity improvement.

This, for example—and I am still quoting:

> It might sponsor studies and legislation to establish tax-adjustment systems which would act to encourage rather than discourage investment in productivity, wage increases, and price reductions. In the same field it should help to protect firms and workers cooperating in its program from adverse actions and injury by restrictionist groups.

I wonder if the author of that slick phrase ever read the Constitution of the United States—particularly the rights of men. Nations are made up of men. Such a plan should be—probably will be—offensive to every thinking citizen in those other nations. In my humble judgment, we are planning to go too far—much too far. But that is not all. Again I quote:

> Where it is not practicable to bring in the productivity agency and its services as such, specific clauses bearing on the objectives of the productivity program along the lines of the labor standard clauses in United States public contracts, might be included in the contracts themselves.

That, I believe, is further indication we are trying to make other nations apply our standards to their economy whether they fit or not. In other words, no matter whether the shoe fits—our shoe—put it on and wear it—and like it. What could be more fantastic than such a proposal coming from a great and free nation?

Now we come to the strong-arm—the coercive—part of the plan. Listen, my fellow Members, to this closely—for to me it sounds much more like a directive—an order—from the Kremlin to the slave and satellite nations under Russia's heel, than part of a plan conceived in democratic America. I quote:

> Where unusual difficulties are anticipated or encountered in securing proper commitments from the participating country governments on this program, ECA, Washington would be willing to consider a recommendation that such undertakings be made a condition precedent to further allotment of program funds to the country involved.

In brief, that means the other nation must let us meddle in its internal affairs or tinker with its economy, its politics, its tax policies—or else, and by "else" we mean the other nation's principles must be sacrificed for our money. What a travesty on international justice that would be.

I recommend the ECA program outline in its entirety as required reading for every Member of the Congress. I have merely touched on a few of the high spots in the amazing document.

We need to carry on that part of the ECA work which is good, but in the name of American democracy and common sense, let us not, under the guise of cooperation and mutual defense against communism, seek to take over the economy and the internal affairs of these other nations, body and soul.

It is my firm conviction they would be fully justified in saying to us, "Until you get your own economy on an even keel, keep your hands off ours."

True, we are spending vast sums to help them regain their national strength and vigor. Equally true, we are helping ourselves at the same time, because that renewed strength is being thrown into the fight against Communist aggression and lust for world power.

We must remember, however, that long before we were a nation, many of those countries were strong and powerful nations. They have borne the brunt of waste and destruction in at least two catastrophic wars. We were more fortunate in our homeland. We escaped almost unscathed.

Those nations are destined to be great and strong again. They have the leadership and the quality of citizenship which assures us of that. We have done much to restore their virility. We will have to do more—at least for another year or so. But let them run their own affairs. They have done it. They can do it.

Unless we amend this legislation properly, we may well be accused later of being responsible, through our interference, for any possible economic setback they might suffer. They would be justified, too, in asking us for many additional billions of dollars to repair that damage.

We must never let our Nation assume the role of a dictator, even of a beneficent dictator.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. May I say to the gentleman I am driving, and I believe the committee is driving, at this, if the ECA has been doing the things the gentleman says they are doing, they should be condemned for it. But let me call the attention of the gentleman from New Mexico to the fact that ECA after this year is going to be out of business. It will not be here very long if this bill passes. So far as I am concerned, I will join with the gentleman in trying to do what he is endeavoring to do.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman. What I have read is what was given to me by the State Department.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman is surprised at that, wait until he sees the super duper independent organization working in foreign fields, armed with diplomatic status plus a satchel full of money, bypassing the regular diplomats in foreign countries. Yes; they have been doing that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the gentleman that I discussed this in part with the distinguished chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 36, line 5, after the word "this", strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert "act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment to make sure the language says what we had in mind. I have talked it over with the committee, and I understand there is no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. We accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 32, lines 7 and 23, strike out "military" and insert "any", and on page 32, line 16, after "Court of Claims", insert "or in the district court of the United States in which a such owner is a resident."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the patent section so that the provisions apply not only to military assistance but any assistance, and given jurisdiction not only to the Court of Claims but to the district court in which such owner is a resident.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that that is a good amendment, and we accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 37, after line 2, insert a new section as follows: "The Administrator in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce shall facilitate and encourage through private and public travel, transport and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States and of recipient countries to and within the recipient countries."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one. It extends to the other recipient countries—this bill extending to other countries in the Near East, Africa, and the Far East—efforts to stimulate travel which we have been pursuing with great success with respect to Europe and which are covered by section 117 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act now in effect. This amendment would extend the same kind of cooperation to the other countries which will be dealt with under this act.

I appreciate the lateness of the hour and that the Committee on Foreign Af-

fairs will have another opportunity to review this bill come January next, nevertheless I hope that even now we can correct this travel question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 12, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMSTRONG: On page 7, line 17, after "including", insert the words "Formosa and other areas under the control of Nationalist China."

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that after this long day of important discussion on the bill with the necessary differences of opinion it will be a happy thing to come to this small and noncontroversial amendment. If you will refer to page 7 and go down to line 16, you will find there in section 301 the following words:

In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea).

All this amendment seeks to do is bring in specifically, as I feel we will all agree there should be, the words "Formosa and other areas under the control of Nationalist China." Thus we shall give proper recognition to a very important ally of ours in the protection of the free world in the Pacific area.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Government of the United States, in using the word "China," applies it only to the Nationalist Government of China.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I only wish that that interpretation could be generally accepted.

I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of all the Members to the fact that unless we nail this thing down, by mentioning Nationalist China by name, all of our efforts over in Formosa may go for naught.

Let me remind you that at the outbreak of the Korean conflict the leaders of the Nationalist forces on Formosa, our allies in the United Nations, not only our comrades-in-arms in the recent war but permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations, offered 33,000 troops for the defense of the free world in Korea. That offer was refused. It was said at that time that the refusal was because the Nationalists were needed to protect Formosa. However, I call the attention of you new Members of the House to the fact that when we met with representatives of the State Department in March, Mr. Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, informed us on direct questioning as to why the Nationalist troops were not permitted to go and fight for their own freedom and the freedom of the Pacific area. He said it was because our allies in the United Nations, specifically mentioning Great Britain, objected to the use of the Nationalist troops. Mr. Rusk, said this was because Great Britain and some other allies have recognized Red China, therefore they did not want the assistance of these, our allies, the free Chinese, to fight the Communist aggressors.

I want to nail this thing down to such an extent that any aid given in this bill to the China area will specifically apply to the use of these, our allies, on Formosa.

Mr. Chairman, with my own eyes some months ago I saw those Chinese Nationalist troops drilling. They are brave and valiant troops. They can and should be used in the Pacific area. Already we have a military mission on Formosa, headed by an able commander, General Chase. For what purpose is that mission there? Is it just to boondoggle some money away? It should be to train these Chinese to fight. Every one of these Nationalist troops could take the place of some boy drafted from out the United States.

The distinguished majority leader of this House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made one statement today which I shall long remember. It hit the nail squarely on the head. He said the only thing the Communists fear is strength greater than their own. That is entirely true. So let us add to the strength that we have in the Pacific area the strength which is waiting for us there, unused, and—up to now—unwanted.

The one thing the Communist aggressors in Korea feared more than anything else was an all-out effort on our part to win the Korean war. I think it is a shameful thing that we sent our boys into Korea unprepared, untrained, and unequipped. But even more shameful is the fact that we sent them in there to fight with one hand tied behind their backs.

The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I talked to numerous of our officers in Japan and Korea. Many of them said, "If you will untie our hands we can knock Red China out of this war in 3 months' time." Shame upon us for not calling on all of our allies and going all out to win that war.

Mr. Chairman, the war in Korea could have been ended in victory, if our allies had not dragged their feet. Our military men wanted to blockade the Chinese coast, bomb the military targets in Manchuria, and use the guerrillas on the mainland. But the British and others wanted to continue their lucrative trade with the Reds. They did not want to offend the enmy. Now, unless we specifically have it understood that this aid we are discussing in this bill will apply to the Nationalist Chinese, they will tie our hands again. The purpose of my amendment is to insure that our representatives in Formosa and elsewhere in the Far East will be free to act in our own interests.

Back home where I live, the people are beginning to ask whether we are going to carry on a stalemated war in Korea forever. So far as I am concerned, if the Reds start shooting again, we had better go out to win a victory or else bring our boys back from Korea and keep them here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment on the same basis that I opposed the amendment proposed earlier to refer specifically to Spain in title 1 of this bill. It is true that we have mentioned the Philippines. It is also true that we have mentioned Korea in the Pacific. But we have special obligations for both of those countries, and for a long time this Congress has had legislation before it for the relief of the Philippines. So far as Korea is concerned, everybody knows our obligations there under the United Nations charter, and is aware that our boys are fighting and dying there. But to add references to other countries in this title, all on the other side of the world, and say definitely "this is for such and such a country" would be deviating from the general purpose. I do not think it would be wise to do that. I can assure the gentleman he will not be disappointed with what can be done under the existing provisions of this bill for the island he mentioned.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Under the terms of this bill, as it is now written, is it possible for our military leaders, specifically General Chase, and those in charge of our mission in Formosa working directly with the Nationalist Chinese, to utilize them for the defense of that whole area outside of Formosa?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think it is.

Mr. VORYS. It is not only possible—not only is a program there, and I not only agree with the spirit of the gentleman's amendment, but even if you should write it in, it is not compulsory and you would not be getting anywhere. So that rather than have a tough vote on this thing when we have stuff for Formosa in the bill, I hope we will leave it stand under the present language.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Surely, the gentleman read only a few days ago the words of Dean Rusk who said it is still the policy of the United States Government not to utilize the Nationalist Chinese in defense of the Far East?

Mr. VORYS. There is nothing in this bill to prevent their utilization—and there is nothing in the gentleman's amendment which would require their utilization. I think the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman contends that this amendment is ineffectual, as it might be, what would be the possible objection to making this friendly expression of interest?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the assurance, and, I believe, the gentleman has given it—I do not want to gum up the works here. I am terribly sincere and anxious about this matter as we all are. I do not want to enter into any controversy or to delay the passage of this bill. The gentleman has given at least a partial assurance as well as the gentleman on the committee on my side of the aisle, and with that

assurance and promise that we will pursue this matter further. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 22, line 11, strike out "operations" and insert "duties assigned to the Administrator."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments, all designed to improve, I believe, the administration of the military portion of this program. I have no disposition to press them because I feel it would be more desirable to have them considered in conference, unless the committee feels they have reviewed them sufficiently to accept them. This particular amendment is to avoid trouble out in the field when the representative of the Administrator arrives there. If he should suddenly say "I have charge of all operations in this area" one could immediately envision great conflict with representatives of the Defense Department in that area. That would be extremely unfortunate. We should do everything possible to avoid that result. I have been assured that it is not intended that the Administrator shall have more power than the duties assigned to him under this act; that there is no thought that he should have charge of all the operations in the area in question which would include military operations. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion and ability, but I believe the gentleman could have facilitated the matter if he had presented this to us before.

Mr. KEATING. I am sorry, I did submit it to both sides, but I thoroughly appreciate the pressure under which the gentleman has labored and that he may not have had the opportunity to review it sufficiently to reach any final conclusion on its desirability.

Mr. RICHARDS. In just a few words, what is the object the gentleman has in mind in proposing this amendment?

Mr. KEATING. If the administrator is given charge of all operations under this act, I fear it might result in conflict with those in the field who are handling the military end of the program. I suggest that in place of the word "operations" you use the words "duties assigned to the Administrator"; but if the gentleman has any doubt about it, I would prefer to have him bear that in mind in conference, and bear in mind the other amendments which I have submitted to your side. I realize the gentleman has been very busy.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I might say that the language in this act is exactly the language in the ECA Act. It has been tested and interpreted. It has always applied only to the civilian functions of the ECA Administrator, and not to any military operations. It is the exact text of the ECA Act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and would ask that the second amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 24, line 18, strike out "Administrator" and insert "President."

On page 25, line 15, strike out "Administrator" and insert "President."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply this: It seems to me that the finding which the designated person is to make there, namely, that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States, is a finding which should be the responsibility of the President to make, and his duty to make, and it should not be the responsibility of some subordinate representative, such as this Administrator. Of course, the President before making this finding would consult with the Secretary of Defense and perhaps also with the Secretary of State and this newly created Administrator. But the final decision is primarily a military one and certainly not one which should exclusively fall under the jurisdiction of a civilian administrator who would be under no obligation to consult with Defense Department officials and who conceivably might not in fact do so. It seems to me that sound principles of administration would dictate that the President who has facilities and authority to correlate views and reconcile conflicts should make the final determination of a question of such transcendent importance.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. As I understood the gentleman, he withdrew the first amendment. As to the second amendment, I am inclined to think it is a good amendment. I am sure it will not damage the operations under this bill. Knowing the gentleman's experience in the military field, and his relation to this subject, I am inclined to accept the second amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 26, line 2, strike out all of lines 2 and 3 and down to the period on line 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

"That the essential features of his primary responsibility are these:

"(a) The determination of military end-item requirements.

"(b) The procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs.

"(c) Establishment of priorities in procurement and deliveries, the allocation of military assistance between recipient countries, and the apportionment of funds as transferred to him by the President between services and countries within each area specified in the act.

"(d) The supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries.

"(e) The supervision of the training of foreign military personnel.

"(f) The movement and delivery of military end-items."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, here likewise, I am not disposed to press this amendment; in fact I think that after half a minute's explanation I will ask consent to withdraw it because I realize it should require study.

The language which I have put in the substitute for the one sentence which appears in the bill is taken exactly from page 43 of the report; it is the exact language of that page. It defines the duties of the Secretary of Defense or his representative with regard to these military-end-use items. I realize, however, that if the gentleman has not studied it he might have hesitancy about that, and I would simply ask that he consider that very carefully in conference, because I do feel that it would be a great improvement over the sentence which is in the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's position, and I assure him that not only will I study it before I go into conference but that it will be considered in conference if it is within the scope of the conference.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a fourth amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 34, line 2, strike out "materials" and insert "commodities"; and on lines 4 and 10 strike out "materials" and insert "commodities."

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TACKETT. Is this amendment going to be withdrawn, too, after they talk about it for 30 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not a mind reader.

Mr. TACKETT. I am going to object if it is.

Mr. KEATING. I would be glad to have this voted on because I feel sure the chairman of the committee would be perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

I gather that there is some fear among those who will be called upon to administer this program that the word "materials" used in this particular section 607 might be considered as including military end use materials. I know

that is not intended; I know that raw materials are referred to since they are the only materials that come under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The word "commodities" happens to be the word used in the report in discussing this section. The same is true in the section analysis, and it would be an improvement, in my judgment, if the word "commodities" were used here to be sure that it does not include military end use items, rather than the word "materials."

Mr. RICHARDS. I think the gentleman is right, and I accept the change.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 7, line 22, after "exceed", strike out "$530,000,000", and insert "$480,000,000;" and on page 8, line 3, after "section", strike out "not to exceed $50,000,000", and insert "no."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this time.

To follow this amendment I direct your attention to page 8 because it is an attempt to eliminate the $50,000,000 that can be appropriated in accordance with the accounting provision as provided in subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. This accounting method for this $50,000,000 is what I want to call to the attention of the House, and I am going to read the language:

Certification by the President of the amounts expended out of funds authorized hereunder and that it is inadvisable to specify the natures of such expenditures shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amounts expended.

In other words, that is just a complete blank check for $50,000,000 to be spent in the Chinese area.

May I call further attention to the fact that under this same section 1604 I was reading and to which this particular section refers, there was provided $110,000,000 to be spent in the same fashion with no accounting in the Chinese area after 1949. If we are going to judge the future by the past, I submit an expenditure of $110,000,000 in China in the years 1949 and 1950 certainly did not promote peace in that particular area and certainly did not provide that China would not go communistic.

I suggest that the House consider very carefully whether it wants to extend this principle of giving blank checks of this nature, particularly in the area of China. Personally I am against any blank check of this nature.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. Chairman, this provision is largely the result of the work of a former colleague of ours on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by the name of John Davis Lodge, now Governor of Connecticut. He was one of the first Members of the Congress who became fully aware of the underhanded and underground methods that the mortal enemy we face consistently uses. The hard fact is that we cannot hope to outwit and overcome this enemy unless there are some funds that do not have to be accounted for and some operations that do not have to be paraded in public.

We regret it, but the fact of the matter is that if we want to fight successfully these enemies operating under the Kremlin's direction we ought to be assisting in every way possible those people behind the iron curtain who, knowing the nature of Soviet rule better than anybody else, are most determined to overthrow it. It seems to me we would be tying one of our hands behind our own back not to allow the President to have these funds to use in areas where it would be impossible and inadvisable to have them accounted for publicly.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to associate myself with everything the gentleman has said and to assure the House that the committee unanimously is in accord on this particular item.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 66, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Insert on page 31, after line 21: "(c) (1) to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, through encouraging and facilitating the development of the natural resources of foreign areas by the investment of private capital and eliminating barriers to and providing incentives for engaging in business enterprises in such areas by persons or business organizations who are non-nationals of such areas, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas (hereafter referred to as the "Commission").

"(2) (A) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(i) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

"(ii) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

"(iii) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"(B) Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(C) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(4) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(5) (A) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(B) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(C) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(6) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(7) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(8) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection (c).

"(9) (A) The Commission shall study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped foreign areas and shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs for carrying out the purposes of this subsection (c).

"(B) The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress from time to time the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall file its first report within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and annually thereafter.

"(10) (A) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(B) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection (c), hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(C) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish

such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(D) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

Mr. BONNER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I understood the further reading of the bill had been dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the new bill be dispensed with.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would create a bipartisan commission, patterned after the Hoover Commission, whose duty it would be to attack the problem of eliminating existing barriers to overseas investment of private capital.

These barriers—fear of expropriation, double taxation, instability of currency exchanges, discrimination against foreign capital, and other abnormal political hazards—have held overseas investments of American capital down to $13,000,000,000 according to Assistant Secretary of State Miller.

By facilitating American investment abroad we will accomplish the objectives of this act far more effectively than we can by doling out public funds, however huge the amount may be.

Our American political and economic philosophy holds that the development of natural resources is a function for the private citizen—not a function of Government.

In the long run our strength, both military and economic, as well as that of nations friendly to us, will depend upon the effieciency with which natural resources are developed and utilized.

We have demonstrated the superiority of a free competitive economy over totalitarian state control and direction of the processes of production and distribution. We can aid our friends overseas by exporting our capital and our mass-production methods if the barriers now restraining overseas investments are removed.

The legislative branch of the Government and the American public should not be excluded from participation in the solution of the problem of eliminating the barriers to expansion of private enterprise abroad.

An advisory committee however able its members may be, which is dependent upon the staff of an executive agency, does not have the capacity to conduct an independent and penetrating inquiry into these difficult problems. Such a committee can only front for the staff of the executive agency. I believe the American people have no confidence that the executive branch of the Government can be expected to do any better in the future with this program than it has in the past.

An example of this point is contained in the activities of the International Development Advisory Board. That Board's report to the President on the operation of the point 4 program, on March 7, 1951, titled "partners in progress," was not based upon any thorough exploration of the problems. No hearings to seek out the facts were conducted. That report was prepared principally by a single staff employee of the Board, with the assistance of several volunteers. The report does not purport to solve the problems of eliminating barriers to private investment; it only recites that the need for such solution exists.

The program which I am urging would take up where the International Development Advisory Board left off.

The removal of these barriers will not be easily accomplished. This problem has thus far defied solution—although there has been nothing to prevent the State Department, the ECA, or other executive agencies from solving it if the capacity to do so exists in them.

This problem will not be solved unless we assemble the best minds in this country—both as members of a commission and as members of its staff, equip them with adequate funds and fact-finding powers, and delegate to them the task of finding out what ought to be done.

The Commission should study the errors and successes of overseas investments of the past, should consult and take testimony from those who are experienced in this field and invite their suggestions and recommendations.

The Commission may not solve these difficult problems, but I can see no other way in which we can hope to promote and extend our free economic system in a chaotic world. It seems to me it is logical and intelligent for us to find out what we ought to do before we start doing it. Spending public money is not enough. We cannot buy friends. Our economy cannot support the rest of the free world indefinitely.

The Hoover Commission cost about $2,000,000. The program this bill inaugurates may well cost $100,000,000,000 over the next 10 or 15 years. It would be folly and false economy to refuse to spend a comparatively insignificant sum to find out if our objectives cannot be more economically and effectively accomplished. It requires no great intelligence to spend and spend and spend.

We have given away over $125,000,000,000 to aid other nations in the last decade. That has not solved anything. Before we give away another hundred billion in the decade ahead of us let us see if there is not a better way of fighting communism. I believe exporting our free economic system is a better way. I believe we can do it if we can harness the best brains in the country in a bipartisan commission to grapple with this problem.

Success cannot be assured. But we can try. If we have faith in our American principles, we will try.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 63, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: On page 11, line 1 strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, the $40,000,000 that is referred to here is for military assistance to "the other American Republics" which mean the countries of Central and South America. I do not object to giving them economic assistance, but I see no point in giving them $40,000,000 of military assistance when they are countries which are not in the line of the Soviet advance, especially when it has already been said by the committee that the great need in Western Europe is for military equipment. We need equipment ourselves. What is the use of tying up $40,000,000 worth of military equipment in Central and South America? I would suggest it might be even feasible to cut it out completely, but there may be some use for it so my amendment proposes to cut the military assistance from $40,000,000 to $20,000,000. I can see no point as I have said in tying up $40,000,000 of military equipment in Central and South America where it will never be used unless Western Europe or the United States is overrun by the Soviet advance. I think it could better be sent to Western Europe or be kept in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentletleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KENNEDY) there were—ayes 98, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 29, lines 9 to 12, strike out lines 9 to 12.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, most of the Members have been here more than 12 hours listening to the pros and cons and arguments pounding against your eardrums; arguments by honest and sincere men. I doubt if such long sessions are in the interest of good legislation. I could give you some advice from a medical standpoint, but perhaps you would not accept it, except that if some of you need a prescription to go to the mountains or to the seaside after

this is over with, I am sure the several doctors in the House will accommodate you. I have worried about the tenseness of debate and you with high blood pressures. You better slow down.

Now, with reference to my amendment. Page 29, section 513, reads:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

You know, we gave the Secretary of State a lot of power, and he should have it, regardless of who the Secretary might be. Then in the bill it strips him of power over these funds. It reminds me of a time when I was a member of the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska. I was chairman of a committee investigating casualty insurance companies. We had all types of casualty companies. They had what was called a "battleship policy." I don't know whether you know what that is or not, but a battleship policy is one that gives you everything on the front page in large print. Then on the back you have a lot of fine print, and you read it over and you would really have to be walking on the water and be hit by a battleship before you could collect anything. That is what is called a battleship policy. Now this bill does that to the Secretary of State, only in reverse.

Now, here we set up a new man to handle all of the problems under this development. Many of those problems have been under the Secretary of State. So we say to the Secretary of State, after we have taken all of those things away from him: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to infringe upon your powers." It is rather odd that you leave that section in the bill, and if someone on the committee would like to tell me why that section is left in, I wish you would do so.

Mr. VORYS. I will be glad to tell the gentleman. That was in the draft. It was not in the draft brought down from the Department of State. It was in the draft which was submitted by our chairman, introduced by him, and that language is homemade by our chairman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I think it is just a little sop that you throw to the Secretary after you take away all of his powers. It is a battleship provision. I would like to consolidate all oversea activities under one head. There is now too much duplication.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in moving to strike out section 513, which provides that nothing contained in this section shall be construed to infringe upon the powers and functions of the Secretary of State, I am constrained to think that the good doctor really wants to infringe upon the powers and functions of the Secretary of State. As a matter of fact the powers and functions of the Secretary of State are not personal; they are powers of long standing conferred by law.

I think we have made a pretty bold move in creating an over-all administrator, but I think the boldness is in the direction of more efficient supervision. The Administrator is at least to handle the administration and in addition to that he is to be an operator. I do not think any member of the committee thought for 1 minute that he could possibly assume unto himself the traditional powers of the Secretary of State. That is all this section 513 provides.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, does this conclude the debate? If so, I am ready to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I will take my time and yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in requesting time is to serve notice that it will be my purpose to offer a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report the same back forthwith reducing the economic aid under title I from $1,335,000,000 to $985,000,000; that is, making a reduction of $350,000,000.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Tennessee has indicated what he intends to do, may I indicate, during the rest of my time, what I intend to do and what I hope will be done by a majority of the Members of this House?

The funds that the gentleman is talking about, that his recommittal motion seeks to cut, is approximately the same as the amendment that was turned down by this House an hour or two ago. Now I want to give the House my honest, candid opinion. For the peace of the world and for the security of the United States itself, it would be better—far better—for this House to cut off three or four hundred million dollars from the military aid itself. Do not forget, for every dollar of economic aid—and the great majority of this economic aid is for military production—we intend to get and General Eisenhower intends to get two dollars of European production. About 13 percent of the total program is for economic aid for military production. The reason we are more anxious and that General Eisenhower is more anxious to get this is because we want to get out of Europe in 2 or 3 years. Until the industry is increased by our aid through this bill, we are not going to be able to meet our targets by 1954, and that is all there is to it.

If we want to keep on furnishing aid over there year after year after the 3 years is over, then cut this bill; but if we want to do what is best for the security of the United States and save our taxpayers money in the long run, vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, I voted for this bill because I believe that it is imperative for the national security of the United States. We must bolster our bulwarks against the Red tide so that it will not engulf us.

We must also make sure that the men who undertake the responsibility of carrying out the program for us are protected to the fullest extent of the laws of the United States while insuring that our interests are secured.

This afternoon I have introduced legislation the purpose of which is to correct a procedural defect, as a result of which heretofore individuals who have committed crimes which have not been discovered prior to their separation from the military service have been declared by the courts to be not amenable to trial by courts martial for those crimes.

I am sure that most Members of this House have been shocked by the revelation in the last 2 days of the facts concerning the brutal and premeditated murder of Major Holohan in Italy in 1944 by a group of conspirators who included two American soldiers.

The deed, to the commission of which one of the two conspirators has confessed—and his signed confession is in the possession of the Department of the Army—was committed on Italian soil while those individuals were in the military service.

Having separated from the military service, they are at this moment apparently no longer liable for trial by courts martial, and the Supreme Court a year or so ago rendered a decision which has made it seem that there is no means by which they can be tried by the military courts.

That defect in our military laws—a defect which has since been corrected in the passage of the Uniform Code of Military Justice—is a procedural one. It does not seem to me that merely to correct such a procedural defect would be the enactment of a law of the type which might be declared ex post facto.

Informal conversations I have had with various attorneys in the executive branch of the Government indicate to me that many Government attorneys who have studied this case consider that an attempt to legislate in a way to make these individuals now amenable to courts martial for the crimes, when they have once had a vested right, by separation, in nonamenability to military law, would be an ex post facto law, and, as such, unconstitutional.

However, there also appears to be an opinion shared by many, to the effect that the mere correction of a procedural defect, as such, does not deprive an individual of any right in which he was vested at the time of the commission of the act. If this is so, such correction should not be unconstitutional.

In *Fletcher* v. *Pack* (6 Crouch 138, 3 L. Ed. 162) John Marshall defined ex post facto to be a law "which renders an act punishable in a manner in which it was not punishable when it was committed. In *Cummings* v. *Mo.* (4 Wall. 326, 18 L. Ed. 356) it is defined as a law "which imposes a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed, or imposes additional punishment to that then prescribed, or changes the rules of evidence by which less or different testimony is sufficient to convict than was then required."

Does a change of the place of trial under the circumstances of this case affect a substantial right of the party accused? Clearly it does not increase the prescribed punishment or make the act an offense which was not an offense prior to its enactment; nor does it affect the quantum or nature of the evidence required for a conviction. In brief, it does not work any disadvantage on the accused, operate upon the past, or deprive him of any vested right or right of defense.

It is within the province of the legislature to create jurisdiction for the trial of persons accused of crimes, and consequently the creation of a separate or new jurisdiction to try an offense in no sense violates the Constitution which prohibits enactment of an ex post facto law.

For myself, and regardless of the pitfalls which may lie ahead for this legislative item, I prefer to hope that, in the final analysis, if enacted, and if later tested in the courts, the Supreme Court of the United States will find the proposal constitutional. Common conscience dictates that it ought to be, simple justice demands that it should be, and our American system of fair play insists that it must be.

If no other means is available by which to bring them to justice I am perfectly willing that these parties should be returned to Italy for trial by Italian courts for the crime which they have committed. At the same time, I would like to make one last effort to attempt to enact a law which would make them liable before a jury of their own people for a crime which they have committed against their own country.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have voted in favor of foreign aid. I have opposed European Cooperation Act and aid to Greece and Turkey for 7 years or since its inception. My opposition was based on many reasons. First, I thought the European recovery could best be handled in a United Nations world by the UN. Second, I thought, and still do, that we so tied up bread with bullets that it was warmongering under the guise of humanitarianism. Third, as a Christian pacifist I was and still am opposed to every kind of war and warmongering unless we are attacked. Fourth, living as we are in one world I could not envisage aid to Europe when the majority peoples of the earth are to be found in Asia and Africa.

Today I will vote in favor of H. R. 5113. We are at war. While I do not agree totally nor wholeheartedly with the origins of this conflict, nevertheless, we are at war and this country, even at its worst, is my country. I must support this conflict because my country cannot be defeated. Also, I note under title II, page six, an appropriation of $175,000,000 for Africa.

I am leaving the first of next month for an extended trip to Africa, Near East, and Europe. I shall judge just how much of our assistance has been utilized or squandered. When I return January of next year I will be in position to actually evaluate our program and will vote accordingly. Until then I will vote in favor of this.

I still think we made a serious mistake in trying to buy friendship and not working through the UNO. We further compounded this tragedy by excluding Africa and Asia.

When the conflict in Korea has been peacefully concluded and we are no longer at war I shall resume my opposition to all aid that includes bullets.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is one important element of mutual security which up to now has been given little or no attention. I refer to the surplus manpower in Europe of such countries as Western Germany, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, and Austria. Much of this surplus manpower is skilled in the very type of productive effort sorely needed for the defense of the North Atlantic area, and could fill the gap of skilled civilian manpower shortage in many underdeveloped areas of the world, particularly Latin America.

In the North Atlantic area, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, under the leadership of the United States, are taking steps to implement the principle of balanced collective military forces. But they are paying very little attention to the balancing of skilled civilian manpower among the countries in the North Atlantic area, which could use the manpower.

The mandate of the Congress on the utilization of surplus manpower is clear. It places on the ECA Administrator an important duty. This mandate is contained in section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act. Section 115 (e) provides that the ECA Administrator shall encourage arrangements among the ECA countries in conjunction with the International Refugee Organization, looking toward the largest practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the ECA countries in furtherance of the accomplishment of the purposes of economic recovery. That provision was contained in the basic ECA Act of 1948, and still is the law. The International Refugee Organization, however, is due to wind up by the end of December 1951. Thus, it is obvious that the Administrator will have to look to some other means for accomplishing the objective of effective utilization of European manpower.

According to a plan which is being worked out, in the first year of operation, close to 100,000 people could be moved from Europe to the various immigrant-receiving countries. The effectuation of that plan depends largely on the immediate availability of the 14 converted passenger vessels now being used by the International Refugee Organization. Therefore, the creation of a temporary resettlement agency within the next few months, before the expiration of the IRO, is an absolute necessity. The experience in the past of dealing with international organizations which have satellite countries in their membership has been most unsatisfactory and unproductive. This temporary organization would not have any satellite members. That is clearly the intent of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Should such a temporary organization not be created, the vessels would be returned to their owners and probably put into moth balls.

When the second extension of the ECA Act was being considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee last year, the committee added this sentence to section 115 (e):

> The Administrator shall also encourage emigration from participating countries having permanent surplus manpower to areas, particularly underdeveloped and dependent areas, where such manpower can be effectively utilized.

That additional sentence has been the law for over a year. It expresses the mandate of the Congress that the Administrator shall do something about the surplus manpower problem in Europe for the purpose of effecting recovery in Europe and of benefiting underdeveloped and dependent areas which can use the manpower effectively. No mechanism has been specified through which the Administrator should work. But, this does not mean that the Administrator should sit idle and do nothing about this urgent problem.

The proviso to section 101 (a) (2) of H. R. 5113 seeks to stir the Administrator into action—and action soon. We do not spell out the precise mechanism to be used for achieving the objectives of section 115 (e) of the ECA Act. But, what we do is to put emphasis on existing provisions of law. We make available to the Administrator up to $30,000,000 of the $1,335,000,000 authorized for economic assistance to Europe. To quote from page 60 of our committee report:

> The committee has ascertained that to date little effective action has been taken to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to increase the movement of surplus manpower from Europe.

Now, the Administrator will have the wherewithal. He has the clear mandate of existing provisions of law, and he has the clear language of the committee's intent in inserting this proviso into the mutual security bill.

Now, what are the facts on surplus manpower in Europe? It is estimated that a minimum of 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 workers, plus the members of their families—an estimated grand total of 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 people—are available for emigration from Western Germany. Of this number, about 1,500,000 are mostly expellees from Eastern Germany and iron curtain countries. Italy has available up to 500,000 people and will have for the next 5 years. Greece will have a million people available over a period of 3 years. The Netherlands will have about 500,000 people likewise available over a period of 3 years. In addition, the emigration of close to 1,000,000 people from Spain and Portugal would be considered highly desirable for the purpose of improving the economic and social structures of those two countries.

As for the willingness of countries to accept surplus manpower, Great Britain would be willing to receive from 50,000 to 100,000 people over a period of 2 to 3 years. France is able and willing to absorb about 50,000 annually over a period of 5 years. The following countries outside of Europe have declared their willingness to receive Europe's sur-

plus manpower: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador. I understand also that some of the countries in Central America are interested in the project.

I have been informed that for the first year of operation of an effective program of emigration of surplus manpower, a sum of $10,000,000 contributed by the ECA, plus a sum of $20,000,000 contributed from counterpart funds by Western European countries, would permit operations to be carried out for 1 year and permit the continuation of such operation for 3 to 4 years following at, roughly, the same cost. Based on a 3-year operation, the ceiling of $30,000,000 made available to the Administrator should take care of the United States share in the operation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the $7,800,000,000 foreign-aid bill now before the House for consideration is, to my mind, the most effective contribution we can make toward world peace, and a sure preventative of world war III. This sum has been agreed upon by our economic, military, and defense advisers as the amount necessary to permit Western Europe to attain the military strength and economic security required in order that its defenses against aggression may be assured.

We need not be reminded again that world war III would destroy civilization. Our citizens stand ready to make any sacrifices necessary to save their children, their homes, their liberty, as well as their lives. To err on the side of petty economy by reducing the appropriations advocated, would mean mortgaging our very existence and our freedom as a nation. These critical days call for strength and a clear vision of what is required of us. Our neighbors who need our assistance must have it unstintingly, if they are to be a bulwark against communism or any other ideology which would destroy the independence of the people.

When we help our neighboring countries, who have aims similar to ours, the preservation of freedom and independence as well as world peace, we help ourselves. The United States alone cannot single-handedly defeat the forces now warring against the democratic ideal—we must rely upon those other nations which share our ideals, for cooperation in peacetime as well as for military strength in case of a war emergency. It is, therefore, to our interest as well as theirs, that we give them the material assistance they must have in order to take their place among the strong and secure nations of the world.

The aid provided for in the bill before us would only supplement the efforts of the nations receiving it; the assistance we give means the difference between weak, economically insecure, struggling countries not able to protect themselves, or powerful allies, who, by maintaining their own bulwarks against communistic or other aggression from without and within, will make our own defenses that much stronger. For these reasons, I am opposed to any cuts in the authorized amounts set forth in the bill.

We have been told that the next year will be a most critical one; that in this time the question of world peace or war will be decided. We cannot act too quickly if we are to win the race on the side of peace; a peace not bought with concessions and fear, but one earned by strength on our part and on the part of our allies.

We must not forget the importance of Israel, our loyal friend and ally—the only democratic nation in the Near and Middle East. Against almost unsurmountable odds she has taken her place among the freedom-loving countries of the world as a power for democracy and freedom. However, this new and struggling nation needs and must have the full amount of financial aid proposed in this bill.

Even as our own country in its early days relied upon assistance from others for survival, so Israel whose doors have been opened for the oppressed peoples of the world, relies upon us to recognize her plight in these perilous days when her enemies would destroy her. And we should remember that the financial help we give her is a sound investment. Her ideals and will to sacrifice all in the name of freedom are as ours; her army is as strong as her people and limited finances can make it; her fighting men and women have taken their places among the bravest and most fearless in the world.

Without question, Israel is our stanch and true ally and would prove herself of inestimable value in holding the line of our defenses in the event of any world conflict.

Once again the United States is called upon to fulfill its obligations as a leading Nation of the world, one to whom those less powerful can look for financial help without undermining their own independence. We owe it to our friendly neighbors to meet our obligations graciously and generously. In return, our own Nation will become that much stronger; our defenses and those of our allies will reach such might that any would-be aggressor against us will know in advance that victory in any conflict will eventually be ours.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, 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. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, pursuant to House Resolution 388, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REECE of Tennessee moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 5113, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment: On page 3, line 16, subsection (2), strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$985,000,000."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 177, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—186

Aandahl	Forrester	O'Hara
Abernethy	Fulton	Ostertag
Adair	Gamble	Passman
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Patten
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Patterson
Andersen, H. Carl	George	Phillips
	Golden	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Potter
Andrews	Graham	Poulson
Angell	Gross	Radwan
Arends	Gwinn	Rankin
Armstrong	Hall, Leonard W.	Redden
Auchincloss		Reece, Tenn.
Ayres	Halleck	Reed, Ill.
Baker	Hand	Rees, Kans.
Bakewell	Harden	Regan
Barden	Harris	Riehlman
Bates, Mass.	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Beall	Harvey	St. George
Beamer	Herter	Schwabe
Belcher	Hill	Scott, Hardie
Bender	Hillings	Scrivner
Bennett, Fla.	Hoeven	Scudder
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Berry	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Betts	Holmes	Sheehan
Bishop	Horan	Short
Boggs, Del.	Hull	Sikes
Bow	Hunter	Simpson, Ill.
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Bray	James	Sittler
Brooks	Jenison	Smith, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Springer
Brownson	Jensen	Stanley
Budge	Jonas	Steed
Buffett	Jones, Woodrow W.	Stefan
Burdick		Sutton
Bush	Kearney	Taylor
Butler	Keating	Teague
Byrnes, Wis.	Kennedy	Thompson, Mich.
Carlyle	Kersten, Wis.	
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Tollefson
Church	Lantaff	Towe
Clevenger	Larcade	Vail
Colmer	Latham	Van Zandt
Corbett	LeCompte	Vaughn
Coudert	Lovre	Velde
Crawford	McConnell	Vorys
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Vursell
Cunningham	McMullen	Weichel
Curtis, Mo.	McVey	Wharton
Curtis, Nebr.	Mack, Wash.	Wheeler
Dague	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Meader	Widnall
Denny	Miller, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Devereaux	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Miller, N. Y.	Willis
Dolliver	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Dondero	Morris	Winstead
Dorn	Mumma	Withrow
Doughton	Nelson	Wolcott
Fellows	Nicholson	Wolverton
Fenton	Norblad	
Ford	Norrell	

NAYS—177

Addonizio	Garmatz	Merrow
Aspinall	Gary	Miller, Calif.
Bailey	Granahan	Mills
Baring	Granger	Morgan
Barrett	Grant	Moulder
Bates, Ky.	Green	Multer
Battle	Greenwood	Murdock
Beckworth	Gregory	Murphy
Bentsen	Hale	Murray, Tenn.
Blatnik	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolton	Hart	O'Neill
Bonner	Havenner	O'Toole
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Heffernan	Perkins
Bryson	Heller	Philbin
Buchanan	Herlong	Pickett
Burleson	Heselton	Polk
Burnside	Holifield	Powell
Burton	Hope	Price
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Priest
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Quinn
Canfield	Jarman	Rabaut
Cannon	Javits	Rains
Carnahan	Johnson	Ramsay
Case	Jones, Ala.	Reams
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes
Chelf	Jones, Hamilton C.	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Judd	Richards
Clemente	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Combs	Kean	Roberts
Cooley	Kee	Robeson
Cooper	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Cox	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Kerr	Rooney
Dawson	Kilday	Roosevelt
Deane	King	Sasscer
Delaney	Kirwan	Sheppard
Dempsey	Klein	Sieminski
Denton	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Dingell	Lane	Smith, Va.
Dollinger	Lanham	Spence
Donohue	Lesinski	Staggers
Donovan	Lind	Stigler
Doyle	Lyle	Tackett
Eaton	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Eberharter	McCormack	Thornberry
Elliott	McGrath	Trimble
Evins	McGuire	Walter
Fallon	McKinnon	Watts
Feighan	McMillan	Wickersham
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Wier
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Flood	Madden	Wilson, Tex.
Fogarty	Magee	Yates
Forand	Mahon	Yorty
Frazier	Mansfield	Zablocki
Fugate	Marshall	
Furcolo		

NOT VOTING—69

Abbitt	Fisher	Prouty
Albert	Gordon	Reed, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Gore	Rivers
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	Rogers, Mass.
Anfuso	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Sabath
Blackney	Hays, Ohio	Sadlak
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Saylor
Boykin	Hedrick	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Breen	Hess	Secrest
Brehm	Hinshaw	Shelley
Buckley	Irving	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Kearns	Stockman
Chatham	Lucas	Taber
Chenoweth	McDonough	Talle
Cole, Kans.	McGregor	Thomas
Cole, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Van Pelt
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Mitchell	Welch
DeGraffenried	Morrison	Werdel
Durham	Morton	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Elston	O'Konski	Wood, Idaho
Engle	Preston	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Blackney for, with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Hays of Ohio against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Gore against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Wood of Georgia for, with Mr. Prouty against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Hagen for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Talle for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Until further notice:

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Lucas with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. NELSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not in order in this particular instance to ask every Member of the House how he voted; otherwise I think we should have a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. In the first place, that is not a point of order.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instruction of the House, I report the bill back to the House with the amendment contained in the instruction.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, subsection (2), strike out "$1,335,000,000" and insert "$985,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 101, answered "present" 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—260

Addonizio	Aspinall	Baker
Allen, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bakewell
Angell	Ayres	Baring
Armstrong	Bailey	Barrett
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Merrow
Bates, Mass.	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
Battle	Granger	Miller, Md.
Beall	Grant	Miller, N. Y
Beckworth	Green	Mills
Bender	Greenwood	Morano
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Morgan
Bentsen	Gwinn	Moulder
Blatnik	Hale	Multer
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Leonard W.	Mumma
Bolling	Halleck	Murdock
Bolton	Hardy	Murphy
Bonner	Harris	Murray, Tenn.
Bosone	Harrison, Va.	Norblad
Brooks	Hart	O'Brien, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Brownson	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Bryson	Heffernan	Ostertag
Buchanan	Heller	O'Toole
Burleson	Herlong	Patman
Burnside	Herter	Patterson
Burton	Heselton	Perkins
Byrne, N. Y.	Hillings	Philbin
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Pickett
Camp	Holmes	Poage
Canfield	Hope	Polk
Cannon	Howell	Powell
Carlyle	Hunter	Price
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Priest
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Quinn
Celler	James	Rabaut
Chelf	Jarman	Radwan
Chiperfield	Javits	Rains
Chudoff	Johnson	Ramsay
Clemente	Jones, Ala.	Reams
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Redden
Combs	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rhodes
Cooley	Judd	Ribicoff
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Richards
Corbett	Kean	Riehlman
Cotton	Kearney	Riley
Coudert	Keating	Roberts
Cox	Kee	Robeson
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
Crumpacker	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Dague	Kennedy	Rooney
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kerr	Sasscer
Deane	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hardie
Delaney	Kilburn	Seely-Brown
Dempsey	Kilday	Sheppard
Denny	King	Sieminski
Denton	Kirwan	Sikes
Devereux	Klein	Sittler
Dingell	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Dollinger	Lane	Smith, Va.
Donohue	Lanham	Spence
Donovan	Lantaff	Springer
Doughton	Latham	Staggers
Doyle	LeCompte	Steed
Eaton	Lesinski	Stigler
Eberharter	Lind	Tackett
Elliott	Lyle	Taylor
Evins	McCarthy	Teague
Fallon	McConnell	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	McCormack	Thornberry
Fenton	McGrath	Tollefson
Fernandez	McGuire	Trimble
Fine	McKinnon	Van Zandt
Flood	McMillan	Vorys
Fogarty	McMullen	Walter
Forand	Machrowicz	Watts
Ford	Mack, Ill.	Weichel
Forrester	Mack, Wash.	Wickersham
Frazier	Madden	Widnall
Fugate	Magee	Wier
Fulton	Mahon	Wigglesworth
Furcolo	Mansfield	Williams, N. Y.
Gamble	Marshall	Willis
Garmatz	Meader	Wolverton
Gary	Merrow	Yates
Gathings	Miller, Calif.	Yorty
Gavin	Miller, Md.	Zablocki
Golden	Miller, N. Y	

NAYS—101

Aandahl	Brown, Ohio	Harden
Abernethy	Budge	Harrison, Wyo.
Adair	Buffett	Harvey
Allen, Ill.	Burdick	Hill
Andersen, H. Carl	Bush	Hoeven
Anderson, Calif.	Butler	Hoffman, Ill.
Andrews	Church	Hoffman, Mich.
Arends	Clevenger	Horan
Barden	Crawford	Hull
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Jenison
Belcher	Curtis, Nebr.	Jenkins
Bennett, Mich.	D'Ewart	Jensen
Berry	Dondero	Jonas
Betts	Dorn	Larcade
Bishop	Fellows	Lovre
Bow	George	McCulloch
Bramblett	Graham	McVey
Bray	Gross	Martin, Iowa
	Hand	Miller, Nebr.

Morris	Rogers, Tex.	Towe
Nelson	St. George	Vail
Nicholson	Schwabe	Vaughn
Norrell	Scrivner	Velde
O'Hara	Scudder	Vursell
Passman	Shafer	Wharton
Patten	Sheehan	Wheeler
Phillips	Short	Whitten
Potter	Simpson, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Poulson	Simpson, Pa.	Wilson, Ind.
Rankin	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Reece, Tenn.	Stanley	Winstead
Reed, Ill.	Stefan	Withrow
Rees, Kans.	Sutton	Wolcott
Regan	Thompson, Mich.	
Rogers, Fla.		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cunningham

NOT VOTING—70

Abbitt	Fisher	Reed, N. Y.
Albert	Gordon	Rivers
Allen, La.	Gore	Rogers, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	Sabath
Anfuso	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Sadlak
Blackney	Hays, Ohio	Saylor
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Boykin	Hedrick	Secrest
Breen	Hess	Shelley
Brehm	Hinshaw	Smith, Kans.
Buckley	Irving	Stockman
Busbey	Kearns	Taber
Chatham	Lucas	Talle
Chenoweth	McDonough	Thomas
Cole, Kans.	McGregor	Van Pelt
Cole, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Welch
Davis, Wis.	Mitchell	Werdel
DeGraffenried	Morrison	Whitaker
Dolliver	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Durham	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Idaho
Ellsworth	O'Konski	Woodruff
Elston	Preston	
Engle	Prouty	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Hagen against.

Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. deGraffenreid for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Talle.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWNSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, who, if present, would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill prior to final passage.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1952

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 394, Rept. No. 892), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived.

AMENDING RULE XI (2) (F) OF HOUSE RULES

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 386, Rept. No. 893), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees, and except that each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony: *Provided*, That such quorum shall consist of not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request, which was read by the Clerk:

U. S. House of Representatives,
August 16, 1951.

Mr. ANGELL requests, pursuant to rule XXXVIII, leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Jess C. Layton, formerly a resident of Portland, Oreg.; all the original papers submitted in support of H. R. 8433, Seventy-fourth Congress, introduced by Representative William A. Ekwall, of Oregon, and H. R. 5091, Seventy-sixth Congress, introduced by Representative Martin S. Smith, of Washington, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

RESERVES

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

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 of this year, I spoke on this floor against the manner in which inactive reservists of this country are being called to active duty. Today I wish to state that the reservist is still being treated unfairly. Insult has been added to injury.

What has been done, after more than a year of fighting, to improve the state of reserves? We are told that about 75 percent of all officers in Korea are reservists. In an unlimited war the percentage would be even greater.

Not only was the reservist taken into active duty without any consideration of his personal problems, but when his discharge date is growing near, he is suddenly informed that his enlistment is extended another year. One reservist in my congressional district has recently written his family that his only military accomplishment to date has been "to answer muster in the morning," after being in the service for almost a year.

In my home town is an example of the way the reservists have been treated. A young man there received his discharge from the Navy and soon thereafter a Navy officer called at his home to talk about joining the Reserves. The officer emphasized the importance of the Reserves to the future of the Nation, and so forth. The boy joined, after he was assured he would not be called to active duty until men of the draft age had been called; all the active Reserves had been called; and all the National Guard had been called, then the Inactive Reserves would be called. If this is the policy of the Navy they have not kept their word in my State. It seems in West Virginia that the policy has been to call the inactive Reserves first.

The home-town boy that I am using as an example, was called to the service at the age of 39 years. He has two children and a wife to support. He is now in the Pacific, where there are 96 men in the same category and the Navy has use for only 4 of these in their particular line.

This is just one typical example of the glaring inefficiency of the way our military service is being run. If private business were handled in one-half as

inefficient a manner it would fail before it got started.

This is mighty bitter medicine to take when the reservist knows that back home are young men eligible for draft, men without dependents and who have never had active military duty. Yet these reservists must continue in active service while younger men are enlisting in the National Guard or signing up in defense plants to avoid active military duty.

Can anyone explain to me the logic used in the calling of men for active duty who are in their late thirties or forties, who have families to support and who have already served their country in time of war, instead of calling the young men walking around on the streets today.

I believe it is the duty and responsibility of the Armed Services Committee to use its influence with those in charge of our military programs and stop this injustice now.

Unless we get into an all-out war, I cannot condone the calling of inactive reservists for involuntary duty so long as there are available young nonveterans, active reservists, and the National Guard. I believe the enlisted reservists now serving involuntarily should be discharged at the earliest possible date and replaced by younger men who should certainly be trained now after a year of war.

POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented increase in the cost of living has acutely affected each of us, but of all the groups of loyal employees it is my belief that the postal workers have suffered most. This is especially true among the men in the lower grades. The situation is extremely critical. At no point in the last 5 years have the employees in the lower grades come within 17 points of receiving enough salary to keep pace with the increasing cost of living.

Hearings in committees have been going on for weeks and weeks and as of today no legislation has been reported. The lowest paid laborer is receiving more than postal veterans of many years service. The service has suffered, the morale among the employees is low, because of the difficulty in securing new employees at the extremely low rate of pay offered.

It is imperative that early action be taken on this legislation to provide to this group of Government workers an increase to combat the high cost of living. Many postal employees in my district have begged me to do something to remedy their plight. The situation is causing bitterness, in view of the many news stories on anti-inflationary measures to siphon off the extra money now in circulation, when these workers are having to scrape the bottom of the barrel to feed their families.

Surely this controversy over a pay raise can be concluded and prompt action taken by the Congress to aid the post-office employees who have been patiently sweating it out while other salaries have doubled and redoubled. It is expedient that something is done and done promptly.

APPOINTMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE TO HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in common with many other Members of the House, I was truly gratified and very grateful for the recent action of the House Committee on Committees in recommending my esteemed and beloved colleague, Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Worcester, Mass., to be a member of the powerful and distinguished Judiciary Committee of the House.

By virtue of education, training, ability, and experience, Congressman DONOHUE is admirably fitted for service with this important committee of the House.

For years a distinguished member of the Massachusetts bar, whose competency, capability, and outstanding success have been widely recognized by his fellow lawyers, Congressman DONOHUE brings to the Judiciary Committee an exceptionally high degree of personal qualification, which is, to be sure, in line with the traditional character of this committee. He possesses a fine legal mind, clear reasoning powers, and sound, balanced judgment.

As his colleague and friend, representin an adjoining district in Massachusetts, I am particularly familiar with the personal and professional qualities he possesses, which fit him so abundantly for this service. Universally esteemed and respected by the bar and by his friends in and out of public life, he is learned and experienced in the law, and is a man of fine human impulses and broad interests. I am confident that he will make a truly great contribution to the work and achievements of the Judiciary Committee, to which he will bring one of the sharpest and best-trained legal minds in the Congress.

I am most thankful to the distinguished Speaker and his fellow colleague, the distinguished majority leader, our venerable beloved Chairman DOUGHTON, and all the members of the committee, who made possible Congressman DONOHUE's designation. Their solid confidence in him will not be misplaced. He will serve in his new assignment with merit, distinction, and efficiency that can develop only from highly specialized experience in the chosen field of the law which requires such exacting standards of zeal, diligence, integrity, and proficiency so notably possessed by Congressman DONOHUE.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BARING. Mr Speaker, I did not hear the bells on roll call No. 163. Had I been present I would have voted to override the veto.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

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. O'TOOLE in two instances and to include articles.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include a sermon.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN to include in the remarks he will make on the foreign aid bill part of the Brookings Report.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. CASE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to extend the remarks he made today.

Mr. SIEMINSKI relative to the Bayonne Naval Base.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 1 week, on account of illness.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. FUGATE), for today, August 17, on account of official business.

Mr. IRVING, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, August 20. 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:

724. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

725. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Martin Garcia or Martin Garcia-Ruiz, file No. A-7050472 CR 32399, and Angel Braulio Demeroutis, Jr., file No. A-6341213 CR 32492, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

726. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Gustav Frank Alm or Gustav Alm, file No. A-4527931 CR 30942, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

727. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Jesus Serrato-Rodriguez or Jesus Serrato, file No. A-7203618 CR 29851, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

728. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Benjamin Montes or Benjamin Montes Amaya, file No. A-7390661 CR 31441, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

729. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Clifford Hubart Grando, file No. A-7450377 CR 29477, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

730. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Ina Janita Lettsome, file No. A-5957920 CR 33778, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

731. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

732. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill transferring to the Department of the Army administrative jurisdiction and control of certain lands and interests therein held by the United States for flood control purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3193 (consideration of H. R. 3193 over the veto message). A bill to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 889). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5215. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 891. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution providing for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 5215 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 892). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution amending rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize committees to establish a quorum of less than a majority for the purpose of taking sworn testimony; without amendment (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 5215. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5216. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN (by request):

H. R. 5217. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officers and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5218. A bill for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 5219. A bill to enlarge the canal connecting the Hudson River and Lake Champlain, the canal connecting Lake Champlain and the St. Lawrence River, and the channels at the head and foot of Lake Champlain, in order that oceangoing vessels may pass between the St. Lawrence River and New York City via the Hudson River and Lake Champlain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5220. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, so as to provide that leave settled and compensated for in cash or bonds under section 6 thereof shall be considered as active military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5221. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 5222. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURDOCK (by request):

H. R. 5223. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5224. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5225. A bill providing that the ratification of the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1951 regular session of said legislature, and to all extensions of the period for issuance and delivery of revenue bonds thereunder, heretofore or hereafter enacted by said legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5226. A bill to approve act 178 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1951, relating to University of Hawaii and the powers of the board of regents thereof, and to vest in said board of regents the fee simple title to all university property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5227. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 5228. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5229. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5230. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 5231. A bill to grant the retention of jurisdiction of military court martial boards over crimes committed by persons subject to the orders of military authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5232. A bill to grant jurisdiction to the district courts of the United States over all crimes committed by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5233. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to

the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5234. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5235. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Shepherds Landing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the payment of cash bonuses to veterans is noninflationary and is an appropriate recognition of their services and sacrifices, and that Federal agencies should encourage the purchase of State bonds issued to provide funds for the payment of such bonuses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. Res. 393. Resolution to provide for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5236. A bill for the relief of Maria Morano Vigorito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5237. A bill for the relief of Martin Huber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5238. A bill for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 5239. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Elise Heinze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5241. A bill for the relief of Biagio Marrazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5242. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Bommarito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5243. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Wali Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5244. A bill for the relief of Herbert McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 5245. A bill for the relief of Auguste Josefine Eberand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5246. A bill for the relief of Frederick Samuel Rowland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5247. A bill for the relief of Walter D. Jenckes and Harriet Jenckes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

396. By Mr. HART. Petition of Woman's Relief Corps, Department of New Jersey, urging the President of the United States and the Congress to exact from our allies adequate military guaranty to avoid another Korea in which American troops are called upon to do most of the fighting and dying. Also going on record as favoring Gold Star Mothers listed as next of kin, the granting of same exemption ($500-tax exemption) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Great and glorious God, author of the world's joy, bearer of the world's pain, make us glad that we are men and sons of God and that there has been placed upon us a major responsibility for the welfare of the world. We acknowledge our human frailties and we pause to lean our weakness against the pillars of Thy almightiness. Grant us wisdom, courage, and understanding adequate to meet the demands of these obligations in each recurring day. We pray in the name of Thy Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 16, 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 14, 1951:

S. 350. An act for the relief of Z. D. Gilman Co., Inc.;

S. 1246. An act to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath; and

S. 1442. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet.

On August 15, 1951:

S. 29. An act for the relief of Teresa E. Dwyer;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Nicholas George Strangas;

S. 543. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke;

S. 581. An act for the relief of Kiyoko and Chiyiko Ishigo;

S. 885. An act for the relief of Wong Thew Hor; and

S. 1417. An act for the relief of Lefrancois Chamberland, Inc.

On August 16, 1951:

S. 526. An act for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi Feng.

On August 17, 1951:

S. 585. An act for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Suenori Fujii;

S. 1105. An act for the relief of K. C. Be, Swannie Be, Wie Go Be, Wie Hwa Be, Wie Bhing Be, and Swie Tien Be; and

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Rev. Thomas K. Sewall.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3193) to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part 3 of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (A), as amended, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. COLE of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709), making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 131 and 132, to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108, and 129 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 8, 14, 24, 40, 57, 83, and 124 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10½ to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill