Vice President the fifth and final report of his committee and concluded its survey of the Federal pension and retirement plans as directed by Public Law 555, 82d Congress.

Mr. Kaplan and his staff are to be commended for this outstanding report and study of our Federal retirement plans.

A casual study of their Federal retirement program will convince anyone that Congress should give consideration to the recommendations submitted by the committee at the earliest opportunity. In my opinion, it will not be possible to do so in this session, but it should be on the calendar for consideration at the beginning of the 84th Congress.

I want to express personally my appreciation to Mr. Kaplan, the chairman of the committee, its members and personnel who have labored so diligently in preparing this report.

I noticed by the letter to the Vice President in submitting this report, that the committee concluded its work with 20 percent of the funds voted by Congress unspent, or approximately $40,000. This is an additional reason for commendation.

It was a difficult task that was well done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of June 22), 1954:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration:

Clement D. Johnston, of Virginia.
Mrs. Helen Chapman, of Illinois.
Harold C. McClellan, of California.
Mrs. Percy Maxim Lee, of Connecticut.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Frederick Stueck, of Missouri, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years, expiring June 22, 1959, vice Dale E. Doty, term expired.

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

William H. Brett, of Ohio, to be Director of the Mint, to fill an existing vacancy. (Term of 5 years.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter E. Hoffman, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William A. O'Brien, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Walter S. Farley, removed.

IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

John C. Bose
Samuel B. Grenell

To be commissioned lieutenant commander

Allen L. Powell
Norman E. Taylor

To be commissioned lieutenant

Omar H. Quade, Jr.

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

Donald L. Campbell
Albert J. Ramey
Robert M. Borst
John F. Vance, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of June 22), 1954:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, term of 7 years from July 1, 1954.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons in the United States Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Marion L. Weiss
Kermit R. Meade
Burton W. Kniseley
Paul A. Yost, Jr.
Henry H. Bell
Philip C. Lutzi
Richard F. Maim
Lamber J. Larson
Cortland G. Pohle, Jr.
John L. Klenk
Earl A. Baker
George J. Kashuba
Swain L. Wilson
Phillip B. Moberg
Lawrence A. White
John S. Nuzum
Wilfred Bleakley, Jr.
John S. Phillips
James P. Randle
George T. Doyle, Jr.
John H. Fournier
Richard O. Haughey
Richard L. Jacobs
Louis L. Zumstein
Alfred P. Manning, Jr.
George J. Roy, Jr.
Frank R. Buesseler
Robert W. Witter
Robert N. Pierce
John G. Martinez
Ted L. Gannaway
Robert A. Moss
Richard M. Thomas
Daniel L. Muir
George P. Adamson
Graham Hall
John L. Steinmetz, Jr.
Edward F. Yost, Jr.
Henry Wilks, Jr.
Joseph P. Hratko
Charles E. Martin
Richard Lacy
Hugh C. Wyatt
Robert C. Powell
George E. Maloney
Richard J. Knapp
Robert Russell
Frederick P. Schubert
Raymond C. Bassett, Jr.
Robert B. Grant
Norman S. Morrill
Michael J. Madden
Eugene A. Stroup
Byron W. Jordan
Russell H. Ferrier, Jr.
Raymond P. Litts
Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.
David M. Kaetzel

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1954

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this new day and we beseech Thee that we may interpret each hour as a glorious opportunity to enlarge and enrich the welfare of our beloved country and all mankind.

Impart unto us a clear vision and understanding of the sound economic, political, social, moral, and spiritual principles which must undergird and sustain our prosperity and our progress.

Grant that we may seek to do Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Inspire us to strive earnestly to make a worthy contribution to the high adventure of establishing, here upon the earth, that noble spiritual order of life which the Master called the Kingdom of God.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On June 24, 1954:

H. R. 8583. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1954:

H. R. 707. An act for the relief of Dr. Ignacy Adam, Mrs. Amalya Alexander Adam, and George Adam;

H. R. 758. An act for the relief of Harry C. Barney;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stella Rebner;

H. R. 1005. An act to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2566. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder;

H. R. 2616. An act for the relief of Generosa Bonet;

H. R. 3026. An act for the relief of Barbara Gene Coster;

H. R. 3097. An act to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif.;

H. R. 3131. An act for the relief of Wesley Howard Leahy;

H. R. 3986. An act to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota;

H. R. 4701. An act for the relief of Josip Stanic;

H. R. 6173. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8357. An act to amend the Standard Container Act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 685; 15 U. S. C. 257–257i), to provide for a ⅜-bushel basket for fruits and vegetables;

H. R. 8456. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain hospital supplies and equipment of the United States to the city of Gulfport and to Harrison County, Miss.;

H. R. 8923. An act to provide for the development of the Coosa River, Ala. and Ga.; and

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.

On June 29, 1954:

H. R. 2844. An act providing that the ratification of the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1953 regular session of said legislature;

H. R. 2848. An act to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 5840. An act to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange certain Hawaiian Homes Commission land and certain easements for certain privately owned land;

H. R. 6154. An act to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribes;

H. R. 6276. An act to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 8729. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and

H. R. 8779. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9203. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 9709) to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, and I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have the same privilege.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BOW, Mr. COON, Mr. TABER, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. GARY, and Mr. CANNON.

REPORTS FROM CONFEREES ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on all appropriation bills now in conference.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1945)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9517) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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 amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 22, 25, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35 and 41, and 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 "$307,565"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,945,522"; 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 proposed by said amendment insert: "$27,626,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,266,641"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$150,000"; 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 "$3,163,410"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,636,000"; 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 "$1,378,000"; 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 "$25,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,238,365"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,406"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,732,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40.

EARL WILSON,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
FRANCIS CASE,
LISTER HILL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
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. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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:

OPERATING EXPENSES

Executive Office

Amendment No. 1: Strikes out Senate language appropriating funds for the National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $307,565 instead of $258,215 as proposed by the House and $317,565 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Department of General Administration

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $2,945,522 instead of $2,877,522 as proposed by the House and $2,965,522 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure, $40,000 is for personal services including funds for additional assessors.

Office of Corporation Counsel

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $428,585 as proposed by the Senate instead of $360,000 as proposed by the House.

Regulatory agencies

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $918,204 as proposed by the Senate instead of $891,021 as proposed by the House.

Department of Occupations and Professions

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement. While the House conferees will offer a motion to recede and concur in this amendment, House and Senate conferees direct that the District of Columbia obtain legislative authority for fixing the rates of compensation for Board members before the 1956 bill is considered.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $264,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $225,000 as proposed by the House.

Public schools

Amendment No. 10: Inserts Senate language permitting the purchase of supplies.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $27,626,570 instead of $27,526,570 as proposed by the House and $27,692,574 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase provided above the House figure, $25,000 is for the driver training program; $45,000 is for additional teachers; $15,000 is for supplies; and $15,000 is for general administration.

Public Library

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $1,611,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,598,500 as proposed by the House.

Recreation Department

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $1,641,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,626,402 as proposed by the House.

Metropolitan Police

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement.

Fire Department

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $6,266,641 instead of $6,259,641 as proposed by the House and $6,309,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure is for supplies and equipment.

Office of Civil Defense

Amendment No. 17: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $150,000 instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $179,048 as proposed by the Senate.

Courts

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $3,163,410 instead of $3,133,410 as proposed by the House and $3,191,145 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Public Health

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $22,636,000 instead of $22,336,000 as proposed by the House and $22,761,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public welfare

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $8,885,061 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,851,516 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Licenses and Inspections

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $1,378,000 instead of $1,175,000 as proposed by the House and $1,415,315 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount of increase above the House figure $128,000 represents a transfer of funds from the Public Health Department appropriation to cover employment of sanitary inspectors in connection with the slum clearance program.

Department of Highways

Amendment No. 25: Provides that $3,761,612 shall be payable from the Highway fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,859,285 as proposed by the House.

Department of Vehicles and Traffic

Amendment No. 26: Provides $25,000 for traffic safety education instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $30,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28 and 29: Appropriate $1,238,365 instead of $1,124,365 as proposed by the House and $1,343,365 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $235,406 shall be payable from the motor vehicle parking fund and $9,000 from the general fund.

Amendment No. 30: Strikes out House language relating to the purchase arrangements for parking meters or devices.

Department of Sanitary Engineering

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $9,732,740 instead of $9,657,740 as proposed by the House and $9,757,302 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Parks

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,344,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,227,500 as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Public building construction

Amendment No. 33. Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate $15,712,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,685,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that $631,400 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds, or by contract, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $630,320 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Highways

Amendment No. 38: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41: Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

EARL WILSON,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 2, 4, 8, 14, 17, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40 may be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 15, after the word "expenses", insert "development of a comprehensive program for slum clearance, by contract or otherwise, as may be determined by the Commissioners."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 20, after the sum, insert "of which $25,000 shall be available for expenditure by the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation in connection with the 1954 National Convention of the American Legion, subject to reimbursement from the American Legion if receipts exceed expenses."

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 6, line 5, after "compensation", insert "at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 10, line 4, after "tenant", insert "the lieutenant in charge of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club with the rank and pay of captain."

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 12, line 25, insert "purchase of passenger motor vehicles, and a shelter survey by contract or otherwise, as may be determined by the Commissioners."

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 19, line 21, after the word "placed", strike out the balance of line 21 and all of lines 22 and 23, the word "Columbia" in line 24 and insert "outside of the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 31, line 8, after the word "Anacostia", insert "addition to Cleveland Park branch library."

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 32, line 3, after the word "Grounds", insert *"Provided,* That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $343,500 for the Cleveland Park branch library, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1952, shall be available toward construction of the addition provided for herein."

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 32, line 9, insert:

"The appropriations for 'Capital outlay, protective institutions,' contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts, 1951 and 1952, shall be available for constructing such additional water purification and transmission facilities at Fort George G. Meade, Md., as may be necessary to provide for a supply of water to the District Training School and the Children's Center under agreements to be entered into by the Commissioners and the Secretary of the Army, and the said appropriations shall be available for advance payment to the United States for work to be performed, subject to subsequent adjustment."

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 35, line 1, after the word "kinds", insert "to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 48, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 17. The Commissioners are authorized to establish a working fund without fiscal-year limitation for the purpose of printing, duplicating, and photographing; and the unexpended balances in the miscellaneous trust fund accounts 'Operating Account, Printing' and 'Operating Account, Blueprinting' shall be deposited to said working fund; and the fund shall be reimbursed for all services performed thereunder."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 48, line 17, insert:

"SEC. 18. The Commissioners are authorized to establish a permanent working fund, which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation, for necessary expenses of maintenance and repair of vehicles of the Government of the District of Columbia; and said fund shall be reimbursed, or credited in advance if required by the Director, Department of Highways, for the costs of all work performed thereunder."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 8, 14, 17, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 11, line 15, insert:

"Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention), to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide additional municipal services in said District from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, payment at basic salary rates for services performed by members of the uniformed force in excess of 8 hours per day (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing services within such period), traveling expenses, hire of means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar-loading platforms; and for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners; $103,725."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$80,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 15, line 3, after "vocations" insert "attendance without loss of pay or time at specialized medical or public health training courses or institutes, tuition and entrance fees, and travel expenses and fees for visiting lecturers or experts in public health and related fields."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "not to exceed $1,000 for attendance without loss of pay or time at specialized medical or public health training courses or institutes, tuition and entrance fees, and travel expenses and fees for visiting lecturers or experts in public health and related fields."

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.

WISCONSIN CHEESE AND BUTTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Howard Carpenter of the Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery, Ellsworth, Wis., and president of the Dairy Cooperative Institute, has been good enough to arrange with other members of the institute to furnish some of the best sweet cream butter which the dairy State of Wisconsin produces. Most of the members of the Dairy Cooperative Institute are located in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin. Members of the institute cooperating in donating butter are: Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery, Baldwin Cooperative Creamery, Barron Cooperative Creamery, A. and G. Cooperative Creamery, Chippewa Cooperative Creamery, Farmers Cooperative Creamery, Ladysmith Milk Producers Cooperative, Medford Cooperative Creamery, Turtle Lake Cooperative Dairy, Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies. The Colfax Cooperative Creamery is not a member of the institute but is furnishing butter also.

Mr. John Wuethrich, of the John W. Wuethrich Creamery Co., at Greenwood, Wis., has arranged for a fine selection of Wisconsin cheese. He is donating some from his own company. Others donating cheese are: Stewarts Redville Dairy, Blue Moon Foods, Inc., and Neillsville Milk Products, all located in Clark County in Wisconsin's Ninth Congressional District.

This selection of Wisconsin butter and cheese will be on the tables of the House Members' dining room and the private dining room on Wednesday, June 30. I want to invite you to this fine treat arranged for this last day of the dairy month of June by the creameries and dairies of the Ninth District of Wisconsin. I hope my colleagues will make it a point to eat in the House dining rooms on June 30 and that they will enjoy these products for which Wisconsin is justly famed.

INTERFERENCE IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS BY THE SOVIET COMMUNISTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the action of the House on yesterday, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas for many years it has been the joint policy of the United States and the other states in the Western Hemisphere to act vigorously to prevent external interference in the affairs of the nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas in the recent past there has come to light strong evidence of intervention by the international Communist movement in the State of Guatemala, whereby government institutions have been infiltrated by Communist agents, weapons of war have been secretly shipped into that country, and the pattern of Communist conquest has become manifest; and

Whereas on Sunday, June 20, 1954, the Soviet Government vetoed in the United Nations Security Council a resolution to refer the matter of the recent outbreak of hostilities in Guatemala to the Organization of American States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, which is designed to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement, and take all necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent any interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen from Texas, Messrs. PATMAN, THORNBERRY, DIES, and BROOKS, and all other Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the quick passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 91 is constructive leadership on the part of Congress. This resolution was drafted and introduced in the Senate by the able and distinguished Democratic leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, and in particular he is entitled to credit for this firm and constructive action. It is leadership and statesmanship on a high level. It is the type of leadership that reflects credit on the Congress. It also reflects credit on the people of Texas.

The reasons for the passage of the Johnson resolution in the Senate and for passing it today in the House are numerous and convincing.

On a number of occasions during the past several years I have called the attention of the House to the control by a small group of Communists of the Government of Guatemala; also, the fact that the great majority of Guatemalans were strongly opposed to communism.

Let us hope this ousting of the Communist regime is sincere, and that the various elements in Guatemala opposed to communism will cooperate with each other in establishing a government of law that will be stable, enjoying the confidence of the people, and as a result of sound, forward-looking, progressive leadership, prosper and progress.

In the event of such a government the people of Guatemala can rely upon the cooperation and assistance of the United States.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I again commend Senator JOHNSON of Texas, for his vision and his leadership, also commend the

leadership and members of both parties in the Senate and the House for the prompt and favorable action on the Johnson resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which states what I believe to be a basic determination of the American people.

Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to communism. The Republics of the Western Hemisphere are overwhelmingly opposed to communism. Even in Guatemala itself, only a tiny minority of the people are avowed Communists.

Such overwhelming sentiment can be overcome by the Communists only if they succeed in dividing our people and dividing the American Republics. They cannot conquer a united America and a united Western Hemisphere.

The purpose of this resolution, as I read it, is to insure the kind of unity which the Communists cannot overcome. It states an American policy which will provide the leadership that will keep our hemisphere free.

A policy is useful when it points the way to deeds. This resolution lays down a course which does exactly that. It provides a congressional mandate for action—action to turn back the Communist threat to America.

These are times when the American people are divided over many issues. But they are not divided in their will to remain free.

In drawing up this resolution, I believe that the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, struck a deep chord of unity. I believe he stated the true courage and resolve which is embedded so strongly in the hearts of our countrymen.

He is to be congratulated for this statement—so basically American and so basically anti-Communist.

I hope that every member of this House will vote to approve this resolution and thus express the American spirit of unrelenting opposition to the imperialism of Moscow.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a timely resolution, one that very definitely meets the needs of our day.

We are going through a great period of social upheaval and change. Events are moving rapidly, so rapidly that it is almost impossible to keep up with them. Even now a Communist-dominated government in Guatemala is only 700 miles from Texas—only 960 miles, or a few hours' bomber time, from the refineries, the chemical plants, and the homes of my own Second District in Texas.

In such a period the wise and prudent man examines his basic concepts. He determines which remain valid and which have lost their force. He decides which are worth fighting for and which should be discarded.

It seems to me that this resolution states in forceful terms one of the most valid concepts of American foreign policy. For 130 years we have held to the doctrine that the Republics of the Western Hemisphere should have the right to develop free of outside interference.

The situation created by the rising tide of Communist imperialism may force us into an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy. But regardless of what the future may hold, I think we must still consider the Western Hemisphere out of bounds for Communist aggression.

The Monroe Doctrine—1823—is still a vital, living force. But it needs restatement in the light of modern conditions. That is what this resolution does. That is why it should have the solid support of all of us.

As a Texan I am very proud that this resolution was conceived by the senior Senator from Texas. It is a resolution which demonstrates vision and statesmanship. It rings with the force and vigor that must be the essence of American policy if we are to turn back the Red tide directed from Moscow.

The senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, grasped the essentials of the situation. He saw the need for laying down a policy that can lead to action—action to protect freedom for ourselves and posterity. He also saw the need for making that policy nonpartisan so it could unite—rather than divide—America.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of leadership that America needs—leadership of youth, courage, and daring. I am proud to associate myself with this resolution and this declaration that America shall stand firm against any effort by international communism to invade the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I look upon this resolution as an urgently needed legislative expression of our determination to keep communism out of the Western Hemisphere.

For 130 years this Nation has operated on the basis of the Monroe Doctrine. It has had the wholehearted support of our people. It has served the noble purpose of protecting the right of our neighbors to the south to develop their own institutions.

We are now facing a new threat—a threat that was unknown during the administration of President Monroe. It is a threat that goes beyond the colonial aspirations of European countries in the 19th century. It is a threat to swallow up the whole Western Hemisphere.

This resolution sets forth a policy which can unite all the Americas against the aggression of international communism. It lays the basis for strong and forthright steps which will protect our freedoms.

The particular virtue of this resolution is that it represents a legislative declaration—an expression of that branch of our Government which most directly speaks the voice of our people. Its meaning will not be lost either upon our friends or upon our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Senate minority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, for his sponsorship of this resolution.

This declaration represents statesmanship of the highest order—the kind that we have learned to expect from him. It also represents an earnest effort to unite our people on the most important issue of the day—the defense of our liberties against Communist aggression.

In presenting this resolution, the senior Senator from Texas has offered a declaration that preserves the vitality of the Monroe Doctrine—but projects that doctrine into the changing conditions of the modern world.

This resolution should receive the overwhelming approval of the Members of this House. On top of the Senate action, it will then become the voice of a united America.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, as one who pioneered the struggle against communism in this country, I am proud and happy to vote for this resolution.

I am one who believes that American policy should be based upon unrelenting opposition to Communist plots and conspiracies. We must keep our hemisphere free of Communist influence if freedom is to survive.

We have come a long way from the early days of the House Un-American Activities Committee. There were few Americans then who realized the dangers of the Moscow-directed conspiracy.

Since then, we have taken strong action against the Communists in this country. We have exposed their subversion and their espionage. Their numbers have been reduced to a small—though still dangerous—fraction of our population.

Since then, however, we have had a new development. The Communists are now openly seeking to arm their followers in the Western Hemisphere.

Guatemala is not a large country. It is not a dominant nation of the Western Hemisphere. But as a beachhead for Communist aggression, it represented a real threat.

Guatemalans themselves have taken vigorous action to meet that threat. But we should not just shut our eyes and pretend that it has gone away.

We should draw a very clear line around the Western Hemisphere and warn the international Communists that this line they cannot cross. That is the purpose of this resolution and it has my wholehearted support.

I urge every Member of this House to register his determination that Communist aggression and penetration shall not be permitted in the Western Hemisphere.

I want to congratulate our senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, for his authorship of this resolution. In steering this resolution through the Senate, Senator JOHNSON has made an important contribution to the great cause of halting the spread of Communist dictatorship to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have some observations to make on this resolution from the background of some boyhood years spent in Central America. I was a schoolboy in a public school in Nicaragua when Great Britain had given some offense to the dignity of Nicaragua and my schoolmates joined in gatherings of older Nicaraguans clamoring for war with Great Britain.

Once an American gunboat had bombarded this Nicaraguan port on the Caribbean and I was shown by my Nicaraguan schoolmates an old unexploded

shell that remained from that bombardment. As a boy I conversed with a member of a distinguished Nicaraguan family who as a youth had served in the Nicaraguan army of liberation under Gen. William Walker, who had come to Nicaragua at a time when great financial interests in the United States were dealing unfairly with the Nicaraguan Government in payments for the privilege of conducting a profitable interoceanic trade through the San Juan River from the east coast to the promising gold fields of California.

It was at a time in the late years of the old century that serious trouble had developed between the United States of America and Great Britain over Britain's claim to sovereignty over the eastern coast of Nicaragua. In that crisis my father had been sent to Nicaragua as the personal representative of President Grover Cleveland. As a boy I accompanied him. At the time Great Britain was maintaining in royal style in Jamaica King Clarence, reigning sovereign of the Carib Indians. Britains claimed that the Carib Indians had rightful claim to the entire eastern coast of Nicaragua.

When Britain sought to exercise its claim of sovereignty through a proclamation issued in the name of Great Britain by the vice consul at Bluefields, Nicaragua, a gentleman named Hatch, Nicaragua responded by arresting British Vice Consul Hatch and sending him in handcuffs to trial at Managua. Great Britain's response was the sending of warships to Bluefields and a threatened bombardment. It was then that President Grover Cleveland intervened, and war with Great Britain was threatened. At about this time also was the matter of Britain's claim, which she refused to permit to go to arbitration, to certain parts of Venezuela.

Later there was dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica over the boundary lines, and President Cleveland, on request of those Republics, dispatched as the arbiter General Alexander, who had commanded the Confederate artillery at Gettysburg. Among the treasures of my memories is the recollection of my experience as a boy privileged to accompany General Alexander, then in my boyish eyes so recently after the Civil War an outstanding heroic figure, in survey of the territory in dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

All of this was many years ago. General Zelaya then was President of Nicaragua. The Sacasa family was then as now a prominent family in Nicaragua, and one of its distinguished members was the head of a household at San Juan del Norte. I have said that this was long ago, but the family lines and the traditional sentiments I doubt have changed.

There was then a general feeling among Nicaraguan people that the United States was a big neighbor with a big stick. There was some justification for this feeling. For instance, there was the mahogany concession which had been extracted in some manner and over which a gentleman, as I recall his name now, Baker, and I am talking only from memory of many years ago, and under which there was cut down by natives and carried away the richness of the mahogany growths of the eastern coast of Nicaragua. Later, and when I had grown to the estates of manhood and was far removed in years from those earlier scenes of my boyhood as a pupil in a public school in the free port of San Juan del Norte, our country pursued a policy of dollar diplomacy.

Then came President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Of all the great services that President Franklin D. Roosevelt rendered to his country and to the world none was of greater value than the building of true hemispheric solidarity. The United States of America, under his inspiration, ceased to be the big neighbor with the big stick. Instead it became in the hearts and minds of the people of Latin America the big neighbor with the big and understanding heart. The scars of past eras were effaced. Real and enduring hemispheric solidarity was attained.

Mr. Speaker, that solidarity is essential to our security. I do not know, nor does anyone in this Chamber, what the future may have in store in dangers arising in other parts of the world, but as long as the Americas present a united front there are no dangers that we cannot meet with positive assurance of our safety.

Once this solidarity is weakened, or exists only in the pretense and not in the spirit, our security is jeopardized and our future is uncertain.

The people in the smaller Republics are as humanly sensitive as the people in our own country. We have no right in the United States to interfere in the domestic affairs of any foreign country, and especially is it the part of folly to do anything which will occasion the thought in the smaller American Republics that we are attempting to dictate to them in matters which concern them exclusively as nationals of those Republics. In my committee, Banking and Currency, I argued against a provision in certain proposed legislation that would have given to the United States of America the responsibility of guaranteeing the stability of government in a sister Republic. To my mind that amounted to interference in the domestic affairs of a sister Republic.

I have read carefully the resolution that we are now considering. I am supporting it for a reason which I wish to make clear. If it were a resolution praising or condemning the government of a sister Republic I should have to consider whether that were within our rightful domain or whether it were a matter within the exclusive determination of the people of that nation. But this resolution covers something which is of concern not only to the United States of America but to every country and to every government on the American hemisphere. It is a re-affirmation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The Soviet Government has exercised its veto on the proposal to submit an American hemispheric question to the jurisdiction of a council of the States of the American hemisphere. In other words the Soviet Government is challenging the right of the states of the American hemisphere to settle problems that concern only the American hemisphere. The Soviet Government, in short, has challenged the Monroe Doctrine. To that challenge there can be but one response.

In December of 1895, when Great Britain in the matter of Venezuela had openly defied the Monroe Doctrine, President Grover Cleveland summoned the Congress of the United States into a special session. Great Britain then was Mistress of the Sea and in a sense ruled the world. Yet President Grover Cleveland said in his address to Congress that if Great Britain refused to recognize the Monroe Doctrine, and I quote his exact words:

> It will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist Great Britain by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests.

He continued:

> In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the Monroe Doctrine as defined by President Monroe himself. I am quoting now the exact words of President Monroe defining the Monroe Doctrine as accepted by President Grover Cleveland at the risk of war with the then all powerful Great Britain:

> We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we are waging a cold war. It is a cold war between two ideologies. It is a cold war that has resulted in the loss of many precious American lives in Korea. I do not know that cold war is the proper term, but that is what it has been called. It is a conflict between two systems. Certainly it has been and is exactly that. Here let me again quote President Monroe:

> We should consider any attempt * * * to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Mr. Speaker, there can be only one answer to the veto of the Soviet Government to a proposition to refer a problem exclusively in the jurisdiction of the American Republics under our time-honored Monroe Doctrine to a jury of the American states. I shall support this resolution with the reservation that by so doing I am not commiting myself, and I am certain that my colleagues do not intend so to commit themselves, to any interference of any sort or nature in the domestic affairs of a sister American Republic.

The Monroe Doctrine is an essential part of American foreign policy. Our position today is unchanged from that in the days of President Monroe and the later days of Grover Cleveland.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

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 372, nays 0, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—372

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Barrett
Bates
Battle
Becker
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burleson
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clardy
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Condon
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crosser
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dies
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fenton
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Graham
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen, Calif.
Hagen, Minn.
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Hosmer
Howell
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Latham
Lipscomb
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Matthews
Merrill
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Kans.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
Oakman
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Poage
Poff
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Rayburn
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shafer
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—62

Albert
Angell
Barden
Beamer
Bonin
Buckley
Burdick
Busbey
Camp
Chatham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dawson, Ill.
Dempsey
Dingell
Dodd
Donohue
Donovan
Feighan
Fernandez
Gregory
Hale
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Heller
Hillings
Holifield
Horan
Kearns
Kersten, Wis.
Krueger
Lantaff
LeCompte
Lesinski
Long
Lucas
Lyle
McGregor
Machrowicz
Madden
Mailliard
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morgan
Morrison
Murray
Norblad
Pfost
Pillion
Powell
Regan
Riley
Roberts
St. George
Smith, Miss.
Sutton
Thomas
Weichel
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Tex.

So the resolution was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Beamer with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Barden.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Bonin with Mr. Machrowicz.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mrs. Pfost.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. Heller.
Mr. LeCompte with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Miller of Maryland with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Meader with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Harvey with Mr. Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Morgan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1953

Mr. HOPE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2475) to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TOMORROW

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate in the House tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

JAKE ALEXANDER—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 457)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval, H. R. 1128 entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama."

This private bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey without consideration to Jake Alexander 160 acres of unappropriated public lands withdrawn from entry as part of the William B. Bankhead National Forest, Ala.

I feel that this special legislation is unnecessary because cases of this kind can and should be taken care of under existing law. Public Law 159, 83d Congress, broadened the Color of Title Act of December 22, 1928, specifically to cover claims similar to the one involved in H. R. 1128.

A basic requirement of the Color of Title Act is payment to the United States of the appraised value of lands patented thereunder. In this respect I feel that H. R. 1128 would discriminate against the interest of the United States, as well as other color-of-title claimants, by exempting this particular claimant from payment of any consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1954.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection the bill and the message will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9678, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I am not supporting it grudgingly; I am supporting it wholeheartedly.

I supported this program during former administrations. A change of administration does not change my principles.

I have been for a bipartisan foreign policy all along, and I am for a bipartisan policy in domestic affairs also, as long as that can be maintained and the minority maintain its principles. We who are in the minority, however, and are trying to be a loyal opposition, who are seeking to help those in authority perform their functions and make our country strong and keep it great, are put to a terrible strain at times. Some people high in this administration nearly every week are making statements about former administrations that really make the blood of some of us boil. Inane speeches and untrue things are being said when we, upon every matter of foreign policy that has been brought forward, have been going along, I think, with more unanimity than the majority party, and I do not say that in criticism. But I trust that in the future, especially when bills like this are coming before the House the following day, such leaders in the Republican Party as the Vice President of the United States may be a little more careful about the statements they make than was the Vice President of the United States on last Saturday night. I deeply regret it, because I want a united country to face that danger that I know this world faces today. If the people in this great democracy do not stand together, if we cannot agree to go in the same direction, then not only our country but this sad world will be in a mighty, mighty bad plight.

I want us to have friends in this world. I heard a great man stand in this place one time and say that the people of the United States were the most peaceable people in the world, but when aroused they were the most warlike; they would go to war nearer 100 percent than any other peoples upon the face of the earth and, if called upon, they were willing to meet a world in arms. I think they would be willing to do that now, but I hope and pray that we do not have to meet the world or any great sector of this world in arms alone. If we had not already done some things under the leadership of prior administrations, and the Secretaries of State, that have been so violently and unjustly criticized, we would probably be standing alone in the world today.

I supported the Marshall plan as did many, and a vast majority on both sides of the aisle. I am always glad when I can say a thing like that. They said at the time, "Why should we spend our money to help rehabilitate war-torn Europe?" Well, you know, France and Italy stood shattered, broken, at the end of World War II. Take a man in France, with her transportation destroyed, with her factories in ashes, sitting under what was his vine and fig tree, with hands willing to work to make a living for himself and those dependent upon him but with no work for his hands to do. That country had to be rehabilitated, because when the man whose hands are willing to work to support himself and those dependent upon him cannot do that under the government he has, he will vote for any change, because he cannot make it worse than to starve and freeze to death. If it had not been for the operation of these plans and this money that we expended, I regret to say, but in honesty I must say, that many of these countries would today be in the bosom of communism. Then they would not have been our allies in any sense of the word, in peace or in war. I am not going to criticize any of these friendly nations today, as I heard some of them criticised yesterday, to my deep regret. Take our great ally, who has been our ally since 1778, France. There is a country which has tried to maintain itself as a democracy. They have tried to be our friend. They want to be our friend today. But the people of the United States who talk lightly about France and Italy have never known what it means to have their country riven and torn and destroyed by the earthquake shocks of war. If we had had that condition in this country, we probably would look upon these matters in a somewhat different fashion.

Ah, my friends, I was here during World War I, when we went to war 100 percent, when we were willing to join the other countries of the world in preserving democracy. Then I saw us draw back into the shadows of isolationism. I saw a great President bring back a charter of peace to this country and it was spurned. That great scholar-statesman cried out at that time, "If this greatest of all democracies in the world does not join with other peace-loving peoples in the world to bring about a league of peace, this world will be shocked and torn by another and more devastating war in a quarter of a century." We did not join. At that time many people thought we could wrap two oceans around us and be safe and secure from attack from anywhere. But that war did come.

The President of the United States recommended money for defense and I stood in this well, as majority leader, in 1938, in 1939, in 1940, and even up until the fall of 1941, after I had taken the chair that my honorable friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] occupies now, and pleaded for strength, saying that we would be drawn into this war, that it would cost us many billions more than it would have cost at that time to make ourselves strong, and that we would sacrifice the lives of untold numbers of American boys and girls; but our pleas were not heeded.

We were drawn into the war and it cost us in less than 5 years more than 400 billions of dollars to come out of that war victorious.

Do we want allies? We do and we must have them. And after they have been torn and broken by war and its devastation, they must have help from somewhere. I am willing to give it to them as I was before World War II. I am willing to spend some billions to help our allies and the other democracies of the world to be strong and stay strong.

I thought the Marshall plan money and I think this aid money is the best defense money that the United States of America has ever spent or can spend. It is not a question of helping somebody. It is not a question of a handout to somebody. It is a question of appropriating this money to some of these countries that are poor and cannot do it for themselves, to help them to get on their feet economically so that they can spend some money to keep themselves free, to help us and to help themselves remain free.

These are just a few thoughts that I wanted to leave with you before we begin reading this bill for amendment.

If this bill is amended with amendments that will tear and rend it, and not leave in it enough power or enough money to operate and carry out the purposes, then we might as well not perform this act or make this gesture.

I think I know, as many others in my presence know, the serious situation that faces us and all of the other democracies of the world. This earth of yours and mine is tinder. A match struck or a gun fired, one, in some part of the earth may bring a holocaust.

You know, when the ingenuity of man, the mind of man, which has the spark within it, starts out to make agencies of construction, and many great scientists and inventors have made for us and the world great agencies of construction, when that same mind, that same ingenuity, starts out to make an agency of destruction, it is just as efficient as it is when it starts out to make an agency of construction.

That is what we have done in this world. We have agencies of destruction that, if insane people turn them loose on the face of this earth, I fear may make that Biblical prediction come true, and this earth may be destroyed as if by fire. This civilization will cease, after 20 centuries of Christianization and civilization and following the example of the lowly Man of Galilee, who walked these shores 20 centuries ago and preached peace and good will. I fear, my countrymen, that when that war would be over there would be nobody left to build another civilization. I fear it.

I plead with you, therefore, to do the thing here today to preserve, protect, defend, and perpetuate not only this, the greatest democracy that ever existed in all the tide of time, but the other democracies of this unhappy, this distraught, and this dangerous world.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield the remaining 15 minutes of general debate on this measure to our able, distinguished and beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to speak here this afternoon following my dear friend, that great patriot, the gentleman from Texas and former Speaker of the

House, Mr. RAYBURN. He has told you with eloquence and with facts what grave problems face us today. I repeat, as he has said, there should be no partisanship involved in the legislation we are considering today. It involves the future safety of our country, and the world. In this crucial hour we must subordinate politics and personal prejudices for the larger objective—the security of our country.

I repeat, this bill comes before us in a critical period. The permanent peace for which we fought and sacrificed so much blood and so much treasure is still remote. We are facing dangers much greater than confronted us in two world wars.

A nation to which we have given so much assistance in the past now aspires to force its ideology of communism upon us and the whole world. Its deadly Red poison is spread through stealth, subversion, and infiltration. Where these methods do not work there is no hesitancy to resort to force.

The Soviet has demonstrated to the world that its pledged word is valueless. The record shows its promises are made only to be broken. The Kremlin talks of peace and at the same time seeks to destroy nations one by one.

How long shall we remain blinded?

The crisis is here. It is here now. This is the compelling reason why there must be no halt in uniting the free world in the struggle for liberty. Our safety depends entirely upon our strength. That is why we must spend billions for armament both at home and abroad. That is why it is absolutely necessary that we give our friends in Asia and Europe the materials to aid them in this fight for freedom. There is no other alternative unless we are to stand alone, which, of course, is unthinkable.

The greater part of the money provided in this bill will go for military aid. The economic assistance is smaller in amount but is still important. Economic aid is a most important factor in this struggle for freedom as we work to improve living standards and thereby make Communist promises less attractive.

Hungry people are more likely to accept the lying propaganda of the Soviets. To the starving, any change can be made to appear desirable.

These people do not stop to think that communism means slavery, that communism means the loss of all freedom and opportunity.

To aid in the banishment of starvation and misery is not merely a humanitarian obligation but an essential factor in this battle against communism.

I would be less than frank if I did not say we have been bitterly disappointed in some of the nations we have tried to help. Lack of appreciation is a human trait not unknown to men and women in public life. Most of us know the story of the constituent often the beneficiary of favors, who was campaigning against his erstwhile friend. The many favors of the past were recalled to him, and to justify his action the constituent simply said: "What has he done for me lately?" Some of our friends out in the world are probably saying today: "What have they done for us lately?"

We in political life, because of a few unhappy experiences, do not stop working for our constituents. We know that most of them are grateful.

The same situation exists in the international field. We do have friends, true friends, real friends, who are unafraid and upon whom we can count to stand with us in resistance against Communist aggression and tyranny to the end. These real friends must not be let down. They are essential if communism is to be stopped.

Most of the money in this bill will go to such peoples as South Korea, the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, Pakistan, Thailand, Japan, Turkey, Greece, Spain, Israel, Yugoslavia, and Western Germany.

These people are not going to run up the white flag. They prize their freedom too highly, and, if necessary, they will fight for that freedom. It would be a great and unthinkable tragedy if we left them to stand alone. I know we will not. We are going to give them the hardware needed for their defense.

Aiding these people as we are doing in this bill greatly enhances the possibility for the honorable peace we all seek.

Real peace can come to Asia only if there is a strong free world. Strength is the only thing communism respects. It is the only thing that will stop the Reds from their goal of world domination. Real peace will never come through appeasement. We tried that before. What is true in Asia is also true in Europe. There can be no retreat while the Red flag of danger still flies.

There is one item in the bill over which some may have concern, and that is understandable. This item is aid to India. We have helped India a great deal, and we have had disappointments because this great Asiatic country did not appear to us fully cognizant of the realities of the situation.

Facing the Communist boundaries, the people of India naturally entertain some fears, and they want peace. They hoped, as indeed we did, for too long a period that we could live at peace with the Communists. Lately they appear to be entertaining some doubts. They now show interest in keeping the Asiatic countries free from Soviet domination. We must not throw away the chance of keeping India neutral and eventually lining up with the nations which must be thoroughly organized if Asia is to remain free.

Here is what may well be called a calculated risk. It is worth trying. After all, a leader may err, but there are millions of Indians who are strongly anti-Communist; and if we can help them improve their condition of life through our aid, the anti-Communist forces will multiply. It would, in my judgment, be a mistake to eliminate them from all aid at this time.

We have in Europe, as we do in Asia, dependable allies. These nations have ratified the EDC. We must insist upon the completion of this essential defense program, or else we must at once make alternative plans. The hour is already late—we have been too patient.

Timidity cannot hold us back from making it possible for West Germany to defend itself from any Communist attack. We have delayed too long already in giving full independence to West Germany.

Timidity must not hold us back from aiding other countries which seek to keep the lights of freedom burning. Pressing ahead boldly is the need of this critical hour. It is the only way we can win. Of course, there are risks; there is risk in anything that you might do; there is risk if you do not do anything. The best chance of avoiding war is to push boldly ahead. That will make it possible to have this great strong world.

There is considerable flexibility in this bill as to the use of money for Asia because of the chaotic situation in Indochina. The use of the money in Asia is left to the discretion of President Eisenhower. This is the course of wisdom. The funds should be spent where they can be most helpful in the battle to contain communism. We know we can trust President Eisenhower, charged as he is with the responsibility of our foreign affairs, to do this.

President Eisenhower knows the great dangers confronting the free world. He will direct the use of the funds judiciously, thereby guaranteeing us the maximum of defense.

Petty prejudices and petty politics are not for this critical hour. The future safety of our own Nation—yes; the fate of the whole free world—is at stake. Facing such a crisis, we must not falter. We must go forward with full trust in the divinity which shapes the destiny of man.

Let us pass this bill substantially as it came out of the committee. The committee has worked diligently on this bill for many months and its members have thoroughly studied the grave problems confronting our country in the international field.

Let us show conclusively to the world that we are not welching in the fight to stop communism. A strong, unafraid, free world cannot be defeated.

One final word. The passage of this authorization bill is not the final word. World-shaking events may well happen in the next few weeks. If we defeat or badly amend this bill, we are helpless to take advantage of future happenings. The wise course is to pass this bill with the full amounts recommended, and then we can take full advantage of what the immediate future brings forth.

I am very happy to be able to say these few words. I say them only because I believe it is a solemn obligation that I owe to the House and to our country.

We are all Americans. We have but one objective, and that objective is to bring the greatest security that is possible to America in this grave, critical hour. So I gladly support the bill and hope the House in its wisdom will sustain its reputation of the past and say that here we go forward unafraid.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, H. R. 9678, purports to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by authorizing assistance to friendly nations, in the amount of $3,470,000,000.

There is no doubt that with the unsettled condition that exists throughout the

world today, it is imperative that everything within reason should be adopted to make certain our national security.

It has been our policy to spend money in a lavish manner, during and since World War II, in an effort to strengthen our allies and gain their good will. The amount we have already expended has been of such huge proportions that it behooves us to give careful study and consideration as to what has been accomplished, whether the results justify a continuation of the policy indefinitely, and the effect on our own financial structure and welfare.

It is most appropriate, therefore, at this time to take account first of the tremendous sum that has already been extended. I am inclined to believe that the average citizen is not aware that during the World War II period, from fiscal year 1941 through 1945, inclusive, that we gave to foreign countries and their people a total of $59,869,639,312 of our money. This was money borrowed from our taxpayers as well as from taxes paid by them. The same is true of all the moneys I will hereafter mention. It is well to keep this fact in mind at all times.

After the close of World War II, during the fiscal years from 1946 through 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953 we have appropriated and sent to foreign countries and their peoples a total of $55,207,451,624. Since fiscal year 1954 started and up to May 15, we have given to others in the form of foreign aid, $4,224,906,564. This makes a grand total spent for foreign aid of $119,301,997,500. These are Treasury figures and therefore accurate and true.

We have also given, in addition to that I have mentioned, aid to other countries through the World Bank and the Monetary Fund the sum of $3,385,000,000.

And, in addition to the above-mentioned amounts it is also well to realize that there have been interest charges to pay. Since July 1940, we have paid interest on the money we have borrowed to finance our foreign assistance program the sum of $18,606,524,210.57 up until May 15, 1954.

When we add all these figures together we find that the principal and interest total the stupendous sum of $141,293,521,710, since July 1, 1940.

How long, and how much more, we will will be expected to spend seems to have no immediate answer.

At first our expenditures were made to carry on World War II. This in itself was a staggering amount. Since World War II, in addition to the tremendous sums spent in the conduct of the Korean war, we have given immense sums, as I have shown, to each of our European allies to rehabilitate the destruction their industries and living conditions suffered as a result of the war. Today, these countries have been restored and their industries have reached a degree of production that far exceeds that of prewar years. All of this naturally raises the question—how much longer should we continue to give aid? We are all conscious of the innumerable ways the welfare of our own people could be improved by the expenditure in our own land of the funds we now send abroad to every corner of the world. While we as a people are always ready to answer the call for help, yet, when there is evidence that it is not appreciated by those to whom we give, and they show a disposition to question our good intent and purpose, is it not time to begin to think in terms of a reappraisal to determine how worthwhile is a continuation of our policy, or, is it necessary?

Today, we do not hear the need for rehabilitation advanced as a reason for our assistance as we once did. We now hear that it is necessary for us to assist in the building of a military bulwark against possible Communist aggression. We have given unstintedly of our weapons of war, and, billions of dollars to enable countries, not only in Europe, but all over the world to strengthen their military forces to fight off Communist aggression. And, yet, many of the nations whom we have assisted in this manner are continually seeking trade relations with Soviet Russia, and, in some instances, have secretly supplied it with strategic materials that could be helpful to it in time of war. Furthermore, notwithstanding our willingness to be helpful in this respect, and, in addition thereto, keep our boys on duty in Europe and in the far corners of the world to create a nucleus of an army to defend against aggression, yet, the very nations for whom we make the sacrifices are loath to build up or maintain defense armies of their own of sufficient strength.

During a recent trip around the world I was astounded to learn that in many of the countries, where we grant assistance, there was a feeling of wonder why we did it. It seemed at times as if they considered us as forcing our assistance upon them. And, as I have already said our motives of good will are too often misunderstood and even cause a feeling of resentment.

Every day there is some new evidence of unfriendliness exhibited toward us. Only a few days ago our flag was burned in a South American country by a mob, and an effigy of President Eisenhower likewise burned. Certainly there was no reason for this show of unfriendliness. Then, why is it, notwithstanding, our desire to promote peace and good will that there is abroad throughout the world this spirit of distrust toward us?

What course should we as a Nation pursue? This is no easy question to answer. There is so much information that has a bearing upon the condition of world affairs that the average person, including Members of Congress, do not have, that one feels at times as if groping in the dark. You have the desire to do the right thing. Your inclination might properly be to shut off all outside aid, and, tell the nations, supposed to be our allies, and, yet who show a desire to do business with Communist Russia, to go ahead and take care of themselves and we will do likewise, but, this in the long run may only be making trouble for our own people. However, there are times when I feel that much of what we now give away to countries all over the world could best be spent in building up our own security and that of the other nations of North, South, and Central America and make ourselves and other nations in this Western Hemisphere impregnable from foreign attack. But, even this may not give us the security we seek in this age of atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, and nuclear weapons of war that can be carried anywhere and everywhere at the speed of 600 miles per hour, and, wreck whole cities and their inhabitants with a single bomb.

The problem of deciding what our foreign policy should be in the matter of financial assistance becomes more involved it seems with each succeeding day. No sooner was there a cease fire in Korea than Communist aggression broke out in Indochina. As a consequence France calls upon us for additional aid to assist in carrying on its war in that country. This, notwithstanding the fact that we have already advanced many millions of dollars to this cause. When will there be a stop to calling upon us for aid every time a nation runs into trouble, even though it is its own fault as the case of France? It would seem as if Uncle Sam is the only one to whom they can go for help. Are our resources such that we can continually respond to these repeated calls without seriously endangering our own financial structure, or, at least seriously curtailing the welfare of our own people?

It is time to give the serious and careful consideration that the problem demands, especially in view of the fact that we do not seem to be building up good will or stemming the tide of aggression and war that accompanies it, by the policy we have been pursuing. The nations to whom we have given the most help seem at times to be the least dependable. France and Italy are weak in their allegiance to the cause for which we have contributed so much, and only within recent days we have been shocked by a suggestion of the Foreign Minister of Great Britain that we become footsie-tootsie with the Communists in southeastern Asia. All of this cannot help but make any thoughtful person stop and ask, Is it not time to review and reassess our give-away policy and make certain it is wise and expedient?

The situation that confronts us is most difficult. It is not easy to find a solution. We are told by our leaders who are grappling with the problem that it is necessary to continue our policy of aid. That if we fail to do so it will mean collapse of the whole structure that has been built up to sustain us and make strong our security. Of course, no one would want to bring on a calamity by a change in policy, yet how can we be sure that such would be the result or that if we do not continue our present policy that it might result in an even worse condition than now exists or that has been predicted.

The task of making a correct decision is made more difficult for the average citizen, including Members of Congress, because the information as to the real situation that exists in each of the nations of the world is not available to all. So much of it is of a secret character that it naturally only comes to those who are high in the policymaking departments of Government and, by its very nature, must be kept secret. Thus, it is necessary to accept in large measure the

viewpoint of those who are supposed to know the real facts. In this connection, I have confidence in the judgment and integrity of President Eisenhower. He has been a great military leader. He has more special knowledge of conditions abroad, and for a longer time, than any other person in our Government. He is honest. He is sincere. He is patriotic. He seeks to establish peace and avoid war. And, above and beyond all else, he has a firm belief in God Almighty. I have confidence in his leadership, his counsel, and his advice.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1954."

TITLE I—MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER 1. MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. Purpose of chapter: The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common defense. The Congress hereby finds that the efforts of the United States and other nations to promote peace and security require additional measures of support based upon the principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. It is the purpose of this chapter to authorize measures in the common defense, including the furnishing of military assistance to friendly nations and international organizations in order to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States and to facilitate the effective participation of such nations in arrangements for individual and collective self-defense. In furnishing such military assistance, it remains the policy of the United States to continue to exert maximum efforts to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion.

The Congress reaffirms its previous expressions favoring the creation by the free peoples of the Far East and the Pacific of a joint organization, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to establish a program of self-help and mutual cooperation designed to develop their economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties and to protect their security and independence.

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

Mr. Chairman, before we consider amendments under the 5-minute rule, I would like to again call attention to some of the provisions of this bill.

The bill that the House is considering today is the culmination of almost 3 months of intensive study by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Whatever judgment Members may have on the measure, none can say we acted with undue haste.

This is as it should be if we are to discharge our responsibilities as legislators. This is a long bill—82 pages to be exact. When it first came to our committee, it was 95 pages—and then not complete. That in itself is evidence that the committee worked its will on the bill before reporting it to this body.

I could not have discharged my responsibilities as chairman of the committee had I not had the full cooperation of members of the committee. I want to record again my gratitude to my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—who worked through long sessions to hear the testimony and to deliberate on the measure that is now before this body.

The amount we are asking the House to authorize an appropriation for is $3,440,208,000 which is slightly less than that requested by the Executive. Eighty-six percent of this sum is for military assistance in the form of military equipment and those other elements that go to make up a fighting force. We are equipping these forces, not as an act of gratitude, but as a means of adding their strength to ours.

Before President Eisenhower became President, he was the commander of the North Atlantic Treaty forces in Europe. He laid the groundwork for much of this program when he was a soldier. He believed in it then. He believes in it now. In his message to the Congress only the other day, he stated that "our mutual security program is based upon the sound premise that there can be no safety for any of us except in cooperative efforts to build and sustain the strength of all free peoples."

The remaining 14 percent—about a half billion dollars—is to carry out programs of a nonmilitary character. They cover many diverse activities; but all of them add up to buttressing the free world against the encroachment of communism. The reasons for this type of assistance are spelled out in the report I filed with the House. In that report is this observation:

It is necessary to recognize that many of these countries—

That is, those receiving nonmilitary assistance under this program—

if left to themselves would be the victims of Soviet subversion although they are not pro-Communist and although foreign domination is feared by them more than anything else.

This bill reflects the changing world scene in another way. Two years ago 73 percent of our foreign aid went to Europe and 14 percent to the Far East. In this bill only 27 percent is earmarked for Europe while 50 percent is for the Far East.

Each of us is often asked: How much longer is this going to continue? None of us is wise enough to answer that one. But, let me show the trend as embodied in this bill. This bill carries an amount 42 percent below that of 2 years ago. More significant, we have written in provisions that require that at least 10 percent of the money for military assistance and development assistance—and that's the "big money" part of the bill—must be in the form of loans. In the case of development assistance 50 percent must be on a loan basis.

Along the same line of cutting down on "free money" is a section called reimbursable aid. It is often forgotten that large quantities of military material are sold—not given away—by us. To date almost $700 million has been sold to our friends overseas.

It is my firm conviction that we must step up our programs that make possible loans and sales rather than mere grants.

Another feature that I find appealing because of my people back home is that dealing with surplus agricultural commodities. We do not want to disrupt our normal trade channels. On the other hand, we ought to convert that resource to serve this program. This bill requires that $500 million of the funds voted in this bill must be used to purchase surplus agricultural commodities. Many of the countries now receiving our aid are also consumers of our farm products. The local currency we get in return for our surpluses can go a long way toward helping other nations improve their military position.

These are some of the unique provisions included in this bill. I want the House to know about them because they represent a definite departure from the past. In the report I laid before the House Members all these matters are fully discussed.

Once we reached agreement on the substance of this bill, we turned our attention to the administration of this program. We cut out all the frills we could find. May I direct the Members' attention to page 4 of the report to which I have already referred. Our basic objective is laid down in these words:

The original foreign-aid programs were designed to meet a postwar emergency. The conditions which the original legislation was designed to deal with have changed substantially. There is a danger that the bureaucratic process perpetuates programs and operations previously begun which would not be started if the operation was just being initiated. This bill repeals all of the previous foreign-aid legislation and makes provision only for operations which are essential to present-day United States foreign policy.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is a test of leadership. The question posed by this legislation, which is being watched by the entire world, is whether or not the United States is great enough, strong enough, and courageous enough, to stand firm in its course for peace and security where others may seem to weaken. Shall we be weak where others are weak? Shall we waver because others waver? Shall we flinch because others do? These are questions which were answered by our forefathers many times during the course of the history of this Nation. But if our forefathers had weakened, if they had wavered, if they had flinched, there would be no America today. If we were to follow the course the doubters would have us pursue, we would abandon our leadership and cast aside this great moment of challenge.

At the very time the men in the Kremlin would choose to divide us from our allies, at the very moment that the free world is frightened as never before, at that moment, I say, is our American way being tested. If America stands fast now at this very moment of crisis, we will be dealing communism a major setback.

I know there has been much criticism of India, and I want to assure my colleagues that I share their concern over that country. India looks in one direction and then she looks in another, like a lost child, in almost a state of confusion, but India is an independent country and democratic institutions flourish in that country. Shall we abandon her now when she needs our help most? So, too, we must bolster our weakening allies; we must demonstrate to them that they can rely on us and that our promises and our policy have meaning for them as well as for us.

Finally, I wish to point out that leadership does not cower in the face of conflicts. We have conflicts and differences in our own Nation. We have conflicts and differences in this very House. Does this mean that we should suspend the Congress of the United States? No, we resolve those conflicts and those differences without imposing the will, one upon the other, and out of this process comes the great action of this great deliberative body. Let us do the same thing in our international affairs. Let us assume our leadership and let us not abandon it. The peace and security of the United States and of those who yearn for peace and security as we do demand this of us.

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me have left no doubt as to how they feel about this legislation. There is unanimity so far as the committee is concerned and so far as the Members of the House are concerned as to the real objectives behind this program, namely the peace and security not only of the United States but of the world.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset we should stop for just a moment and realize that at this moment there is in this fund the total sum of $9,749,500,000. I get this figure from the report of the majority on the committee.

The gentleman from Texas said that we ought to approve all the money that is being requested in this authorization because we might endanger the program. No one will deny the fact that so far as the money on hand is concerned it will run this program for 2 years. In view of the fact that we are in a real crisis today it seems to me that we ought to stop, look, and listen, and I believe delay final approval of this bill. A delay of 30 days will in no way hinder the program because of the large amount of unexpended funds on hand.

The news today states that India and the Chinese Communists have made a deal. It is also possible that France will capitulate in Indochina to these same Communists. So I caution delay at this time. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it would be just good common sense if we decided that so far as the final appropriations are concerned in this matter, or the proposed final authorization, that we ought to give the world situation a chance to jell. It is in a chaotic situation at the present time.

Now, then, I call your attention to what I believe is a very salient fact, that in the time this program has been in operation, the administration has never been able to spend more than $5.5 billion per year. When you consider that fact and realize that we have almost 10 billion left, I see no reason why statements are made that if funds are denied at this time that the program would be in jeopardy.

Now, I have another fear, Mr. Chairman, and it is that the money in this program is not being administered judiciously. I do not want to be unkind, but it seems to me that we have today sufficient evidence to indicate that there is a lack of understanding as to the intent of the Congress when this legislation was adopted. I want to call attention to some important information that I have accumulated. We have, I think, as it is operating today, an international slush fund that is being used to throw around wherever the Administrator decides it should be used. For instance, it has come to our attention that $380,000 is going to be used in Indochina to make movies. They are sending some experts from Hollywood to Indonesia where they are going to give them technical advice, they say. The cost of that operation in Indochina is $239,940.

Just a few days ago one of the local newspapers carried the story that an arrangement had been made with the University of Maryland whereby $900,000 is going to be used in New Guiana. For what? Now, let me quote from this article:

> The administrators of the program say that British Guiana's development program is designed to correct conditions of unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, and to establish the basis for a sound, progressive economy.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I certainly will not object to this request of my friend from Wisconsin, I think it is well known, however, that it is the plan of the leadership to conclude this 80-page bill today, and it is going to be necessary later in the day to probably limit debate on it. It will be much better if the Members do not ask too much time for the early part of the afternoon. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman that he move to dispense with the reading of the bill and save that much time and try to afford to the Members as much time as possible to discuss a very important bill. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have this $900,000 item for this particular project that I have just mentioned.

Yesterday the newspapers carried an item to the effect that we are going to spend some $222,000 to set up a school system in Nepal. Nobody challenges the humanitarian aspects of that kind of a program or the desirability of it. But I recall that many Members of this House have taken the floor to tell about the deplorable conditions in their schools. Is that a sound program, with tax dollars of the American taxpayers? I doubt it very much.

Last November we had an unusual situation which I say was contrary to the intent of Congress. In this instance the Administrator authorized an expenditure of $20 million for locomotives to India, and, mind you, out of agricultural funds. That is what I called Operation Choo Choo; and that is what it was. And right after that we had Operation Santa Claus. We had the Administrator all dressed up like Santa Claus, in a red suit and a white hat and long whiskers. And what did he do? He proceeded to give out some Christmas presents in the form of food packages. It was a fine idea, but do you know what we spent on these Christmas presents? There were 5 million packages. That, again, had a worthy objective. But, I was thinking of some of my own unemployed in my district who did not get any food package from the United States Government at Christmastime. We spent $13,800,000 to distribute 5 million packages. There should be no more Santa Claus operations without specific congressional approval.

I do not want to seem petty in this argument. We want to do what is right. On the other hand, we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. If you went to your taxpayers and said, "Is it all right if we take $13,800,000 and distribute these Christmas parcels all over Europe?" what do you think they would say?

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that while we want to give this bill fair consideration, I believe we ought to take out of it the boondoggling and we ought to take out of it the WPA part of it, and we ought to charge the administration with a strict accountability. That is the only way, that is the only atmosphere in which we should operate.

Under permission previously granted, I submit the following for the RECORD:

UNITED STATES HANDS OUT CASH FOR FILMS—GIVES INDONESIAN MOVIES $380,000 SENDOFF

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—Harold Stassen's Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) is giving Indonesia $380,000 to establish a movie industry, Stassen's aides said today.

As a preliminary, FOA has brought at a cost of $140,000 some 19 Indonesia males to the United States for "studies" in Hollywood directed by the University of California.

FOA said it is costing the American taxpayers an estimated $4,000 for each of the 19 Indonesians to spend 6 months learning how Hollywood operates. FOA is giving $36,000 to buy movie equipment for these men.

GIVE TECHNICAL ADVICE

Seven other Indonesians are here for 3 months "to study our democratic free press" and our "dissemination of information."

Their trips also are costing the American people approximately $4,000 a man.

In addition, Stassen's staff arranged to send Louis de Rochemont, Cinerama director, and Lothar Wolff, producer of "Martin Luther," and seven of their assistants to Indonesia at a cost of $239,940 to provide "technical advice" to the Indonesians.

TAKE FAMILIES ALONG

Stassen's office said some of De Rochemont's aides took their families along. Their salaries of $132,600 came from aid funds. Travel costs for the men and their families totaled $39,000.

FOA AND UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SIGN GUIANA AID PACT, LARGEST OF ITS KIND

The largest contract of its type by the Foreign Operations Administration has been signed with the University of Maryland to provide technical aid to British Guiana during the next 3 years.

The $900,000 agreement was concluded yesterday by FOA representatives and Judge William P. Cole, Jr., chairman of the university's board of regents; Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, secretary to the board, and Dr. T. B. Symons, acting president.

A contingent of experts will leave almost immediately for the South American possession. Heading the group will be Prof. Carl W. Gohr, 5712 Ruatan Street, Berwyn, and Prof. Presley A Wedding, 4500 North Chelsa Lane, Bethesda, both civil engineers.

ANGLO-AMERICAN PLAN

FOA said specialists from the university will aid British Guiana in a comprehensive economic and social development plan on which that country and Great Britain will spend $25 million in the next 2 years. Additional funds are to be provided later.

Dr. Symons saw the work as a "missionary movement" designed to benefit both the United States and the South American country.

"British Guiana's development program," the FOA announcement said, "is designed to correct conditions of unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, and poor housing and to establish the basis for a sound, progressing economy."

ANSWER TO COMMUNISM

"Successful implementation will be a forthright answer to the Communist forces which have exploited existing conditions in an attempt to obtain political control."

FOA recalled that Great Britain suspended a newly proclaimed constitution in British Guiana after reporting that Communists had attempted to gain control of the country last year.

The university will train some Guianans as technicians. A staff averaging 18 persons will be maintained in Guiana by the university.

FOA said the development program is expected to increase the national income of British Guiana by 20 percent in the next 5 years.

POINT FOUR PROGRAM TO AID NEPAL SCHOOLS

KATMANDU, NEPAL, June 28.—Nepal and the United States yesterday signed a technical assistance program designed to develop the primary schools of this tiny Himalayan kingdom.

Under the pact, the United States will contribute $222,000 to build and equip schools and train teachers and the Nepalese Government will provide another $147,000.

[From U. S. News & World Report of July 2, 1954]

NEWSGRAM

At the halfway mark in 1954, looking ahead over the second half year:

War threats will recede more. Talk of deals with Communists will grow.

Indochina, in big part, will be handed over to communism. Communist conquests in Europe and Asia will be confirmed and accepted by United States allies.

Anti-Americanism will grow in popularity almost everywhere.

United States, anxious to help, will be pushed back, somewhat isolated. There'll be a play to Russia instead, a try for neutrality between the United States and Russia.

Americans will discover that $60 billion in aid didn't generate confidence in United States leadership.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, section 101, after "security", strike out the remainder of the line, and on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "United Nations"; and on page 2, section 101, line 22, after the comma strike out the remainder of the line, and in line 23 strike out the words "Charter of the United Nations."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. On page 1 of the bill we find this language:

The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations.

At the bottom of page 2 we find the following language:

The Congress reaffirms its previous expressions favoring the creation by the free peoples of the Far East and the Pacific of a joint organization, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

I have offered this amendment because it is utterly inconceivable that any spending or action contemplated by this bill should be predicated in anyway whatever upon the whims and caprices of that glorified debating society known as the United Nations.

Moreover, there is almost universal agreement that the United Nations Charter must be revised if even a false front of effectiveness and respectability is to be given this organization.

I point out to you that only a few moments ago this House passed by a unanimous vote a resolution dealing with the Gautemalan situation because the United Nations could not deal with it. The United Nations could not deal with it because of the charter of the United Nations. Yet here you are saying in this bill today, and expecting us to swallow it, that we should predicate this entire handout program on the charter of the United Nations.

In this bill we are asked to be consistent with the charter of the United Nations, which is recognized to be inconsistent and ineffective in the field of international relations.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to be a lickspittle to inconsistency, and I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois whose consistency with respect to this kind of legislation is never in doubt.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I take it that the gentleman is aware, after reading the whole bill, that it is fairly replete with high-sounding platitudes and oratorical outbursts, and that it all has a specific purpose. Your observation is just one of many that I consider as irrelevant matters intended to dress up this bill to delude and mislead the American people.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, the language which the gentleman seeks to strike has been in this legislation for 5 years. This year our committee appointed a very able subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], which carefully reviewed the language in previous purpose clauses. They felt it was most important at this time that we reaffirm the purposes that appear in section 101 and that we reaffirm our purpose of seeking a joint organization in the Far East consistent with the charter of the United Nations. The committee supports that position. We are a member of the United Nations. We are using the United Nations so far as it is possible as a part of our policy to achieve international peace and security. The purpose clause, if you will read further, states that the additional efforts are necessary. Having reviewed this language which has been in our statute for 5 years, our committee feels very strongly it would be most unwise at this time to attempt to scrap our United Nations policy by this sort of amendment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman is defeated, and I trust that we can dispose of the pending amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill to be a good bill, and I shall support it. The matter of a foreign-aid bill is not a partisan problem. In the past the decision of what we shall do with respect to foreign aid had always been decided without reference to party lines.

Why is foreign aid necessary now? It is because the world is still in chaos. One portion of the world is bent upon a program of aggression and domination. The Soviet Union started its expansion program promptly at the end of the war. Although she was our ally, she immediately renewed the program upon which she had been working since the overthrow of the Kerensky regime in 1917. I need not go into detail, as the facts are well known. Perhaps the first indication of her determination to take over where possible and to expand her influence and power over other countries was when the Soviets demanded that they be permitted to capture Berlin and her refusal shortly thereafter when the Soviets refused to permit Berlin to be controlled jointly. She refused, and Berlin was divided into four parts, each controlled by a separate nation. Theoretically, that looked good, but the Soviets refused to cooperate with the others.

Immediately upon the termination of the shooting in Europe a group of the Armed Services Committee went to Europe to study DP problems, surplus-property problems, and other problems that would arise during the postwar period. There we learned that the Soviets had trained a number of persons in Moscow in the art of using Communist techniques in subversion, taking over labor unions, and even taking over a country. One Sunday morning the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and myself went to the Roman Forum and there listened to a speech by Palmiro Togliatti. He was just back from Moscow and was preaching to a throng of about 15,000 the virtues of communism.

This drive to take over and dominate has continued down to the present moment. Vast territories have come under Communist domination.

France and Italy were saved by the Marshall plan. Others were engulfed, until finally the Soviets controlled a great part of central Europe. That program has continued down to the present, and in the postwar period a great part of Asia came under the Communist banner, some freely and others through subversion.

The world today consists of two distinct parts—the Soviet world and the free world. To any person who reads, it is obvious these two groups could collide. In this scientific age, if these conflicting groups come to grips, it is obvious that both could be practically annihilated. Why is this? Fast planes and deadly weapons in the control of a country dedicated to world conquest could make a surprise attack that might be almost fatal. Consequently we have built a military force, the greatest in all the world, with an arsenal of weapons unequaled by anyone now. We have determined that representative government shall not perish from the earth, so we have taken steps to unite the free countries of the world for our mutual protection.

We only intend to use this power in defense. We pray we will never have to use it but we feel we must be properly prepared to protect ourselves and our associates. Even a dictator cannot take a chance on being defeated and destroyed. So we feel that our power plus our unity with free countries may act as a deterrent. Behind our military power potential, we may be able to convince those who wish to practice subversion that it may be best to negotiate for a peace.

Even the dictators, as well ourselves, now realize that a military conflict today may bring total destruction. That sobering thought may penetrate the mind of dictators.

In addition to our military arsenal we have in the free world a good part of the resources necessary and useful for both peace and war. We have more know-how, more ingenuity and we have a free people who know how and are willing to fight for their freedom and their institutions. What we are trying to do is to stiffen the military posture of our associates. It has been my great privilege to make official visits to almost every MAAG—Military Assistance Advisory Group—in the world. I can testify that they have done good work. It is unfortunate that in a world where there could be plenty for everyone; where popular government should flourish, and where it should be possible to adjust international differences, that we should be required to build up the military potential of these nations. The kind of a war that might be precipitated in this world would result in world murder. I think we should organize so that the outlaw nation, just like the outlaw citizen, can be put under restraint for the protection of the peaceful nations or the protection of law-abiding citizens.

In these extensive travels I have found that in almost every place I have been there is great respect for our country. This bill will move in that direction. I deny that we are universally hated. The present situation shows what wars—of the orthodox type—can do to the world. France, England, and other countries who are cooperating with us have been made prostrate by war. They simply cannot have another war, although they are now spending about as much of their taxes, proportionately, as we are.

This bill will move the world toward peace, even though it may be slow. We do have an international forum now, where the woes of the countries may be aired. We at least can quarrel with each other, but more, we may come to better understand and respect each other. After the fiendish destruction of World War II, it is only natural that much time will be required to bring the nations, who suffered, back to a more normal life. When we protect and help those free countries who are in that situation we are helping perpetuate and strengthen free government and private enterprise. If freedom can ultimately prevail our money will be well spent.

The man who will have the key spot in developing such a world will be President Eisenhower. He has been trained for the specific job. He believes in this program and our people practically unanimously believe in President Eisenhower. This bill should pass by a wide margin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

IT WOULD NOT HAVE HAPPENED IF THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIES COMMITTEE HAD BEEN HEEDED

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, since World War II, communism has cost the United States thousands of lives and billions of dollars and the end is not in sight. No one can predict the outcome. There may be another world war far more destructive and devastating than any war in history. Russia has welded the manpower and resources of nearly one-half of the earth into a single unprecedented striking force. All Asia may fall beneath the iron heel and mailed fist of Communist dictatorship. Europe is vulnerable because of disunity and reluctance to pay the price of survival. Communist fifth columns are strong and active in France and Italy and a beachhead has been established in South America.

This situation was caused by the failure of the United States to grasp the fixed purpose of the Kremlin to conquer the world and to understand the tactics employed for the accomplishment of this purpose. On January 3, 1939, the Dies committee unanimously submitted its first report to the Congress and the executive department. Among other things, the committee found:

> We have shown that communism is a worldwide revolutionary movement aiming ultimately at the setting up of a world union of Soviet Socialist republics. This is a proposition which is beyond dispute. It is substantiated by voluminous literature of the Communists themselves.
>
> In this plan for world revolution, the Communists have omitted no country or people as too small or insignificant to command their attention. They have, on the other hand, taken the logical position of concentrating their attention upon the richest and most populous countries of the earth. Among these the Communists recognize the United States of America as the foremost. The Communist's conquest of the earth will be far less than complete until it has conquered America and destroyed our free institutions.
>
> It follows logically from the Communist International's plan of world conquest that every possible tactic, device, maneuver, and intrigue would be employed to gain such an end as the communization of America. These tactics, devices, maneuvers, and intrigues are both boldly open and patiently subtle, both violent and insidious. The tactics and maneuvers for revolutionary ends are the meat and drink of a Communist. They are the very air he breathes.

If our Government had heeded this finding of the Dies committee it would not have made enormous concessions to Russia at Yalta and Potsdam. Our Government would not have permitted Russia to occupy the Balkan States when it would have been a simple matter for our armies to occupy these countries, including Germany, weeks before the Russians could get there. Our diplomats would not have agreed to give Russia a strong foothold in eastern Europe. They would not have accepted the American Zone of Occupation in Berlin without requiring means of ingress and egress. They would not have agreed to permit Russia to dismantle the industries in the Balkan States and remove them to Russia. They would not have surrendered millions of helpless people to Communist domination. They would not have agreed to surrender valuable rights in Manchuria to the Communists, thereby enabling them to establish a beachhead for the conquest of China. It was these postwar concessions which enabled the Soviet Union to emerge from a third-rate power to the position of a world menace, and if our Government had heeded the findings of the Dies committee, it would never have made these concessions.

Another cause of the Communist menace was the theft by Communists inside our Government of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets and the influence which these same Communists exerted upon our foreign policy. If we could have retained these secrets, such as the A-bomb and the H-bomb as well as many others, it would have been a long time before Russia could have acquired them and thereby neutralized the tremendous advantage which the exclusive possession of these secrets gave us. If the Communists could have constructed the A-bomb and the H-bomb,

they would not have gone to such pains to steal them from us. As long as the United States had the exclusive possession of these secrets, Russia was stalled in her campaign for world conquest. The moment, however, she was able to secure these secrets through theft, her machine was able to resume its strides toward world dominion. Long before these secrets were stolen, the Dies committee named the Communists on the Federal payroll and urged their discharge. In its report filed on January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

The Communist Party has penetrated the Government itself, with the result that some Communists hold key positions in Federal agencies and projects.

In the report of the Dies committee dated January 2, 1943, are the following findings:

Since the committee's creation in 1938, there has come to its attention from time to time the presence in the Federal Government of high-salaried employees who were prominently and definitely identified with communism and its front organizations. Many of these cases were promptly called to the attention of the President, the Congress, and the departmental head concerned by either the committee or its members. At this point, the committee would like to cite a number of examples where this procedure has been followed.

On October 25, 1939, the committee made public the names, positions, and salaries of some 563 Government employees located in Washington, D. C., who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. In three reports which this committee has made to the House, it has found the American League for Peace and Democracy to be a Communist-front organization. It will be recalled that Earl Browder was vice president of the organization. Furthermore, the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, has branded the American League a subversive organization, in language as strong as any used by this committee in its characterizations * * *.

On September 6, 1941, the chairman of this committee wrote the President a letter, accompanied by 43 exhibits, detailing the Communist affiliation and background of the following officials of the Office of Price Administration and suggested that they be dismissed from their positions: * * *

On November 18, 1941, the chairman of the committee wrote a letter to James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, calling his attention to the fact that the committee had a considerable file revealing the Communist affiliations of one Goodwin Watson who had just been appointed Chief Broadcast Analyst of the Federal Communications Commission. * * *

On January 15, 1942, the chairman of the committee, in a speech on the floor of the House, called attention to the presence in the Office of Facts and Figures of one Malcolm Cowley, chief information analyst, at a salary of $8,000 per annum. The chairman inserted in his speech the record of Malcolm Cowley, which showed 72 affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations. * * *

On November 28, 1941, in a speech on the floor of the House, the chairman called the attention of the Members to the case of Gardner Jackson, principal economist in the Department of Agriculture at a salary of $5,600 a year, and included in his speech the Communist record of Gardner Jackson. * * *

On March 28, 1942, the chairman wrote a letter to the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and called his attention to the Communist affiliations of eight of its employees. * * *

Pursuant to this request, the committee on October 17, 1941, sent to the Attorney General the names of 1,124 Federal Government employees who were members of organizations which this committee obtained largely by subpena and has been identified and authenticated by the officials of the organization involved. All of the committee's files were immediately made available to the Attorney General and his investigators who were charged with carrying out the mandate of Congress as contained in this act.

Thus, it will be seen that before World War II the Dies committee had furnished the executive department with the names of more than 1,000 Government officials and employees who belonged to organizations which the committee and the Attorney General had found to be Communist controlled and subversive. Included in this list were the names of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and Harold Glasser. These people were kept on the Government payroll for at least 10 years after they were exposed, and the theft of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets was made possible because of their presence on the Federal payroll. Furthermore, these Government officials greatly influenced our foreign policy in favor of Russia. They were largely responsible for the policy of the Government which coddled and protected Communists at home and abroad. If they had been fired promptly after they had been exposed from 1938 to 1941, Russia would not have been able to steal those enormously important secrets which upset the balance of power throughout the world and brought us close to another world war.

Another cause which contributed to Communist success was the failure of our Government to deport and exclude Communist aliens. In 1932, my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens passed the House of Representatives but was stymied in the Senate by the liberal bloc headed by Senator La Follette. At that time, there were only 20,000 Communists in the United States and 90 percent of them were aliens. If my bill had become a law, these Communists would have been deported and the thousands who came after 1932 would have been excluded. The Communist conspiracy would have been nipped in the bud.

In the committee's report filed on January 3, 1939, is the following finding:

The committee received considerable evidence of the activities of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist aliens in the United States. It does not seem that these aliens experience any difficulty in entering the United States or remaining here after entrance. A large part of un-American activities is inspired and carried on by these aliens. Some of them are direct representatives and agents of foreign governments. All of them are engaged in fomenting discord, stirring up trouble, and spreading foreign ideologies. Some of them occupy important positions in other organizations and are able to wield considerable political influence. * * *

The committee believes that it will be difficult to ever cope with un-American activities and propaganda in this country so long as the Department of Labor follows its present policy with reference to deportation. The laxity with which the Department of Labor deals with alien agitators would be unbelievable if we did not have before us the most convincing proof. We believe that a more thorough and careful investigation will reveal the presence of scores of Fascist, Nazi, and Communist aliens, who could be and should be deported, if the Labor Department would proceed against them in accordance with the laws of the land.

We further believe that the failure of the Labor Department to carry out the laws with respect to deportation is a contributing factor to the widespread activities and propaganda carried on by un-American elements in the United States.

We further believe that greater care should be exercised in permitting aliens to enter the United States to the end that aliens who believe in or advocate communism, fascism, and nazism will be excluded.

It must be remembered that under the decisions of our courts, aliens occupy the status of guests and Congress can pass any laws with respect to their deportation that it sees fit. It is unthinkable that these aliens should be permitted to abuse their guest privileges with immunity. The evidence discloses that some of these aliens are actually supported by the tax money of loyal and patriotic American citizens. This is an intolerable situation. We recommend that the evidence and testimony in the record with reference to the activities of alien agitators be read in order that there may be a full appreciation of the seriousness of the situation.

In the committee's report filed January 3, 1940, we recommended:

The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form of our Government; the enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country.

Notwithstanding these findings and recommendations of the Dies committee, Communist aliens were permitted to remain in the United States and hundreds of Communist aliens were permitted to enter the United States. If they had been deported and excluded in accordance with the recommendations of the Dies committee, the Communist conspiracy in America would have been destroyed before it was able to accomplish its mission.

Another cause of Communist strength and success in the United States was the infiltration of labor unions and seizure of control. Through these labor unions Russia was able to wield great political influence. These unions had the balance of power in some areas. Through these unions the Communists were able to instigate many political strikes which paralyzed production and spread disunity and class hatred. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the committee found:

The Communist Party is boring from within labor unions on a wide scale, seeking to dominate or wreck the unions for purposes that are alien to the interest of organized wage earners. It deliberately projects violence in labor disputes for the purpose of training a revolutionary group in the tactics of civil war. It seeks to sabotage and cripple our economy on every possible front, with the view to its profiting by the resulting economic crisis.

In its report filed on January 3, 1940, the Dies committee found:

On the basis of the evidence submitted, we find Communist leadership entrenched in the following organizations: National Maritime Union; United Cannery, Packing, and Allied Workers; Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; Fur Workers International Union; International

Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union; Transport Workers Union; United Office and Professional Workers' Union; American Communications Association; United Electrical, Radio and Mechanical Workers of America; and the United Furniture Workers of America.

In its report filed January 2, 1943, the Dies committee found:

In the early part of 1941, a wave of sabotage strikes in American defense industries reached its highest point. From the very beginning of these strikes, this committee pointed out that these menacing workstoppages were led by known Communists and that the Communist Party's program called for just such treasonable interference with this country's military and industrial preparedness. The damage done by these strikes was incalculable.

We called upon the CIO to expel these unions from their organization. Ten years later the CIO took this action. We asked that these organizations be denied any rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

Another cause for Communist success in the United States was the infiltration of educational institutions. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

The Communist Party is unusually active in our schools, both openly and subtly insinuating its propaganda into the minds of students.

In its report dated January 3, 1941, the Dies committee recommended as follows:

Withhold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism, or nazism as a substitute for our form of Government to the student body of these educational institutions.

If this recommendation had been adopted, educational institutions would have been compelled to expel Nazis, Fascists, and Communists from their faculty. This would have struck a telling blow at the Communist conspiracy.

After my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens was stymied in the Senate, instructions went forth to all Communist agents to become naturalized. Most of them complied with this instruction for fear that Congress would enact my bill or similar legislation and they would be deported. Therefore, in the committee's report dated January 3, 1941, we recommended as follows:

We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

If this recommendation had been followed, our Government could have revoked the citizenship papers of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists and deported at least 90 percent of them.

A contributing cause to the growth of the Communist conspiracy in the United States was the ease with which Communist agents were able to travel to and from the United States. In its report dated January 3, 1945, the committee recommended:

Due to the fact that the committee has discovered that many members of foreign-controlled organizations have traveled on American passports which have been fraudulently obtained, the committee feels that the statute of limitations should be extended from 3 to 7 years. This is made necessary because of the unusual difficulty in apprehending those who resort to the use of fraudulent passports within the period of 3 years.

The most important recommendation made by the Dies committee during the 7 years of its existence was the recommendation contained in the report of 1941 that foreign-controlled organizations be outlawed. It reads as follows:

The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs and the window dressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights, since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, had this recommendation been adopted in 1941, the Communist conspiracy would have been dealt a deathblow. In its 1939 report the committee found:

The Government, by use of the provisions of the wartime legislation, drove the Communist Party underground, where it remained in an illegal status until 1924 when the repeal of the war measures and the consequent halting of Government activities by the agents of the Department of Justice permitted it to reappear. The Communists came more and more into the open until today they flaunt their revolutionary activities throughout the country. Since 1925 the Department of Justice has had no power, no authority, or no funds from the Congress to investigate Communist propaganda or activities. During the period that the Department of Justice had actual authority, the Communist Party was driven underground where it could not function successfully. Just so long as the agents of the Department of Justice were active, the movement remained comparatively stationary and innocuous. At the present time the Communist Party of the United States is thoroughly and highly organized, nationally and locally, and is extremely active.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we have tried the method of outlawing the Communist conspiracy and the result was very satisfactory. Based upon our careful study of what happened during the 4 or 5 years that the Communist conspiracy was outlawed, our committee reached the unanimous finding that the only way to deal successfully with the Communist fifth column in America was to outlaw foreign-controlled and directed political organizations, such as the Communist Party and its frontal organizations. Since it proved highly successful during the 4 or 5 years it was tried, the committee felt that we should return to that method. To this day, Mr. Chairman, we have been unable to get this Government to take this necessary action.

I have a bill pending before the Judiciary Committee to outlaw the Communist Party and its various components of subsidiary, auxiliary, and frontal organizations, but the committee has not yet reported it. If our recommendation had been followed in 1941, we would not be confronted today with this great threat.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding this speech I would like to read a few excerpts from my book, the Trojan Horse in America, which was published in the early part of 1940 by Dodd, Mead & Co. On page 354 I said:

It should, however, be stressed that the Government itself has played an important role in the growth of communism by providing Communists with jobs and opportunities for recruiting members and fellow-travelers. There are few subversive organizations in America which cannot produce letters of endorsement and encouragement from prominent Government officials. All of this is a form of feeding the Trojan horse. It can be ended promptly and effectively by those in Government who have been responsible for it.

On page 362 I said:

These leftwingers are scattered throughout the Government service and occupy key positions which enable them to oppose any efforts to combat the fifth column. They themselves are too deeply compromised to permit any vigorous action against the Trojan horse organizations with which they have been affiliated. They do not understand that liberty and the Bill of Rights cannot survive the destruction of the American economic system. It is this group in the Government that constitute the spearhead of the Trojan horse movement in this country. Until they are removed from their positions, we may expect at best only half-hearted and ineffectual action. They do not believe in the system of free, private enterprise, and if they had their way it would have been scrapped already.

On page 363 I said:

The issue is before the President. He must take the initiative in performing this necessary task in the interest of adequate preparedness.

The President cannot supply the leadership on which our national security rests until he inaugurates a thorough and a genuine housecleaning in Government service. This is the plain truth and to deny or avoid it may prove fatal in the end.

The President must surely realize by this time that his leftwing followers in the Government are the fountainhead of subversive activities.

Whether or not we can develop courageous leadership in this country remains to be seen. It depends upon an awakening of the people. The totalitarian psychology of communism and fascism has taken root in the minds of many of our people. It must be eradicated before the Nation is prepared to defend itself against the assault of totalitarianism.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to follow through with what the distinguished gentleman from Texas has just said, that the leaders of our Government not only ignored the findings of the Committee on Un-American Activities but in fact they did exactly the opposite. Instead of suppressing, and instead of stopping the onward rush of communism throughout the world, they went in exactly the opposite direction and financed the growth of communism throughout the world, to wit, the granting of $13 billion of lend-lease material to the Soviet Union.

I remember when the Russians had butter running out of their ears and

they were using it for axle grease, so concerned were we about the welfare of communism, while at the same time we were rationing butter in the United States of America.

When we were delivering this material to them the Americans who delivered that war material could not even step off of the boat to find out what they were doing with the material.

In other words, I submit to your consideration that it is exactly the foreign-aid programs of the United States that got us into the mess that we are in today. If we had not given the Russians the $13 billion worth of lend-lease during the weeks when MacArthur was stranded in the Pacific and could not get anything, we would not have the Russians to contend with today.

I want to bring it more up to date. If it had not been for American aid given to Ho Chi Minh in China during the war in 1944, to be specific, we would not have the Indochinese war going on today. It is American foreign aid that started Ho Chi Minh on his Communist conquest of Indochina. He was sought out by the American Office of Strategic Services, Communist infiltrated to the core. We took war materiel that was supposed to go to fight our enemy, and we gave it to Ho Chi Minh. He used this American aid to start the Communist conquest of Indochina. If it were not for the American foreign aid program to Ho Chi Minh, the greatest Communist leader in China at the time, sought out by the American Office of Strategic Services, if Ho Chi Minh had not gotten American dollars and American war materiel, today we would not be faced with the necessity of appropriating approximately $2 billion in carryover funds and in new money to stop the man that we started with our money in Indochina and in China in 1944.

So I submit for your consideration and carry on from where the eminent gentleman from Texas left off. We did not heed the advice of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938 and 1940, but instead we went in exactly the opposite direction and opened the bank of the United States of America to finance this Communist intrigue all over the world.

If it were not for these American foreign-aid programs which financed the Communists from 1941 through 1947, we would not be in the mess, in the jam, we are in today. I submit for your consideration that after we spent these billions of dollars to aid communism now we are called upon to spend billions of dollars to stop them.

To me that does not make sense, and I am kind of tired of the same people who got down in the well of the House over here in 1941 through 1947 and said: "We have got to give this money to Russia, we have got to give this war materiel to Russia, we have got to give this materiel to Ho Chi Minh," these same people who said at that time, "We have got to help the Communists through mutual security for our own protection" and now are coming down the aisle and saying, "My God, we made a mistake. Now we have got to appropriate equal billions of dollars to stop the sons-of-guns."

That is the situation we have here today. I am of the opinion that these people who were all out for financing communism from 1941 to 1947 should not tell us what needs to be done now, because they were in error then, and the methods they are pursuing here are just as much in error now.

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

Mr. Chairman, when the roll is called, my vote will be cast today as it has been for, oh, all of the years legislation of this nature has come up, that is, against the bill.

The gentleman from Texas gave us a rather accurate story of what has been happening. We get nowhere by pointing to previous mistakes, except as we profit by those mistakes and not do the same thing over again. It is all right to make a mistake once or twice, but we should not let it become a habit. That we have done. We have not only wasted billions, but, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] stated, in the spending of it, we have encouraged Communist-aided communism.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke about what happened some 20 years ago. He told of his warning against communism earlier, and in 1925 John L. Lewis—think of it, John L. Lewis—had something to say about Communists.

Let me quote from a talk made by me from the well of the House in 1937:

> In Senate Document No. 14 of the 68th Congress, 1st session, compiled under the direction of John L. Lewis, then president of the United Mine Workers of America, to lay bare the attempt by Communists to seize the American labor movement and to destroy our Government, we find on page 1 these statements:
>
> "Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American continent.
>
> "The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation."
>
> These statements were no hasty, ill-considered utterances of a man forced to speak at once and without deliberation. They were the result of a prolonged, painstaking, and thorough investigation made under the direction of John L. Lewis, and may be accepted as true.
>
> John L. Lewis, before his viewpoint had been warped by his consuming personal ambition, speaking of a similar movement, accurately described his own present organization and its purpose in these words:
>
> "The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States."

I guess the Communists did succeed in part because on the last day of December 1936, the sit-down strikes came to Michigan, and John L. Lewis through 1937 used the Communists and their methods to organize the CIO. He later changed his mind about Communists. But they are an ever-present danger.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] wondered why these things could come about in a country like this where the people were so intelligent. They happened because we have been misled and misguided by certain columnists, editors, and internationalists. We all know who they are. They are still on deck. All one needs to do is to read the current Washington papers. It is the same old crew that the gentleman from Wisconsin was talking about, that the gentleman from Texas was talking about. They are still dishing it out. They are still dishing it out, we read it every day, morning, noon, and night, and we swallow it, and then we come in here and vote as they would have us vote. It is all a mistake, is it not? Why are we so dumb? We have never gotten anywhere with it so far, but still we continue—at least, our leaders here, I mean, the majority of the committee, are asking us to again go along. I, for one, just cannot, just will not, do it. To again appropriate billions of the hard-working taxpayers' money to finance a war in which we have no real stake, a war which will solve nothing, into which we may ultimately be dragged, with the result that hundreds of thousands of our men may sacrifice their lives, I will not do it. The columnists, the internationalists, the war profiteers, yes, and even the sincere, do-gooders may one and all yell their heads off. I will not go along.

One of our colleagues has been going around asking us to read page 9 of the May 21, 1954, issue of United States News & World Report. Well, that is all right for those who came here recently, but many of us who have been here over the years have been aware of the situation which was bound to and which has developed. The situation there described is about what some of us predicted. Listen, here is the first line:

> Things are going bad for the United States out in the world. That is becoming clear.

Well, that depends on how you look at it. What is next?

> This country isn't going to fight to save Indochina for France.

That is not bad news for me. That is good news. I hope it is true. I am happy about that. That indicates that maybe we are coming to our senses. Then on down below:

> People in many places are fed up with the United States urge to save them. They are glad to take American dollars but they don't want any more advice.

Is that not good for this country? Is it not? Had we stopped to think we would have known that you cannot buy friendship, nor can you purchase the support of another nation when, by giving that support, that nation will endanger its own security.

Now, some people thought communism was all right. Vastly more, who are good, kindly Christians, want to make the world over. I have never been able to absorb the thought that we were going to convert the Hindus to Christianity. I

have never been able to believe that by force of arms—you know, they tried that long ago; the Romans tried it on the Christians—I have never been able to believe that by making war on the Communists we would change their thinking.

I voted for this resolution which was adopted today, telling as I understood it, certain groups to stay out of South America. I will go along with that, even to the use of armed force to keep them out.

On the same theory, why should we not stay out of Asia and Europe? We do not want anybody monkeying around our hemisphere. Then why do we insist on going elsewhere to make other people, all other people, conform to our way of thinking, our way of worship, if you want to put it that way?

I will go along with MacArthur who long ago said if we are going to fight communism, then fight it at headquarters, in Russia. I will go along with Herbert Hoover who said that instead of trying to fight all over the world, we pick out a line of defense that we could maintain and make our stand there.

Now, years ago—oh, not years ago but 10 or 15 years ago—I was bitterly criticized by columnists and radio commentators and some Members of the House because they said that I was an isolationist. Well, the truth of that depends on the definition of the word. I do believe in serving my country first, and I think now, along with U. S. News & World Report, we ought to be able to realize it is still useless to try to make people conform to our way of thinking and our way of living. They will take our dollars, but they will go their own way.

The statement in the U. S. News & World Report is so accurate that I read it:

Things are going bad for United States out in the world. That's becoming clear.

Communists are winning in Indochina. French are on the way out.

Defense pact of Asian nations, United States backed, is a long way off. Britain is dragging her heels on that one. Britain and France, both, with big stakes in that part of the world, aren't willing to stand and fight on present lines.

United States, left to hold the bag, can fight alone or pull back.

This country isn't going to fight to save Indochina for France.

War, as a result, is not in the cards. Conditions to be met prior to war are these: (1) An appeal by independent peoples to be saved, (2) combined action by a united group of nations, not United States alone, (3) prior approval by the United States Congress. None of those conditons exists in southeast Asia now.

United States military, too, is adamant in opposition to a jungle war.

War, when and if it comes again, is going to be the real thing, not a fringe fight in a remote area, where nothing is settled whoever wins.

If you want to know it, what's happening in the world is this:

People, in many places, are fed up with the United States urge to save them. They're glad to take American dollars but don't want any more advice.

Churchill, for Britain, has just told American diplomats as much. Eden has done the same. France is getting set to go her own way, which isn't the way the United States planners figured it. India long ago told this country off.

What the non-Communist world seems to want is new leadership. Feeling is that United States has had its chance and has muffed it. Now its the turn of somebody else, with a few new ideas, with less emphasis on the sword.

Alliance, United States built, is not in a happy state at the moment.

There is just this other point: The United Nations is helpless in the present situation. Russia stands ready to veto any U. N. action directed at the Communist aggression in southeast Asia. The U. N. action in Korea came when the Russians were boycotting the Security Council. They weren't around to veto. Now they are. The United Nations, as a result, is just an onlooker.

From the above, we gather the thought that today we are, as a nation in one sense of the word, an isolationist or, if you prefer, a nationalist people, at least we stand alone. Today, apparently instead of having chosen to follow the advice of Washington and of Lincoln to avoid entanglements in the affairs of other nations, we have constantly and determinedly stuck our national nose into the affairs of other nations until now, as I read the above, they have shoved us out; in effect, told us to mind our own business—that, while they will accept our dollars, they want none of our advice as to how they should conduct either their domestic or their national affairs. To my internationalist associates and friends, if I have any, may I humbly suggest that, having given away to other people, other nations, billions of your constituents' dollars, you now accept the advice of those to whom you have given the billions—pack up your carpet bags, come home, and set our own house in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. General authority: Military assistance may be furnished under this chapter on a grant or loan basis and upon such other appropriate terms as may be agreed upon, by the procurement from any source and the transfer to eligible nations and international organizations of equipment, materials, and services or by the provision of any service, including the assignment or detail of members of the Armed Forces and other personnel of the Department of Defense solely to assist in an advisory capacity or to perform other duties of a noncombatant nature, including military training or advice.

SEC. 103. Authorizations: (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to appropriations authorized by sections 104 and 105, not to exceed $1,430,300,000, to carry out the purpose of this chapter; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations for military assistance under each paragraph of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1954 (except the appropriation for mutual special weapons planning), are hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this chapter and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this subsection; all of which is hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1955.

(b) Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purpose of this chapter including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for the procurement of equipment or materials outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will result in one or more of the following conditions:

(1) Adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweigh the strategic and logistic advantages to the United States of procurement abroad;

(2) Production of such equipment or materials outside the United States under inadequate safeguards against sabotage or the release to potential enemies of information detrimental to the security of the United States;

(3) Unjustifiable cost in comparison with procurement in the United States, taking into account transportation costs for delivery overseas; and

(4) Delays in delivery incompatible with United States defense objectives.

SEC. 104. Infrastructure: (a) The President is authorized to make contributions to infrastructure programs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in accordance with agreements already made between the member nations, out of funds made available pursuant to this section, or section 103 or chapter IX of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, of amounts totaling not more than $780 million, less amounts already contributed for such purpose. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for such purpose, in installments prior to June 30, 1958, not to exceed $321 million, to remain available until expended. Such contributions by the United States shall not exceed its proportionate share, as heretofore agreed upon, of the expenses of such programs.

(b) When the President determines that it is in the interest of the security of the United States to participate in programs for the acquisition or construction of facilities in foreign nations for collective defense other than programs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he may use for such purpose funds made available under section 103 or local currencies made available under section 402 in amounts totaling not more than $50 million.

(c) Notwithstanding section 501 of this act, no funds other than those referred to in subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be expended for the purposes of this section. No funds shall be expended under this section for rental or purchase of land or for payment of taxes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 5, lines 14 and 15, after the comma on line 14, strike out "in installments prior to June 30, 1958" and insert "for fiscal year 1955"; and on page 5, line 15, after "exceed", strike out "$321,000,000" and insert "$122,700,000."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is obviously addressed to the section on infrastructure. I am sure that every Member of this House is aware of the fact that the term "infrastructure" is a term arising out of the NATO usage and means those facilities which are designed for collective defense use. Those facilities would include airports, communication networks, pipelines, port facilities, and things of that sort. The program of implementing the infrastructure build-up has been divided into annual increments called slices. There are planned seven of such slices.

The sum of $321 million set forth in the bill would take care of the portion of the last three slices which will be

chargeable to the United States; that is, slices V, VI, and VII, and, as you have observed, would be available under the bill as submitted until June 30, 1958.

Heretofore, there has not been a special section provided in the law in which infrastructure money was requested. It has been made a part of the general military expenditure for NATO purposes. This year it was the thinking of some that because we are asking for not 1 year's authorization but 3, a special section ought to be required for it. Hence, this is, to that extent, a new provision in the legislation.

The entire program of infrastructure in the seven slices to which I have made reference is expected to cost something in excess of $2 billion. Of that the United States is expected to pay $780 million. My amendment does not affect that figure of $780 million. It simply reduces the amount to be authorized in this bill from $321 million to $122.7 million, and it provides that the latter sum will be authorized for the next fiscal year instead of the entire sum being available until June 30, 1958.

As the hearings progressed, a question was asked of one of the team presenting these facts to the committee, as to whether or not a limitation of this year's expenditures to $122.7 million would have an adverse effect upon the program; and the answer given was that it would not have such effect. In other words, if we authorize and if there is subsequently appropriated $122.7 millions, you are giving the infrastructure program all the money they expect to use and all the money they need for this coming fiscal year.

More than that, this bill has been widely heralded as a bill containing authorizations for $3.4-plus billions. If this wording remains in the bill, we are not enacting a $3.4-plus billions bill, we are enacting a $3.6-plus billions bill.

I hasten to add that the executive representatives have said they do not expect to ask authorization for more this year than the amount I have provided for; more than the $122.7 millions. They have said they do not expect to ask for more this year but they just want the continuing authority. Therefore, the bill has been said to be a $3.4-plus billions bill because they are not going to ask for the appropriation. The authorization, however, is here, as the legislation now stands.

Finally, it seems to me that by the adoption of this amendment we are accomplishing a thing which I mentioned yesterday in general debate, that is, we are retaining for this House, and indeed the Congress, the right to scrutinize annually the authorizations which are to be used in this program. If we pass this section here as it is written today, then from the standpoint of authorization it need not be brought before the committee or the House again.

Therefore, I would say that by the adoption of this amendment you would accomplish three things: In the first place, you will not injure the program. That is the uncontroverted testimony. Secondly, you will make it a $3.4 billion bill as we have stated, instead of a $3.6 billion bill. Finally, and perhaps the most important of all, you will retain the right of this body to inspect and control annually these authorizations.

It seems to me that all of the arguments are in favor of this amendment, and that nothing but good can result therefrom.

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to my friend from Indiana. Perhaps it is because of pride of authorship in section 104, on infrastructure, which appears before you, which I redrafted.

As he has stated, there never was a separate provision for infrastructure before this year. The previous bills were drafted so that they could use the general authorization for public utilities and public works all over the place. This year separate provision was made for infrastructure. It was the purpose that all of the $1,430,000,000 which has just recently been approved in the bill could be available for infrastructure.

That concerned me, so I, with assistance of other members of the committee and the presentation team, drafted this present section on infrastructure.

As the gentleman has explained, this is the first year we have been asked to authorize in advance for infrastructure. The reason for the request was that there has been a series of executive agreements so that we could complete the NATO infrastructure, this vast system of airfields, pipelines, and telecommunications needed for the defense of Western Europe in the NATO complex. There have been executive agreements that our share of it, after taxes are deducted, because this section prohibits our payment of taxes, will amount to 37.9 percent. I wanted to put in here language that we would authorize this provided the proportionate shares of others were contributed as per agreement. Therefore, you find the language on this page in lines 16 to 18. In addition, I proposed to the committee and the committee agreed that of the other military authorization not more than $50 million could be spent for infrastructure. This word "infrastructure" may be confusing to you. The arithmetic of it may be confusing to you. But I suggest this, that if you leave the bill as it comes to you from the committee, you will authorize agreements already made provided the other member nations live up to their agreements. If you leave it as it is, there will be no additional money appropriated this year. Therefore, I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated and the committee sustained in their draft of this exceedingly complicated but important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 28, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. Development of weapons of advanced design: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $27,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of encouraging and expediting the development of weapons of advanced design by nations or international organizations eligible to receive military assistance under this chapter. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, funds made available pursuant to this section may be used only for the purpose of this section. In addition, the unexpended balance of the prior appropriation made pursuant to section 542 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, is authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this section until expended and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 6, line 8, strike out all of section 105 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 105. Development of weapons of advanced design: The unexpended balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 542 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, is authorized to be continued available until expended, for the purpose of encouraging and expediting the development of weapons of advanced design by nations or international organizations eligible to receive military assistance under this chapter. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, funds continued available pursuant to this section may be used only for the purpose of this section."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is too important a bill to be amended and worked upon without a quorum present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have here a section of the bill which requests authorization for $27 million for the purpose of encouraging and expediting the development of weapons of advance design, by nations or international organizations. We had last year a request for this same purpose by the administration for $250 million. In its wisdom the Committee on Foreign Affairs cut that amount down to an authorization of $50 million. Now they are coming in here asking for $27 million more.

I have before me a complete list of all the items in this legislation that are available, cumulative obligations, unobligated balances, expenditures, and all of that, as of April 30, 1954. On this particular item for the development of weapons of advance design—as I say, remember that last year the administration got $50 million for this item—we have as of April 30 not only an unexpended balance but an unobligated balance of $50 million. In other words, they have not been able to figure out how to use this money. Still they want $27 million more.

Now what is the purpose of this amendment? The purpose of the amendment is to allow them to carry over the unexpended balance as of June 30. They will still have the $50 million, but this would forbid them any new money under this legislation until the Congress can find out what the money is being used for.

On page 303 of the hearings Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Director of Offshore Procurement of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, was asked about the special weapons fund. He was asked if it was tied up in any way with our defense budget. He said:

No. We are not using that fund for further research in our Armed Forces, because that would duplicate funds already in use.

In other words, this money is supposed to be used for the manufacture of these special weapons abroad. We did have special weapons funds in our own Defense Department, which could be made available for our military allies. Yet we cannot find anything about it. It is a deep secret.

Later on Mr. Voorhees said:

We are asking here for money to spend on things that are not proven but that we hope will prove out.

In other words, it is clearly a gamble with $27 million of the taxpayers' money.

I would like to use the balance of my time to ask anybody on the majority side of the committee if there was one single word of testimony in all of our hearings which gave any reasonable justification for the use of new money in this respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I expect to take some time on my own to discuss this amendment.

Mr. BENTLEY. Is there anybody else who cares to make an explanation about the use of the money for the special weapons fund?

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to join the gentleman in his position.

Mr. BENTLEY. Thank you. Is there anybody who is opposing me on the committee? I do not see any opposition, so I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made it clear to the gentleman that I would oppose the amendment on behalf of the committee, Mr. VORYS having asked me to handle it. I am sorry I did not think it was necessary to rise to say it twice. We all have a deep affection for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and, considering the peril in which he has been placed, we feel like cheering every time he comes into the room, but I must differ with him on this amendment.

It has been reiterated that there are something like $9 billion in unexpended funds in this program.

This is an enormous military aid program. We also are appropriating for all the military side of this program something like $1,500,000,000.

Last year they asked a quarter of a billion dollars to develop special weapons adaptable to the different areas in which these arms we are helping to equip them with might be used—very different areas from our own, with very different geographic problems, and very different logistic problems, and very different tactical problems. Our committee cut that down to $50 million.

I now refer the Members to the committee report which states specifically, according to the testimony of the administrators of this program, just what will be done, and just exactly what has been done with it. At the top of page 25—there need be no conjecture about it—the statement is made, from the testimony of Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Director of Offshore Procurement of the Department of Defense:

Thirty-six projects, constituting the bulk of the originally recommended program, were submitted to the President and approved by him, as the act requires.

Negotiations are now underway with the respective governments as to these projects, providing for United States assistance to speed them up, and assuring that successful developments resulting will be available, subject to adequate security protection for NATO defense.

May I emphasize that the 36 projects have already been approved. Now I continue on page 25:

The second part—that is, the American part—of this program includes a screening of the development of our own Armed Forces which might be useful for NATO defense.

Finally, there is the view of Mr. Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, which appears further down on the page, as reported by Mr. Voorhees:

Mr. Quarles * * * has in mind the possibility of utilizing a portion of this fund to develop a mutual arrangement with the different countries under which they will, with some assistance, round out their own aircraft control and warning systems, and these will be linked up with some assistance by the United States, including United States know-how and experience through a central laboratory.

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

Mr. JAVITS. In just a minute, after I make my point. The point in brief is this, that we have authorized this $50 million in order, so to speak, to lubricate a program of $9½ billion for mutual security in arms, to permit the development of original ideas particularly adaptable to the sections of the world where we are going to back up our allies. Such assistance in development is necessary; as a matter of fact, a good many of these projects have been approved by the President as required by law. What we want is to help them develop new ideas. We are continually worried for fear the Russians are getting ahead of us in this regard. We are giving them not $250 million but $50 million for this development. We think the chances of success are good. It is something we think should be done, and we want to help them. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Did these 36 projects of which you speak, did they originally come out of the $50 million that we authorized and appropriated last year? Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The 36 projects have been approved by the President and are within the appropriations we have provided. We believe it will eventuate in something very tangible and worthwhile. That is the point I have been making.

Mr. BENTLEY. These projects have been submitted to the President, approved by him, but can the gentleman answer whether negotiations have been concluded with any of the foreign governments which are to receive this money?

Mr. JAVITS. The committee were advised that the administration intends to go through with this program. It just seems to me when you consider the magnitude of the program and the many problems they have to meet which are peculiar to certain areas of the world, that to have an effective program we have got to be able to meet any potential enemy in terms of lively new weapons, the type of weapons we ought to be vigilant they are not getting ahead of us in. I ask the Committee to turn down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 49, noes 35.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. Conditions applicable to military assistance: (a) Military assistance may be furnished under this chapter to any nation whose increased ability to defend itself the President shall have determined to be important to the security of the United States and which is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance. Equipment and materials furnished under this chapter shall be made available solely to maintain the internal security and legitimate self-defense of the recipient nation, or to permit it to participate in the defense of its area or in collective security arrangements and measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. The President shall be satisfied that such equipment and materials will not be used to undertake any act of aggression against any nation.

(b) In addition to the authority and limitations contained in the preceding subsection, the following provisions shall apply to particular areas:

(1) In order to promote an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area and to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe, equipment and materials of the value programed for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for nations signing the treaty constituting the European Defense Community shall, pending the coming into force of the treaty, be delivered only to such of these nations as have ratified the treaty, and have joined together in or are developing collective defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President.

(2) Military assistance furnished to any nation in the Near East, Africa, and South Asia to permit it to participate in the defense of its area shall be furnished only in accordance with plans and arrangements which shall have been found by the President to require the recipient nation to take an important part therein.

(3) In furnishing military assistance in the Far East and the Pacific and in carrying out the provisions of section 121 of this act, the President shall give the fullest assist-

ance to the free peoples in that area, in their creation of a joint organization, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to establish a program of self-help and mutual cooperation designed to develop their economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence.

(4) Military assistance may be furnished to the other American Republics only in accordance with defense plans which shall have been found by the President to require the recipient nation to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall insure that the value (as determined pursuant to section 545) of equipment, materials, and services heretofore furnished under military assistance programs authorized by acts repealed by this act or hereafter furnished pursuant to section 103 (a) to nations or organizations in each of the four areas named in this subsection shall not exceed the total of the funds heretofore made available for military assistance in that area pursuant to acts repealed by this act plus the amount herein specified for that area:

(1) In the European area (excluding Greece and Turkey), $617,500,000.

(2) In the Near East, Africa, and South Asia, $181,200,000.

(3) In the Far East and the Pacific, $583,600,000.

(4) In the Western Hemisphere, $13 million.

(d) Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purpose of this title, equipment, materials, and services of a value not to exceed 10 percent of the sum of (1) that portion of the unexpended balances referred to in section 103 (a) which was available on June 30, 1954, to furnish assistance in any of the areas named in subsection (c) of this section, and (2) the amount specified in the applicable paragraph of subsection (c) of this section for additional assistance in such area, may be furnished in any other such area or areas, notwithstanding the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of this section. Funds heretofore obligated or programed or hereafter made available solely for the purpose of section 104 (pertaining to infrastructure) or section 105 (pertaining to the development of weapons of advanced design) shall not be included in the total fixed for each such area. Funds heretofore appropriated for military assistance in a particular geographic area but transferred from such use under section 513 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, or under section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, shall be included in the total for the area for the benefit of which such transfer was made, and not in the total for the area from which the transfer was made.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 7, line 22, strike out "and" and insert the word "or."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, could I point out to the House what this amendment means? Please look at page 7, line 22, and you will find there that I changed the "and" to "or."

Now, this is not just a simple dispute. This question is one of long standing. Previously, in the debate on the foreign-aid bill last year, there was an argument on whether, as Mr. RICHARDS proposed, the European defense community would have to be put in complete effect for any of those nations to continue to receive full aid. Or whether such nations who had ratified EDC individually and had done their part could have the aid continued, as my amendment then proposed, even though all the nations had not ratified and EDC was not in effect. You remember the Richards amendment said that unless EDC—that is European Defense Community—went into effect, that 50 percent of the aid would be cut off from all those nations even though individually they had ratified it.

The Richards amendment said that the European Defense Community would have to come into effect before any of the possible members of it could have any aid whatever.

My position last year is really the present position in this bill, that even though EDC did not come into effect, if any of the nations ratified, then they were our allies and we should give them the aid, not cut it off.

This year my position may likewise be made 1 year ahead of time, because I am moving ahead to the future as I see it. I am moving ahead because there is some likelihood practically that the European Defense Community will not come into operation soon. My amendment would give the President the power to continue aid to any country which makes a satisfactory effort for collective defense, even though they have not ratified EDC specifically. The bill this year says these countries must have ratified the European defense treaty, and, I repeat, and have joined together in or developed collective defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President. My amendment this year says this to the European nations: If you will join EDC and ratify it, fine, because you have done your duty toward mutual defense. If you have ratified the European defense treaty, we will give you the full aid. But on the other hand, if you have joined together or are developing collective defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President of the United States, you will receive our cooperation and aid.

You may ask: Won't the Atlantic Treaty Organization take care of this? If we cannot get France to join the European Defense Community, why will not NATO do the job of defense? The trouble with that is that Western Germany is not in NATO, and France may refuse to permit Germany to become a member nation in NATO, as it takes unanimous consent. I believe Western Germany should be allowed to defend herself, and I want to do this in the European Defense Community if it can be done. If it cannot, I would proceed with other measures to arm Western Germany in a collective defense of western Europe. So, the word "or" means in my amendment that I will not insist on EDC, but I want EDC as one alternative, leaving other satisfactory mutual-defense arrangements open, within the discretion and to the satisfaction of the President.

I will cite as my authority none other than the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who on the floor in his speech adopted this alternative program this morning. In his speech on page 2—I have the original copy here—he uses my exact word "or" instead of "and," which the bill now provides.

We have in Europe—

Says the Speaker—

as we do in Asia dependable allies. These nations have ratified the EDC. We must insist upon the completion of this essential defense program or else we must make alternative plans.

And, this morning when he said that, I believe he emphasized the point by stating that we must proceed immediately to make those plans. Now, if you do not adopt my amendment, it means this, that this Congress has decided that it will wait for the European Defense Community to be formed, for the whole year 1955, because the United States will not be able to give these nations the aid unless these nations have ratified EDC either in whole or individually. I want collective action by the free nations for the defense of Europe. My amendment will permit aid to be given to these free nations in Europe not only if they have ratified EDC, but if they have joined together in mutual defense arrangements which the President approves as satisfactory defense arrangements under the circumstances as the fiscal year 1955 progresses.

This avoids the rigid ban of aid for one year to France and Italy which will occur if they have cooperated in every way for mutual defense of Europe, but have simply not yet ratified the European Defense Community treaty.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. The point of my amendment is this: I want Western Germany given the ability to defend herself, and in some sort of a security pact for Western Europe. I do not believe we should wait for the year for France to make up her mind in the matter of the European Defense Community, and we certainly should not withhold aid from France for this long period arbitrarily by this provision in the bill, when France may be doing her best under the cirumstances although not through EDC, and what is more, cooperating for mutual defense in a manner satisfactory to the President.

I hope, for the security of the United States, that the House will give this administration the alternative to the European Defense Community, that is, give aid to collective defense programs and arrangements which may be worked out by the free nations in Europe in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President of the United States. We need that. We need that flexibility.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It seems to me that changing the "and" to "or" gives France an escape. Once you adopt this provision, as I see it, you provide France with a means of escaping EDC completely; whereas, if you retain the language, then they either have to fish or cut bait on this proposition.

Mr. FULTON. Let us say this. Suppose France will not join EDC. If she will not join EDC, it puts us in this quandary. We have to cut off all aid to France for the fiscal year 1955, and we are very near the point where we would have to cut aid under the present status of the aid program under the current rigid Richards amendment now in the law. The former Richards amendment has not really started operating, because the deliveries have not really started much under this fiscal year 1954 program authorized by the bill last year. We will all admit that. There has been no real effect yet under that Richards amendment, but this rigid approach will start to strangle deliveries and cut off the aid programs to France and Italy substantially in the next few weeks.

We should say to these European countries, we want you to join in a collective defense security pact of some kind, and we will give you aid to help you, and ask that you adopt a feasible course which the President feels is satisfactory and will protect the aid the United States taxpayers give you. We should not insist rigidly on EDC as the only course, or aid will be cut off. This is not fair nor is it realistic.

You may say, Why does not NATO provide this defense organization? Let me repeat that, Why does not the North Atlantic Treaty Organization permit us to do what we want? France can veto Germany coming into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We therefore need EDC or an alternative defense arrangement among the free countries of Europe. We should encourage our good friends among these nations along these lines rather than threaten them with the cutting off of all defense aid under the present provision in this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment and I want to tell you why. It will be remembered that in the bill last year we cut off all military aid to six countries in Europe, so-called EDC countries, until all ratified the EDC treaty. The amount involved was something less than $1 billion, something between $800 million and $1 billion.

Those six EDC countries were Germany, Luxembourg, Belgium, Holland, France, and Italy. None had ratified the treaty, with the exception of Germany, under the leadership of that great statesman, Adenauer.

The amendment provided that these countries could not get this military aid until they have ratified the EDC Treaty and joined together for collective security, as General Gruenther and General Eisenhower, and General Ridgway had repeatedly testified was necessary if any effective defense of Europe was to be had in the future. After that provision of last year's mutual security bill, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Holland ratified the pact. That left France and Italy outside.

In this bill, we have a liberalization of the prohibition of the 1953 act. Its purpose and meaning is as follows:

The principal purpose of this provision is to emphasize the importance which the United States Government attaches to European unity, and particularly to the plan for a European Defense Community. Some of our foreign friends appear to have misinterpreted the provision to mean that the committee favors some kind of alternative to the EDC Treaty. Nothing could be further from the truth. We believe that the EDC Treaty is by far the best method now available for dealing with the problems of German rearmament, French-German cooperation, and European integration as a whole. It is hoped that the new provision will provide a strong incentive for those nations which have not yet ratified the EDC Treaty to do so promptly.

At the same time, the provision realistically takes account of the fact that the rejection or indefinite delay in realization of EDC would create a new situation, and that the United States Government would be compelled to consider new measures to attain its security objectives. It is not possible at this time to determine what the results of an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy might be. However, it is clear that the President should have considerable flexibility in pursuing new approaches.

To clarify the meaning of the new provision, let me point out that countries which have already ratified the EDC Treaty are now eligible for aid, provided they are cooperating in collective defense arrangements to the satisfaction of the President. As long as the United States Government supports EDC and believes there is a good chance for its ratification, the countries which have ratified EDC can be qualified to receive aid on the basis of satisfactory cooperation in NATO or the development of programs preparatory to EDC. On the other hand, if it should unfortunately become clear that EDC cannot be realized, the language of the provision would enable the President to undertake a new approach to European security and to work out alternative arrangements to qualify the countries which have ratified the EDC.

It is meant particularly to give encouragement to Germany that other methods and measures permitting her rearmament in the face of Communist aggression and threats are being and will continue to be explored in the event the EDC agreement, first proposed by France, does not come into being.

In summary, I believe the new provision serves the double purpose of encouraging ratification of EDC and providing the President broad flexibility to deal with various unforeseeable situations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an explanation?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not correct that my position last year was just about the position that is in the bill?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not yield for a statement. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULTON. I am trying to clear up my position. It was the same, practically, as the bill this year, that I would give it to each one who ratified, but this particular year we are to the point where my position says, if they will join another collective defense agreement, even though it is not EDC, I will give it to them as long as the President approves.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is what the gentleman's amendment stated: On line 22, page 7, "such of these nations as have ratified the treaty, or." That leaves this bill just where last year's bill would have been had his amendment been adopted then.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman not say that under the Richards amendment as drafted by the committee this year, actually by the gentleman himself in collaboration with the executive department, without change, any 1 of the 4 nations that have now ratified which joins together in or develops collective programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States, as determined by the President, will be eligible for assistance?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, any of them. In that connection, I want to say this: There is a twofold purpose in this provision in this bill. One is to encourage Germany. Right now they are losing heart because France refuses to ratify, and France proposed this European Defense Community. The German people are becoming restless. I want to reassure them that if EDC is not consummated there is still a way by unity of effort on the part of those who ratify. At the same time, I want France, our old friend France, to take notice that EDC, while the most important defense step yet to be taken in Europe, is not everything, and that there may have to be, in the words of the Secretary of State, an "agonizing reappraisal" of the situation in Europe unless EDC is ratified.

Mr. FULTON. Then the difference in the positions of the gentleman from South Carolina and me is this. I say to France and Italy, "Even though you have not ratified, if you will nevertheless proceed with defense on your own motion, then if the President approves we will give you something."

Mr. RICHARDS. No. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, "You will get it whether you ratify EDC or not." That plainly means EDC will never come about.

Mr. FULTON. And if they do not join, they do not get anything, for France and Italy.

Mr. RICHARDS. You say if you do not join, you get the money anyway by another and devious path.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; I say that.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As I recall, the distinguished and able gentleman from South Carolina had a provision in the bill last year denying these funds to France and Italy and some other countries unless they participated and joined up in the pact. What happened in that instance? I am sorry to have to say to the gentleman that I could not quite hear him.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, this is what happened, they have not received the money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Fulton amendment. I voted for both amendments when they were offered in the committee. Because neither was adopted, I voted against the modified Richards amendment. My position is this, and I think it is sound. France is ready to do something. The Richards amendment this year would require them to join the EDC—not any other plan, but would require them to ratify EDC. France says, "We do not want to do that because it means a loss of our sovereignty." But, Mendes-France, the new Prime Minister, has said, "First of all, I am going to get peace in Indochina by July 20 or I am going to resign." Now, he may sign a peace treaty that we do not want to see him sign, but he thinks it is necessary in order that he may then give his attention to restoring the economy of France. That is the second thing he has pledged to his people to do, and that is why, apparently, the legislative body in France is backing him up, and it seems to be the reason why he is getting the support of the people of France. The third thing he has said he is going to do is this. He says, "I am going to find some substitute for, or some compromise on, the EDC." In other words, he is going to do just what he would be permitted to do, and to get the benefits that his country would get if this amendment is adopted. If you do not adopt this amendment, then for another year we are not going to have any community of effort—political effort in Europe, and this is going to put off the unity that we ought to have, in the face of the Communist threat.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it not true that there was restrictive language placed in the bill last year, which applied to France and Italy in an attempt to force them to join the EDC and that it was ineffective?

Mr. LANHAM. It was ineffective, of course.

Mr. McCARTHY. And there is no reason to believe that the language will force them now, any more than the language that was put in last year?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think you can force France to do anything. I do not think you can force any country to give up its sovereignty.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not true that since the adoption of the amendment last year three of those countries have ratified it?

Mr. LANHAM. They were going to do it anyway. There was not any trouble in those other countries. It has always been Italy and France. You have held it over their heads for a year and we have lost time. If we lose any more time we are going to lose Germany, because Adenauer is losing part of his support due to the delay.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that under the bill as it now stands, unless Italy and France ratify EDC they will not get any aid?

Mr. LANHAM. Exactly. That is exactly what it means.

Mr. FULTON. And if they join the organization they can get aid?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the gentleman can give us an illustration of how this would work. I cannot conceive of any other agreement France might enter into which would justify the use of funds in this section.

Mr. LANHAM. They might do what England has agreed to do. They have not agreed to join EDC but they have agreed to integrate their army into the European army. Let us not try to force people of France and Italy to sign something that they are not going to sign, because we are going to lose Germany if we do not get something done soon.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I stood with the gentleman on this position and I intend to offer another alternative to the very general idea the gentleman is discussing. Is it not a fact that France and Italy could make a collective defense agreement, they are in NATO now in fact, and if this amendment were adopted could qualify under this act?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If this restriction is removed it means we are going to give them the money, regardless.

Mr. LANHAM. No; it does not. It says "if you will enter into some agreement satisfactory to the President we will give it to you." But it does not have to be EDC.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is that not fiction and not reality? We have had no illustration as to how the proposed amendment might work.

Mr. LANHAM. We have no reality now. Perhaps a little of what you call fiction would help. If we can get some unity I do not care whether it is a reality or a fiction.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt this amendment it is perfectly clear that it will be considered that the Congress is now backing away from EDC, and it would be, in my judgment, impossible to ever get any ratification of EDC. Now, remember, EDC is a plan that was devised by France. The treaties have been rewritten by the French, and now they have been marking time, and in my judgment the Richards amendment last year has helped to keep the thing moving that otherwise might have died. Let us remember that the joint communique issued within the past 24 hours by our President and his distinguished visitor, once more points up the importance of moving to conclude and ratify EDC by France and Italy. In this same section we have language that has been written in here and has been the purpose of the Congress over a series of years. Realizing that Europe must unite or it cannot get along either in peace or war, we wrote in the language on page 7: "In order to promote an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area and to support concrete measures for a political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe." It is in order to encourage those things that we make this equipment and materials for these 2 years available to the nations that sign EDC. If you make it available to them whether they ratify or not, you are taking a step toward destroying the thing for which there is no alternative as yet.

So I hope this amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Would you tell me what the Speaker meant when he talked today on EDC? He said: "These nations have ratified the EDC. We must insist upon the completion of this essential defense program or else we must make alternative plans." You will notice the Speaker uses the word "or," just as in my proposed amendment to state what he has in mind if EDC does not work.

Mr. VORYS. We have the alternative right in here: If they have joined together for developing a collective defense program—that includes Germany—in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President.

I think our Speaker had in mind this Richards amendment provision when he used those words.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman used the word "or" when he read it. He did not read it like it ought to be.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask 2 or 3 questions at this point of the gentleman from Ohio and perhaps of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Is there any provision in this bill at all by which the President can rearm Western Germany outside of the manner in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has just suggested?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; I will answer that. If the gentleman has been listening, I explained how under the language that now is in the bill in line 22, a country that has ratified the treaty if it joins together in or is developing collective

defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the President can get arms under the bill as the committee presents it to the House—and I want to be corrected if I am wrong in my interpretation.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. But first it would have to ratify EDC.

Mr. SPRINGER. Germany has ratified EDC.

Mr. LANHAM. I know, but you say other countries must also ratify EDC.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Ohio said no such thing. He said that the countries which have ratified EDC, even though some other countries have not ratified, could still join together in some form of cooperative collective effort for defense, under such terms and conditions as the President of the United States would approve.

The object was not to penalize those countries who still had the cooperative spirit and had shown it by ratifying EDC.

Mr. SPRINGER. The answer then—and the gentleman from South Carolina may correct me if I am wrong—is that there is authority in this bill to provide for the rearming of Western Germany regardless of what anyone else does with reference to EDC.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. Now, wait a minute——

Mr. FULTON. There is the answer.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact one purpose of the provision is to encourage Germany, and to give some hope that, even if France never ratifies EDC, some way is going to be found to help Germany on the road to a decent defense posture so necessary to the defense of Europe.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then this does give Germany the authority to go ahead, and it gives the authority to the President to go along and aid them before EDC is ratified by all parties to that compact?

Mr. RICHARDS. We hope so, in the NATO framework—or outside.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me ask the gentleman from South Carolina a little further: He uses phrase "hope so." Does he think there is authority given here to do it? It seems to me we are short of something if we go ahead on this European defense and we do not get Western Germany into this thing.

Mr. RICHARDS. Those are difficulties, I readily admit.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman explain that way out? I have not determined how Germany is going to be rearmed.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think there are other ways outside of EDC and outside of NATO.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is that in this bill?

Mr. RICHARDS. It is suggested in this bill, dependent upon the President's decision.

Mr. FULTON. Here is the problem: Certain countries either cannot or will not join EDC because they will lose their sovereignty. I would give these nations a chance to join another organization satisfactory to them and to the President, which would be a defense organization, in which they would not lose their national sovereignty. As an alternative I want to give them the chance to join up in collective security for Europe and not lose their national sovereignty by being forced to join EDC.

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

(At the request of Mr. SPRINGER, and by unanimous consent, he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON. The reason that NATO cannot do this job is apparent. That is why on the amendment as it now stands it must be said, "We hope so." That is the point that the gentleman from South Carolina brought out. Western Germany is not now a member of NATO, and France would probably veto Germany's coming into NATO. Under the treaty, new members must be approved by unanimous consent. If Western Europe could get together in some sort of a collective arrangement, just as Britain wants to join with them, it would be a good thing to encourage, as well. So I would be willing for the free nations of Europe to join together voluntarily in a defense pact as we propose to do in south Asia, without forcing, for example, the United States to give up its sovereignty. Why do we not let the other countries do the same thing?

Mr. JUDD. Look at the language. The answer is very clear. It says that aid can go to such nations "as have ratified the treaty." There are four who have ratified the treaty "and have joined together in or are developing collective defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President." Four of them have ratified the treaty. Four of them are joined together in ratifying EDC. Perhaps they can start off as a sort of rump EDC. If the President of the United States declares their organization, the organization of the four for collective defense, satisfactory to him, we can and will start arming Germany tomorrow under this language. It is just as plain as day.

Mr. RICHARDS. Here is what we seek to do. The gentleman was right when he said that France could prevent the rearmament of Germany by veto, under the North Atlantic pact. Through this provision we seek to encourage those who have ratified EDC to find other channels of cooperative effort, and provide funds for the venture.

Mr. VORYS. I want to read language contained on page 26 of the report. This happens to be language approved by the executive branch, because we wanted to make it crystal clear what we all had in mind:

> The basic requirement remains that a signatory of the European Defense Community Treaty must have ratified that instrument before it can qualify for assistance. The continuation of this provision reemphasizes the importance which the United States attaches to the European Defense Community. The language adopted, however, recognizes the fact that a new approach to mutual American and European security objectives may be necessary if the European Defense Community Treaty is not ratified and provides the President with the means to pursue such an approach. It is not possible at this time to foresee what situation would follow nonratification of the European Defense Community Treaty, nor to anticipate the consequences of an agonizing reappraisal of United States foreign policy which would be made necessary in such circumstances. However, it is believed that the language adopted is sufficiently broad to provide the President with the necessary flexibility in meeting future contingencies.

You will note an item on page 9 of the committee report of $384 million, "Undistributed by Country," and a footnote saying that mutual-defense money for Germany is contained within that amount. Thus this bill provides authorization for arms for German forces, showing the results we hope for under the Richards amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 5, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 7, line 14, after "(1)", insert "It is the sense of the Congress that" and replace the capital with a small letter in the word "In."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know now this is the only amendment that I have to this bill. I would not raise the subject unless I was deeply convinced of its great importance, and I believe the debate on the Fulton amendment showed its great importance.

The question is: Will the Congress write into law a prohibition against the supply of arms out of new appropriations either for the year 1954 or 1955 to France and Italy, or will it leave the last word to the President, expressing to the President its sense in the case which we know has great persuasive power and great prestige? This is the issue, and I would like to restate it, because we seemed to be all over the lot before. Shall France and Italy get arms—we are not talking about any other kind of aid, but arms—out of the 1954 and 1955 appropriations, or shall those arms be withheld unless they ratify respectively the European Defense Community and shall we say this absolutely by force of law; or shall we give the President the final jurisdiction over the case expressing to the President what we want done on the question of policy? My amendment seeks to take a fair alternative and express to the President what is the sentiment of the Congress, but not to tie the President's hands absolutely for a year or such sooner date as we change the law or such sooner date as the European Defense Community is ratified by France and Italy.

I offer this amendment because I think it is extremely important in a touch-and-go situation such as we are in now in the world and where the Richards amendment is beginning to be put into effect. There was nothing done about it and nothing needed to be done about it until now, because no arms were

deliverable to either of these countries under the 1954 appropriation until very recently. But now—and I should like to state this as a fact—arms are beginning to back up due to the Richards amendment. They have to be put in storage; arms which otherwise would be delivered to France and Italy. So the shoe is beginning to pinch in terms of arming our allies.

Why do I say that we should take a new tack in this situation, declaring very clearly what is our policy—and it certainly is as evidenced by the decisive vote of this House—but not fixing it into law? You have got a new Premier in France, Mendes-France and he said that he is going to do some things within 30 days. Many very capable observers ascribe the fact that French governments have been so plagued on foreign policy issues to the fact that the politicians who desire to say so, have been able to claim that France is being threatened, that she is being compelled to do things. Obviously we are making a condition here for arms assistance to France, that she must do a certain thing. Congress is saying that otherwise she shall not get those arms.

Let us not forget one other very critical and important fact. The French are mortally afraid of the Germans. It is an undeniable fact that they are. And who would say that they have not the right after three wars of devastation since 1870 in France itself?

If we leave this bill as it is and make this provision mandatory—which it is—we are, in effect, saying that we are willing to accept a coalition of Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and Germany, and thereby by-pass France. Nothing could scare the French more than that. This is the very thing that they are constantly concerned about.

Let me emphasize that there is nothing in this bill that stops arms to the German Federal Republic. Those are questions outside this bill. But if this provision be left in the bill it is France and Italy that are to be denied arms.

France and Italy are members of NATO. Let us never forget that. They are bound in a contractual defense agreement now. The NATO agreement runs for 25 years. What I say is that you should not as a matter of the soundest kind of policy in this very trying situation which we face, absolutely tie the President's hands so that he cannot let any arms go to France and Italy out of these new appropriations, either for last year or this year, without violating the law; but that you should express it as your view that this is what ought to be done and give him that flexibility.

The committee report itself recognizes that the Richards amendment was too tight in 1953 and must be relaxed and on page 26 it says:

> However, it is believed that the language adopted is sufficiently broad to provide the President with the necessary flexibility in meeting future contingencies.

But the provision in the bill is not sufficiently flexible, because it absolutely cuts off arms aid to Italy and France unless they ratify EDC, which is something we strongly want them to do. I think that is the really intelligent way to rearm West Germany, and I have supported EDC throughout. But we should not absolutely cut off the flow of arms and give such French politicians who may be against EDC and who want to make political hay out of it, the opportunity to say that we are seeking to coerce France to ratify the EDC.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Does not the gentleman think really that it is time that the French and the Italians made a decision on the matter of EDC and either voted it up or down, so that we may proceed with possible alternatives?

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to my dear colleague that it is time and that the Congress will have said so if they adopt my amendment. But I am suggesting that we do not go that one step further which often makes people say "No" who want to say "Yes"; and the gentleman has enough spirit to know that. Often people will say "No" when they want to say "Yes," when they feel that they are being coerced by one who wants them to say "Yes."

Mr. RICHARDS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The Richards amendment was written into law when the President signed it last year. If it ties his hands, he has deliberately tied his own hands. The language appearing in this section right now is approved by the executive department. If it ties the President's hands then he wants his hands tied. This amendment would make of something which is a prohibition in law into a mere pious gesture. I hope it is defeated.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. If the President is opposed to this item, he has not said so. I want to give you the history of this in the few minutes that I have. I have supported the foreign-aid program from the beginning. I think it has accomplished a great deal. It was an investment we had to make and a chance we had to take. But I could never join with some of my friends who have supported the program in the position they seem to take that in sending billions of dollars abroad we do not have any right to attach conditions. I reject that theory.

Here is what is happening. All the military men, all the political men, testified that Europe could not be successfully defended unless there was unity there. Mr. Schumann, the great man of France, sponsored the European Defense Community, and the EDC treaty was signed by representatives of every country, including France. What did we do? We said, "All right, you have promised unity there. We have told you that you must have military and economic unity in Europe, and you agreed. You signed this treaty. We are going to help you. You are going to have our support; we will send you money." And we did send billions of dollars. There are still hundreds of millions of dollars that France and Italy can get to strengthen their defense establishments. I mean money already in the pipelines, before fiscal 1954 and 1955 to which the restriction applies.

France proposed EDC, and four nations ratified it but not France. Do not think for 1 minute that my amendment last year kept any nation from ratifying EDC, because most of the four were ratified afterward. It is not keeping France and Italy from coming in. France does not want to ratify anything, it does not want to see Germany rearmed, unless on her terms and unless she gets what she wants in the Saar. Italy will not ratify because she wants Trieste. They are just welshing on what they have agreed to do.

I have never understood why Members of Congress willingly vote billions of dollars to arm American boys and send them into battle and at the time refuse to spend one-tenth as much to arm others to stand by their side. Neither have I ever been able to understand the logic of those who vote billions in defense to other nations, yet take the position that we have no right to attach conditions thereto.

This is no slap at France, or Italy. It is simply commonsense. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I might say I am sure the President would not veto this bill no matter how we vote.

Mr. RICHARDS. I reckon not.

Mr. JAVITS. But may I ask the gentleman if the gentleman has confidence in the President, why does he not give him the modicum of flexibility which I suggest the world situation dictates? If the gentleman knows the President is not going to give them the arms, why should he oppose it?

Mr. RICHARDS. We have had flexibility in all of these foreign aid bills. We have made many suggestions as to unification, military and otherwise, without success. Now we must say "the money is cut off unless military unity really comes about." If France thinks for one minute that on account of her holding back on the ratification of EDC that Germany is not going to be rearmed in some other way and with the support of the United States, she is simply pursuing a mirage because Germany must be accepted back into the family of nations and must be permitted to defend herself.

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

Mr. Chairman, I realize I do not have the background to discuss foreign policy. I have only been here 14 years, during none of that time have I served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I have served for 14 years on the Committee on Military Affairs. I have been to Europe a number of times along with the duly designated members of our committee in an effort to try to find out what was going on over there militarily. I think one of the best things that ever came before this Congress is the Richards amendment to the last mutual aid bill. We told the French and those who

do not want to do anything but drag their feet that they could not get aid under that bill. Now for someone to come along and try to repeal that means that they are faced with two propositions. One is that they are going along dragging their feet with France, and with Italy, and the other is that they just plain do not want to see Germany rearmed. I do not care how you word your amendment, it means you just do not want to see Germany rearmed. Anybody with any brains at all who has been to Europe——

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

Mr. RIVERS. Wait a second. You did not yield to me.

Mr. JAVITS. I tried to.

Mr. RIVERS. You did not try.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, anybody who has ever been to Europe and seen Western Germany knows that you cannot oppose Russia and keep Germany lying prostrate on the field of battle. Everybody knows that.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is speaking about me.

Mr. RIVERS. I am not speaking about you—I am speaking about RIVERS.

Mr. Chairman, anybody who has been to Germany knows that Adenauer is staking his entire political future on their alinement with the Western powers, notably the United States, and for us to cut him down from behind under the guise of France not being willing to go along with EDC, which as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said, "They created under Schumann—the only statesman to come out of France since the Napoleonic wars—they created this EDC and now they are stabbing it in the back." I was there last year. I will tell you what a Frenchman told me. I actually listened to him because I could not speak French and he could not speak English. He told me, "They got a time table. They are going to conquer us again in 5 years." I said, "Well, I come from South Carolina, son, if anybody told me he was going to conquer me in 5 years, I would get busy and raise me an army. If I were you, I would raise an army." I say to you, my colleagues, France would rather hate Germany than arm and protect themselves. Now the only language they understand is just the thing that is in this proposition here today, and when we tell them you are not going to get a dime out of this proposition, and I have voted for every one of them—and I do not think I was right all the time—but somebody had to help DICK RICHARDS. If they find out that they are not going to get any money, that we are going to arm Belgium and Luxembourg along with Germany, they will get busy. One thing, they have not given us base rights in France, and they have not given us base rights in Italy. They have not given us anything but conversation and we have given them the American eagle. The American eagle has flown all over there, and now is the time to get behind that eagle and you will see business pick up.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I wanted to ask my colleague who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, Do you not believe that if we had 25 German divisions with proper support on the line in Europe it would do more to stop the Communist threat than anything else that we could have? It is not a question of dollars, it is a question of strength and building up our defense. Does not the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, you said that almost as eloquently as I could say it. You are absolutely right, and if we do not hurry up and arm Germany, time is running out. Let us get busy now. I am behind the gentleman from South Carolina, DICK RICHARDS. Nobody can stop us. Let us get behind this.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this sense amendment because it clearly gives to the President of the United States the right to do what he wants in his discretion, instead of writing the provision as a matter of affirmative law and express prohibition, preventing action by the President, although he thinks a certain other course is right.

Everyone here should remember that the European Defense Community is an organization to have the various European nations give up their nationality, their sovereignty. Those of us who are here today making this fight may probably go down to defeat; but sometimes in the bitter fruits of defeat there is victory. We people who had this fight last year to get this House to adopt its present position lost to the old Richards amendment, but the idea of relaxing the strict provisions was implanted. The administration and the Foreign Affairs Committee's present position was the Fulton amendment of last year which was defeated at the time. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, page 6899, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] joined others, including Mr. VORYS, of Ohio, and defeated me, and defeated me soundly. But right now the defeated position is the position of the administration in this House. My position today is that this does not go far enough under today's circumstances, and we should show more cooperation by giving the opportunity to the President to offer these nations various alternatives. A man who stood with me on that amendment last year to try to get aid to the allies who ratified EDC was the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], who likewise foresaw the probable developments in Europe, and I want to credit him publicly and thank him, as well as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. I was proud to stand with them, and there were only a couple of us, but we raised the issue, and we are doing it today. I hope that this particular debate can be remembered by the House, because then it was said, "Let us get on with the debate or we will waste the whole afternoon." In fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said, "The point is this, that we will either dispose of this subject promptly, or spend a lot of time on it. The way to do it is to vote down this amendment and go on to some other subject or we will spend the rest of the afternoon debating the merits and demerits." It is too important a matter to be finished quickly, as it vitally affects the defense of all of Europe.

The Fulton amendment on EDC was last year as follows:

> This section in the interests of the security of the United States shall not operate to deprive of aid nor penalize nations who have fully ratified the treaty to create the said organization, because of the lack of action or failure to ratify by any other nation.

That is the position today on this bill. But the point we make to you today is this, that the two nations who have not ratified are Italy and France. They do not want to give up their sovereignty, their nations, to EDC. They do not want to join the European Defense Community. Why, then, not let them, under my proposed present provision, join a new defensive arrangement like NATO, with other European nations as we have done for the Western Hemisphere under the Rio Pact, and even now have in southeast Asia under the Anzus Pact? The United States has also proposed a mutual defense pact for other free Asian countries along these lines.

Why, then, is it not a feasible alternative for the administration to be permitted to consider for Europe, and aid could be given through such an organization? I do not understand the rigid position at this time of saying that if our allies do not specifically ratify the EDC treaty alone, that aid will be cut off to the nonratifying countries, France and Italy, for a whole year. And this even though they may offer every other cooperation for their individual defense, and for the mutual defense of Europe.

I therefore plead with the House not to deprive France and Italy, our good friends, of aid under the provisions in this bill. These people have stood by us, and were our good friends who fought with us in World War II. While Italy joined later, the Italian people certainly proved a real help to our cause. We should not deprive them of funds for their country's defense because they refuse to give up their sovereignty at our request in order to become eligible for this year's aid. I feel for them and their loyalty to their country's traditions, and it is a hard decision to be forced under these circumstances from the outside.

I would not give up the sovereignty of the United States of America for a little or a lot of foreign aid from any other country. Why should we put on our aid the condition that unless these nations agree to give up their sovereignty to a general European defense community, give up their traditions, that they will not get the relatively few dollars of aid from us in this year's authorization?

Instead of forcing me to give up my sovereignty, I, like these nations, would stand and say: "On those conditions, keep your money." I would not take it.

We must give France and Italy a fair and free decision on their own national existence.

We Members who are on the floor today arguing this, want to give these nations that have not ratified EDC, that have so far chosen not to give up their own sovereignty, the right to join another organization such as we in the United States would join for the defense of Europe. It could be done under a similar pact such as proposed by Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States, for the South Pacific.

The United States does not give up our sovereignty when we join a defense pact under section 51 of the United Nations Charter. Why then put on a dollar sign and a condition and say to these other nations: "You must join such an organization as EDC, or you will be taken over by the Communists, because the United States will cut off your mutual security aid for a whole year."

Of course, we who believe thus should raise the issue. Of course we would ask to join us, you who believe in United States sovereignty, for example, Mr. GWINN there, who defends American sovereignty. We should not vote for other nations to give up their sovereignty for the few dollars in United States aid for their defense budgets, I am sure of that.

And if that is the case, let us stand up for these nations, these friends of ours. Let us get cooperative action for mutual defense and assistance, rather than rigidly insist at this time on EDC ratification alone as the test for continuing aid for the current year. We need allies and friends, and should offer constructive alternatives that we can all join in wholeheartedly. This is mutual defense by agreement, and not by lever. This is mutual aid for mutual defense on a basis of mutual respect. We need to adopt such a course as the United States policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, after the gentleman from Minnesota has concluded.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I think the record shows rather clearly that the method which is proposed in this bill has not been effective. I recall the famous ultimatum of Secretary of State Dulles issued last spring in which he gave France until April 15 or April 30 to ratify EDC. The response on the part of the French was one of resentment and protest. It gave a great deal of fuel to the Communist forces in France.

Restrictive language was included in last year's authorizations for this same purpose. It has been admitted on the floor that this was not effective in bringing Italy or France into EDC.

Is there any reason for us to believe that putting the same or similar language into this bill will be any more effective than the ultimatum of last spring was effective or than the language placed in the bill last year was effective?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has said that the administration is in favor of the restriction. It may be that Secretary Dulles thinks that he can go into this contest with one hand tied behind his back, or with both hands tied. If so, he has more confidence in his powers than I have. We have seen what happened at Geneva. I do not know whether the Secretary feels that he went into that Conference with his hands tied or not, but the record shows that in that Conference he was nearly helpless and the principal negotiations and deliberations had to be carried on by the representatives of other nations.

I do not want to be a party willingly to the passage of a bill which will tie the hands of the Secretary of State. I think we should give him authority and should give him freedom to negotiate and then hold him responsible for his actions.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wanted to state to the gentleman on this question of what the administration does or does not want about the Richards amendment that it is my conviction that the administration said the provision in the bill was acceptable to them, because they knew they were going to get something like this and they thought this provision was better than what they had before and the best they could probably get.

Mr. McCARTHY. Even if the administration asked to have its hands tied we should not perform the act.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] also said there was no alternative to EDC. If that is the case then France and Italy should see the light. If there is no alternative they ought to come in, and we should not have to force them. If there is an alternative, however, it is to the advantage of the United States to leave the way open to go in and give help to them. If they do not go into EDC, or if they find a better way to do it, we ought to leave the way open for the granting of aid so that we can help to work out the alternative that may develop.

We must realize that the United States cannot stand aside observing the shifting of the balance of power in the rest of the world. We could do that in the 19th century and in the early 20th century. But that time has passed. We need to realize, with all the sobriety of historical awareness, that we are ourselves in the scales today in this struggle for balance of power in the world. What is called for is responsibility and maturity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether we have the right to write into this bill limitations such as the Richards amendment provides. The question is, Is it wise to do so? There is not any question but that we made a mistake last year in adopting the Richards amendment. It has been proven that we who opposed it were correct. Even the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has agreed to the change this year. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] offered to amend the bill last year by striking the amendment of Mr. RICHARDS. I supported him because I saw then that the Richards amendment was too severe, that it was not going to have the effect that the proponents honestly thought it was going to have.

The question is this year, Shall we continue in this bill provisions that are too restrictive although they have been agreed to by the executive department? There is not any question but that they accepted them because they knew, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said, that they were going to get something worse. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dulles said that in effect in a recent speech. He said, "We know that the language this year is too stringent and we prefer the new amendment to the continuation of the old one," or words to that effect. The question is, Shall we tie the hands of our Secretary of State and our President so that they cannot meet the rapidly changing conditions in Europe? I do not think we should.

Mr. Chairman, of course there is flexibility in this bill as far as the four countries who have already ratified are concerned; but there is absolutely no flexibility in this bill as far as Italy and France are concerned. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about the position of France. General Gruenther told the committee what the situation was. He said to us, "I think it would be a mistake to write any sort of restriction like this into the bill."

That was General Gruenther's statement. He is right there with the French people and he knows the problems they are having to deal with. He said, "If I had to go in and deal with the Foreign Minister of France with his desk piled high with problems he cannot solve, I would feel like a heel if I had to go in and beat him over the head with such a restriction as this."

He said that the French are reconciled to the rearmament of Germany. Of course, we must rearm Germany. He said that the French are reconciled to that, that the only thing they did not want to do is to give up their sovereignty under EDC. That is what this bill requires as now written. What we are trying to get is some flexibility so that if we do have to make a reappraisal, and we are going to have to do that, the President will have the power to take some other form of European unity other than EDC, which is a supergovernment and which England has refused to go into. Why should we insist that France join that supergovernment if she is not willing to do it?

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has said just what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, that France did not

want to go into this thing because they would then give up their sovereignty.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, is this not true, that it was France herself who first proposed EDC and signed the treaty?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. And then would not ratify it?

Mr. LANHAM. The rulers found that the people would not back them up in giving up their sovereignty. Consequently the French officials had to change their position on EDC.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, do not wonder about me being somewhat confused about this whole program, not being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I was somewhat amazed to find the degree of confusion on the part of the membership of that committee as was evidenced here a few moment ago by a member of the committee referring to Italy as being an erstwhile ally of ours in World War II. I cannot imagine that it could possibly be said that they were an ally except that being on the other side would accrue to our advantage, but that is the only way I could possibly define them as being an ally.

I would like to say before reading a little editorial from a Washington newspaper that a little earlier in this debate I was somewhat amazed at two of the military experts of the House agreeing that we would be completely safe and secure in Europe if we could just get 25 ground force divisions of Germans to hold some theoretical line over there. I would like to ask these military experts just what you propose to do to save those 25 divisions of surface troops if and when the Soviets start dropping a few H bombs over there. How many of those surface force troops or how many divisions of surface force troops would it take to retaliate in kind? Germans would be preferable to some others but ground-force troops of any nationality would be useless in this atomic age.

Now, relative to the pending amendment, I would like to call the attention of this committee to a little editorial that appeared in the Washington News under date of May 3, 1954. It is headed "Eccentric Sam":

The attention of Congress, particularly those members handling foreign-aid appropriations, is directed to the following United Press dispatch from New Delhi, India:

"The Indians are beginning to think Uncle Sam is a pretty eccentric character. He poured $183 million of economic aid into India in 3 years. All the while, India refused to yield neutrality and side with the West in the cold war.

"Now, Secretary of States Dulles has asked Congress not only to continue economic aid to India but to increase it (by another $85 million).

"'I don't understand it,' an officer of the Indian Army said. Most Indians share his bewilderment."

Most Americans, we believe, are more than bewildered—they're flabbergasted. And we hope Congress takes note of American resentment in fixing the amount of handout we give this year to Nehru, the counterfeit "neutralist."

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I note that my good friend from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] refers to my remarks regarding 25 German divisions. I assume that along with those 25 divisions we would have the proper air and armored support for these German ground force divisions. I am one who believes in the ground forces as a necessary component in building our national defense forces. I have every confidence and faith in our own ground forces. They need no defense from me. Their performance in World War I and World War II and Korea speaks for itself. We must depend upon the ground forces and the armored forces, just as we do in our Air Force. They all work together in the overall picture in any kind of a defense program. So when the gentleman attempts to underestimate the suggestion that 25 German divisions with proper air and armored support on the line would not deter this communistic threat it surprises me. Also I do want the gentleman to know that there are other parts of our defense setup beside the Air Force. They are the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Now, returning to the subject matter before us, I might say time is running out on us and certainly some decision must be made. We have patiently waited on action by France and Italy for the past several years with no satisfactory decisions reached. I am firmly convinced it is necessary to include Germany in any setup for the defense of Europe. Certainly, in event the Russians should move, which I doubt very much, if there were no opposition on the ground from ground and armored forces, they would move to the English channel as fast as mechanized equipment could carry them and occupy the great industrial centers of Europe, our supply depots and airbases, and we would be in a most difficult position. We would then be isolated on the North American Continent and pinned to our base without hope of moving from it to attack. It must not be forgotten that wars are won only by control of the land areas vital to the conduct of war. Control of these vital land areas is effected only by outmaneuvering the armies which guard them. Certainly the rearming of Germany with 25 divisions on the line, armored and infantry, would be a great contribution to the building of the defenses of Europe. In my opinion, with the other strength we have in Europe, it would deter them from any possible thought of moving against us. I would like to say to my good friend from Georgia, and he is my good friend, that in event we ever are catapulted into an emergency, I would like to see 25 German divisions, infantry and armored, along with our support ready to go into action.

The point that I am trying to make here is that it is my opinion that unless some plan is developed, the Germans are ready to go it alone, if necessary. There is not any question about that. The French have been engaging in dilatory tactics for the last 4 years. We were supposed to get a vote on ratification of EDC in the forepart of this year. We are no closer to a vote today than we were 4 years ago to ratify EDC and to permit Germany to participate in the defense program. And I doubt that France or Italy will ratify any agreement.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] referred to the piddling amounts that we have contributed in these foreign-aid programs. I say that when you get up into such sums as fifty or sixty billion dollars, they are not piddling amounts. We have been putting the cash on the barrelhead for a number of years. It is about time that we secure some cooperation from the French and the Italians in the matter of the ratification of this agreement in order to permit us to build up the defense of Europe, whether it comes through EDC or whether the Germans go it alone.

It is my opinion that they should make up their minds as to what they intend doing so that we can determine what we want to do.

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 19, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 7, line 14, strike out lines 14 to 24.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be concluded in 10 minutes, 5 minutes for the gentleman from New York and 5 minutes for the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple yet a very important amendment. It strikes out that section of the bill that cuts off military aid to France and Italy until these countries have ratified the European Defense Community Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any one nation is more concerned with the menace of communism and its threat to world peace and security than the United States. In our efforts to secure or attempt to achieve this peace and security in this troubled world, we have spent billions of American taxpayers' dollars all over the globe.

Whether this tremendous financial help to all of these countries in both hemispheres has been successful in diminishing the ever-present Soviet threat of aggression is problematical.

Whether our whole policy of military and financial aid to all of those countries should continue, presents a serious question that I am not prepared to answer.

But if I have a choice at this point in world history of investing American dol-

lars as against investing American lives, I will support the less painful course.

So long as the President, in his wisdom, feels that money and weapons might arouse the peoples of these countries to the dangers of communism, I am willing to go along with him. But, in our determination to promote peace and security, let us not do more harm than good.

Under this bill, military aid to Italy and France are cut off until these countries ratify the European Defense Community Treaty. While the action of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was well-intentioned, it is one of those dangerously threatening gestures which succeeds only in alienating people and not in persuading them. Since the close of World War II, the Communists have been our bitter rivals for the friendship of the Italian people. Russian propaganda has consistently tried to drive a wedge between us and this Mediterranean country, which is a key link in the defense chain of Western Europe. We have countered these attempts by strengthening our bonds of friendship with Italy and by extending financial and technical assistance designed to restore that country's economy and political life to a balanced position. Aid to Italy has amounted to about $5 billion, including the offshore procurement program of contracts to Italian industry.

Now the argument is that pressure should be used to get Italy to join EDC. The fact that our policy in Italy has served only to diminish communism and not to wipe it out entirely is a good indication that the problem is not solely an economic one. Of vital importance are our efforts to convince the Italian people that the policy of the United States is in their best political interest. We must do everything in our power to prove this. One sure way of doing it is to bring the Trieste problem to a speedy and just settlement. Such proof of our regard and friendship for Italy would be a far more forceful argument to the Italians for the ratification of EDC than a threat to withdraw military assistance.

Since the end of the war, Trieste has been one of the danger points in Europe. The lack of a solution in that area has been successfully exploited by the Italian Communists. Trieste, like all border regions, is an area of mixed population, but it is a port which has been developed by the Italians and which has been essential to them for their commerce. The Italian majority there has long looked to the United States in the hope that through us an honorable and equitable solution would be reached. So far we have not succeeded in using our influence to achieve such a solution. This is one of the reasons Italy has been hesitating to ratify EDC.

We have made offers to Marshall Tito of various compromises which, however, do not respond to legitimate Italian claims. Our attempt to gain Yugoslavia's friendship is nothing more than a calculated risk. Tito is not a member of NATO while Italy has played one of the key roles in this defensive system. I disagree with my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] when he says that Italy has done nothing. The Italian factories through our offshore procurement program are responsible for almost half of the military needs of NATO. And yet, why do we hesitate to bring about a just solution in the Trieste problem? Return Trieste to the Italian motherland, or at least arrive at a solution that is fair to Italy, and the bonds of Italo-American friendship will indeed be firm and lasting. But withdraw aid to Italy and not only will there be danger that she will not ratify EDC, but there is the more fearful possibility that Italy might become a Soviet Russian satellite.

Italy has proven herself to be one of our stanchest friends in Europe. If we now alienate Italy, we would be dealing our prestige in all of Europe a great and possibly irreparable blow. The consequences of cutting off aid to Italy are indeed frightening. The possible effect on NATO and EDC alone should make us doubt the wisdom of this course. The total effect in the battle against communism in Europe might be such a victory for the Kremlin that no responsible person can support this attempt to withdraw support from one of our allies and one of the key points of European defense.

For these reasons, I shall support the amendment.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would strike out the Richards amendment which was adopted last year and which has been debated for about an hour or so here today. I feel the House clearly wants to retain the Richards amendment which was brought in by unanimous vote of the committee, with the approval of the executive branch. I hope the present amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman from Ohio agree that the Javits amendment and the Fulton amendment were very mild and that those amendments cut off just a finger from the EDC and this cuts off the head of the EDC proposal?

Mr. VORYS. This amendment would give the Richards amendment the business, therefore, I think we had better give the pending amendment the business.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO]. The legislation now before us, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, gives broad, wide and sweeping powers to the President of the United States. While I am in agreement with, and intend to support this measure as reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I note that in the report that sums specified for Italy under Europe are classified. The committee has not disclosed details of the program planned for that great nation. I know that the committee has been advised as to the intentions of the Foreign Operations Administration, and I respect the confidence in which this information is held. I also realize that Italy can receive no military aid from this legislation without becoming a member of the European Defense Commission.

In this connection, I wish to again impress upon all of the Members of this House that the question of aid to Italy is one of primary importance, not only to the Italian nation, but to all the civilized world. Italy's 47 million people makes that nation the second largest in the Western European bloc. Only France has a greater population.

Italy is beset with problems that are foreign to all of the other Western nations. Despite its great population, due to its mountainous terrain more than two-thirds of its area cannot be used for agricultural purposes. This necessitates the importation of a great portion of its essential food supply. Coupled with an agricultural shortage, there exists an almost complete absence of native coal, iron, oil, and other necessities for a modern, complex manufacturing civilization. The loss of the colonies, plus the raising of immigration barriers in the United States, France, and Australia prohibits draining off any part of the surplus Italian population.

As a result of these aforementioned factors, a great deal of unemployment exists. Unemployment is the natural father of discontent and unrest. To go to bed each night with hunger as a bedfellow is not conducive to clear political thinking. To observe each moment of the day, the plight and want of your loved ones does not tend to develop rational ideas.

Some say the Italian people are gravitating to communism. That I deny. The principles of communism are abhorrent to the Italian character with its great Christian tradition. Italian life is featured by its love of God, family, and country; the very antithesis of communistic doctrine.

The Italian people have never displayed a desire to conquer the earth, or to force upon others their way of life, culture, or political philosophy. They have established through the centuries a culture and mode of living from which other enlightened nations have been happy to borrow so that they in turn might be enriched. The long line of Italian poets from Dante to D'Annunzio, have given to all peoples a basis for thought that created a respect for the dignity of man. Verdi, Rossini, Peri, Caccini, and other Italian composers have established the musical standards of the earth. The golden voices of Caruso, Tettrazini, Martinelli, and Galli Curci have added richness to the lives of millions in every corner of the globe. The paintings and sculptures of Michelangelo, the rich warm colors of Raphael and Titian, the vibrant paintings of Correggio and Gordano, and many other Italian artists will live until the end of time. The world still marvels, although he has been dead for centuries, at the endless versatility of Leonardo da Vinci. Toscannini is still the peer of gathering together the brasses, woods, and percussions and developing a harmony that might even shame the heavenly hosts. Marconi and many other Italian scientists have given to mankind

the benefits of their massive minds making life easier and safer.

In our own hemisphere, from the days of Columbus and Americus Vespucci, men of Italian blood have been in the forefront of the vast struggle that has made the new world the wonder place of history.

In the colonial days, the Italian painter, doctor, musician, and laborer was found in Boston, New York, Charleston, Philadelphia, and Savannah. They fought under Washington in the dark, bloody days of the revolution. When victory came they gave their strength to the efforts being made to establish the young Republic. They, together with their neighbors, took part in the early development of the central section of our country. When the Nation was threatened with severance in 1861, they responded to Lincoln's call and one of the most famous of all the Union Army's regiments was the Garibaldi Volunteers. In this desperate war, four men of Italian background attained the rank of general in the Union forces.

In the latter part of the 19th century, and the early part of the 20th century, the United States saw a vast wave of Italian immigration. These vibrant people gave a new life and impetus to our country. They brought their artistic, scientific, and cultural backgrounds with them. They made the life stream of America richer and stronger. These immigrants, while contributing much, nevertheless instantly embraced the American way of life and shouldered the duties and responsibilities of United States citizenship. Spreading out as they did from coast to coast, border to border, they became active participants in the ever-moving American scene. Civic, fraternal, philanthropic, and religious movements gathered greater momentum from the contributions made by these new, young, vigorous, liberty-loving people. Wherever the Italians settled in our land they erected churches, schools, hospitals, homes for the orphans and aged, all built for the service of their American neighbors, regardless of creed, race, or color. Bit by bit, and day by day, they became more and more an integral part of these United States. They have given this country all of their hearts and faith.

However, by reason of their blood, and knowing much more of Italy and its needs, having heard from their fathers and mothers of Italy's struggle through the centuries, the Italian-American joined by all other thinking Americans, prays that the hand of friendship shall still be extended to the young Italian Republic. We hope more aid will be given to these people to whom not only America, but also the world, owes so much. We know that now, as through the centuries, Italy will rise to the last man to oppose barbarism if it endeavors to march again.

I am sure that all Members of Congress are aware that Italy is a natural ally by reason of culture, tradition, and blood, and I am confident that through the legislative action of the Congress of the United States, and the administration of the Foreign Operations Administration that through a program of mutual cooperation all will reap great dividends.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 107. Sale or military equipment, materials, and services: (a) The President may, in order to carry out the purpose of this chapter, sell or enter into contracts (without requirement for charge to any appropriation or contract authorization) for the procurement for sale of equipment, materials, or services to any nation or international organization: *Provided*, That prior to the transfer of any such equipment, materials, or services to any nation which has not signed an agreement under section 142 of this act or joined with the United States in a regional collective defense arrangement, the President shall have received commitments satisfactory to him that such equipment, materials, or services are required for and will be used by such nation solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, or in collective security arrangements and measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state.

(b) Whenever equipment or materials are sold from the stocks of or services are rendered by any United States Government agency to any nation or international organization as provided in subsection (a), such nation or international organization shall first make available the fair value, as determined by the President, of such equipment, materials, or services before delivery or, when the President determines it to be in the best interests of the United States, within 60 days thereafter or, as determined by the President, within a reasonable period not to exceed 3 years. The fair value for the purpose of this subsection shall not be less than the value as defined in subsection (h) of section 545: *Provided*, That with respect to excess equipment or materials the fair value may not be determined to be less than (i) the minimum value specified in that subsection plus the scrap value, or (ii) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is the greater. Before a contract for new production is entered into, or rehabilitation work is undertaken, such nation or international organization shall (A) provide the United States with a dependable undertaking to pay the full amount of such contract or the cost of such rehabilitation which will assure the United States against any loss on the contract or rehabilitation work, and (B) shall make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to meet the payments required by the contract or the rehabilitation work in advance of the time such payments are due, in addition to the estimated amount of any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contract or rehabilitation work.

(c) Sections 106, 141, and 142 shall not apply with respect to assistance furnished under this section.

SEC. 108. Waivers of law: (a) The President may perform any of the functions authorized under this chapter without regard to (1) the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1262 (a), and title 34, United States Code, section 546 (e); and (2) such provisions as he may specify of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), as amended.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of Revised Statutes 1222 (10 U. S. C. 576), personnel of the Department of Defense may be assigned or detailed to any civil office for the purpose of enabling the President to furnish assistance under this act.

SEC. 109. Transfer of military equipment to Japan: In addition to any program of military assistance for which funds may be appropriated pursuant to this act, the President is hereby authorized to transfer to the Government of Japan, until June 30, 1955, upon such terms and conditions as he may specify, and upon its request, United States military equipment and supplies programed for Japan to meet its internal security requirements for which Department of Defense appropriations were obligated prior to July 1, 1953. No appropriation shall be requested to replace the military equipment and supplies so transferred, and no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the purpose of this chapter shall be available for reimbursement to any United States Government agency on account of any transfer made pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support President Eisenhower and the Republican administration. They are doing a job for America. President Eisenhower does not expect this Congress, or any Congress, to approve every single request which the executive department sends to us. The basic philosophy of the writers of our Federal Constitution established the system of checks and balances which we operate under for a good and sufficient purpose. I cannot agree that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has fully exercised the prerogatives of the legislative branch of our Government in approving the entire request of the executive department in this Mutual Security Act of 1954.

This bill is presented to us as a $3.5 billion authorization bill, when in reality it is a $13.2 billion authorization bill, as it contains approximately $3.7 billion in new authorizations and $9.5 billion in requested carryovers to be reauthorized. On July 1, 1954, which is the start of fiscal year 1955, there will be $9.7 billion unexpended in previous appropriations made by this Congress to the mutual security program, and of this amount approximately $3 billion will be completely unobligated.

The House Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, will be asked to make appropriations covering the new authorizations covered in the bill which we are considering today. If every penny is not granted by the House Appropriations Committee, members of our committee will be accused of not keeping faith with the Congress. In view of the fact that the mutual security program can be carried on for the next fiscal year, particularly the military aid program, without an additional dollar of new appropriations, it seems to me fantastic that we should authorize today military items which will not even be allocated for 3 or 4 years in the future. There is no question in the minds of the Members of this House that a program for mutual security of friendly nations in the world is needed and necessary in view of the threat of international communism. There are real questions in my mind, however, of whether merely making large authorizations and large appropriations will have any real psychological effect upon this threat of international

communistic aggression. I believe that we would be justified here in the House to reduce the new authorizations which are included in this bill by $1,200,000,000. By doing this we would be providing for a mutual security program of $2.3 billion in new authorizations plus the $9.7 billion in requested carryovers, making a total program of $12 billion provided in this Mutual Security Act of 1954.

In view of the situation as it exists in the Far East and in other sections of the world, it seems to me unrealistic to extend our lead time in this mutual security program beyond 2½ years.

I plan to vote against this bill unless substantial reductions are made on the floor of the House today in the amount of new authorizations provided for in this program.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE WESTERN PACIFIC, AND DIRECT FORCES SUPPORT

SEC. 121. Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955, to be made available on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify, not to exceed $800 million for expenses necessary for the support of the forces of the Associated States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam and the forces of France located in such Associated States and for other expenditures to accomplish in southeast Asia and the western Pacific the policies and purposes declared in this act. In addition, the unexpended balances of funds allocated from appropriations made pursuant to sections 304 and 540 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, for the purpose of support of the forces of the Associated States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam and the forces of France located in the Associated States, are hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this section through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 14, after line 8, insert the following:

"It is the sense of the Congress that no part of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used on behalf of governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment which was adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning. This is offered at the end of the section of the bill dealing with Indochina, which provides $800 million plus unexpended balances "for the support of the forces of the Associated States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, and the forces of France located in such Associated States and for other expenditures to accomplish in southeast Asia and the Western Pacific the policies and purposes declared in this act."

It is a very broad and important section. As we know, the situation in Indochina is critical and fluid. The Congress has shown its foresight with reference to Indochina for over a year, after our Secretary of State appeared before our committee early in 1953 and told of the serious situation there. The committee brought to the floor and the House and Senate adopted an unusual section similar to this one, authorizing $400 million for the support of the defense effort in Indochina against the Communists.

The committee amendment has to do with the issue, let us say, of "peaceful coexistence." That concept for East Asia has been discussed considerably around Washington during the last couple of days. Now we believe in peaceful coexistence with our friends, the British, in spite of the fact that we have had two wars with them; but in spite of the ties of blood, language, and friendship we have with the British, and with due regard to our recent distinguished visitors, this amendment proposed by the committee will make it crystal clear that we are buying no part of a Locarno Treaty for Southeast Asia. The amendment provides that none of this southeast Asia money shall be used in behalf of governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia. It was typical of the Locarno Treaties that mutual guaranties were exchanged. It was proposed by certain recent visitors in Washington that we approve of similar treaties for Asia that would guarantee territorial lines that might be drawn out of some agreement or settlement at Geneva, dividing up territory between Communists and free peoples.

This amendment makes it clear that it is the sense of the Congress that we are not going to enter into or underwrite such treaties, and are not going to support the signatories of such treaties. This amendment makes it clear that none of the funds that we are providing for southeast Asia to carry out the purposes of this act are going to be used to defeat the purposes of this act. The purpose of this act with reference to southeast Asia can be found on page 2, line 20, where the Congress "reaffirms its previous expression favoring the creation by the free peoples of the Far East and the Pacific of a joint organization; to safeguard basic rights and liberties and to protect their security and independence." That is the purpose of this act, and this amendment makes it crystal clear that it is not the purpose of this act to have any of the funds used on behalf of or to aid governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule, which denies liberty and basic rights to free peoples, and destroys their security and independence.

That is the meaning of the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Ohio on this statement and to congratulate him and the other members of the committee on their wisdom in adopting this amendment.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia as an amendment to the Vorys amendment: At the conclusion of the amendment add the words "for the use in combat of any military forces of the United States without approval by Congress."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. That amendment states that the funds appropriated in this act or authorized in this act shall not be used to carry out a certain kind of peace treaty. I am in favor of that.

My amendment goes further and adds the provision that neither shall the funds be used in furtherance of unauthorized war undeclared by this Congress.

I do not know what the administration policy is in Indochina; I do not think anybody knows; I think it is in process of formation. The Vice President in an off-the-record speech indicated that we would have to go to war. The Speaker of this House said, "No, we would not"; that all that was needed there was domestic troops. The Secretary of State seems to have been talking a great deal lately about the circumstances under which we would go to war in Indochina. So I do not know what the policy really is. With all due respect, it seems to be one that changes from week to week, from day to day, and from hour to hour. War in Indochina is a responsibility that belongs to this Congress, and while we are saying that we are not going to allow money to be spent on a certain kind of peace treaty or nations that adopt that peace treaty, I propose that we also say that we will not permit money to be spent on a war until this Congress declares it or permits the use of combat troops.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I am wondering whether or not section 102 of the bill does not take care of that situation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not think so.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The gentleman from Virginia knows I supported in committee an amendment somewhat similar to the one he has now offered.

The record on this points out that section 102 makes clear that United States military personnel can be assigned to foreign nations only for noncombat duty, including furnishing of training and advice. The language was included to give reassurance that the military assistance authorized in this bill does not include participation by the United States forces in combat. I am wondering if that language would not take care of the amendment that the gentleman from Virginia suggests.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That language authorizes the use of troops under certain circumstances. This

amendment forbids the use of troops. I think there is a great difference.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the special Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, I am detained in Europe where we are holding important hearings.

However, since I cannot be present to cast my vote, I would like to make my position with respect to the foreign aid bill a matter of public record.

I am in favor of this measure and I would vote for its passage because I believe that we must continue to assist our friends, from both a military and an economic standpoint, in order to make it possible for them to be strong enough to resist the forces of Communist aggression.

I am conscious of the fact that the American people have made a great sacrifice for several years in order to carry out this foreign aid program.

I believe it is a good investment and I think it will pay dividends, provided we do not permit the Communists to rob us of its substance.

Since we have been in Europe we have seen abundant evidence of the fact that many political leaders in this part of the world either do not or will not understand the evil nature of communism. Apparently some of them think of it as simply another political problem with international complications.

In the carrying out of our foreign aid program, we should, if at all possible, make clear to our friends that there can be no compromise with the forces of communism, and it would seem reasonable and sensible and in our best interests to require that our friends whom we assist stand unequivocably with us in our opposition to this evil influence.

There can be no neutrals in this struggle.

At the same time I believe that the times call for patience and understanding. Our task is to convince our friends, even while they provoke us and tire us with their unwillingness or inability to face up to the issue.

Whether we like it or not, as a matter of our own defense and security and welfare, we must take the lead in this struggle.

The responsibility of leadership thus thrust upon us will call for the best that is in us.

In order to lead others we must know ourselves where we want to go.

This requires a firm policy and a sound pattern in all of our international relation.

The cornerstone of this policy must be based on the principle of no compromise with and no appeasement of communism.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia to the committee amendment.

As the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has just pointed out, we have provided in what we feel is the right way, by unanimous action of our committee, I believe, a limitation on the use of troops in section 102, page 3, lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, which states, under the authorization of services, "members of the Armed Forces and other personnel of the Department of Defense solely to assist in an advisory capacity or to perform other duties of a noncombatant nature, including military training or advice."

Now, if the objective of the gentleman is to limit the use of combat troops throughout the bill, that has already been done; but if his objective is to prohibit the use in combat of forces of the United States—for instance, in their own defense in any territory they might be in, Asia, Japan, or Korea, or some place else—then I do not think he means that. As a matter of fact, I cannot conceive of the use of any of the funds out of this particular section for United States combat forces at all. We have provided in this bill for the things that the gentleman's remarks were primarily directed to, and with Executive approval in restricting the authorization in chapter I, which is the military-assistance chapter, of military money for Indochina. That is the chapter containing section 102, which limits personnel of Armed Forces or the Department of Defense solely to assist in an advisory capacity or to perform other duties of a noncombatant nature, including military training or advice, such as our troops performed in Greece, for instance. This is a clear prohibition against the use of armed forces. It protects the Congress in its prerogatives, and it seems to me that is the right way to do it, and this is the wrong way. I hope the amendment to the amendment is defeated and that the committee amendment may be disposed of on its merits.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Is not this language in 102 the same language that was in the bill passed by the Congress in 1947 to give aid of the same sort, military and economic aid to Greece when she was threatened? A lot of people at that time thought that language was not strong enough, which said that these forces may be detailed, the members of the Armed Forces, to Greece and Turkey in an advisory capacity only. However, the program was exceedingly successful. At no time did we have more than 600 men over there. None of them carried more than a revolver, sidearms, for his own self-defense in case he was shanghaied or something of that sort. To use this language does not change our policy one way or the other; therefore, it does not contribute to any possible speculation one way or the other as to whether there may be a change in American policy. I hope the language that has been tested will be agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with everything the gentleman has said except one thing. I am under the impression that the word "solely" in line 12, page 3, was inserted this year. This is as absolute a limitation as you can conceive of being put in at this time.

Mr. JUDD. "Solely" is even stronger than "only."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My understanding of the gentleman's position is that it is already in the law. In that case, what possible harm could there be to spell it out? The gentleman is undertaking to tell the executive branch that these funds cannot be used for a certain type of peace treaty, so then what harm does it do to say that it cannot be used for an unauthorized war?

Mr. VORYS. Here is the difference, to answer the gentleman's question. This is a ticklish subject, and we do not want to tread on the constitutional prerogatives of the President, and we do not want him to tread on our constitutional prerogatives. We worked this out in committee with some care in an earlier section, section 102. The gentleman's amendment contains language which I do not fully understand and I hope it will not be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia goes too far. It covers more situations than he believes it does. I believe that section 102 does protect, as the gentleman from Ohio has said and as agreed to by the gentleman from Minnesota, so that there is adequate protection in this bill against the administration getting into an undeclared war without action or consent of Congress.

I would like to comment on the original amendment, and I want to separate myself from the policy that says to our great ally, Great Britain, that if you join a Locarno-type treaty, we will cut off aid under this bill. To me that is a wrong use of money power. That is using dollar diplomacy. If this Congress in its great wisdom, and this House, believes that we should have a sense motion, I believe that it should be put as a separate sense motion as to what we believe and not use the weapon of money to force a willing ally to change the position that she thinks might be wise in the guidance of her own foreign affairs. We must remember in this world of ours that we need a society of friendly democratic nations. We need to speak frankly of our divisions, but we should not use the money power in any way to force a friendly nation to do what it otherwise would not do and especially as great and as good an ally as Great Britain has been.

So, I would separate this off if I had an opportunity, but cannot now. I urge that when we might make a sense resolution on another nation's foreign policy it should be by a separate resolution and not in a money authorization bill. Secondly, even though this states it is a sense matter, it nevertheless implies that no money shall be given. This is because the amendment reads that it is the sense of the Congress that no part of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used on behalf of governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory in Asia. That, in effect, is a request to the President, the Executive,

who has charge of the foreign policy of this country to cut off aid in his discretion if Great Britain enters into a Locarno-type treaty with any other nation about Asia. I respectfully request, and ask the House in its judgment later to consider, when the bill comes up to conference, to make a change in this provision so that it does not in any way reflect on this ally of ours, Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] to the Vorys amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking a few questions of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I note the language "it is the sense of the Congress that no part of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used" and so forth. I am wondering why the words "it is the sense of the Congress that" are necessary. Why should we not say definitely no part of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used on behalf of governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia? Why do we not hit it head-on.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is addressing the question to me, it seems to me that this formula is appropriate in this instance whereas, due to the history of the Richards amendment, it is inappropriate there. This is a field in which the situation is quite fluid. We have got "sense" language in section 106, referring to this same situation where it says that the President in carrying out the provisions of section 121, which is the Indochina section, "shall give the fullest assistance to the free peoples in that area, in their creation of a joint organization, consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to establish a program of self-help and mutual cooperation designed to develop their economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence."

That general language has been in the bill as a sense resolution for 5 years. We have put it in with especial reference to it. This is pretty broad language to incorporate in a statute and it was felt by the committee that it was more appropriate, acting on this matter, where we had no opportunity to take it up until this morning, to have this as a sense proposition rather than a clear mandate.

Here is the problem, if the gentleman will yield further. We are talking about treaties that have not yet been signed, treaties that are merely proposed by some of our dear friends from across the water.

Mr. McCORMACK. Our dear friends? I thought they were dear friends, and I hope they will become dear friends again, but I have my doubts today, I am sorry to say.

Mr. VORYS. It was felt that it might be well to leave the language in this form perhaps while our visitors are in town and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and others have suggested, it may be possible to perfect and polish this in the other body and in conference. But one of the things that is true about this is that this is the sense of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, will admit that in opposing the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], on which I voted along the lines the gentleman from Ohio argued, and along the lines that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] argued, that he said that "in a sense" did not mean much; that the words "it is the sense of the Congress" did not mean much. Using the same words here also may not mean much in the event that a nonaggression pact is undertaken in Southeast Asia, such as is commonly known as a Locarno pact.

Mr. VORYS. We are against a Locarno SEATO. Any "sense" resolution of the Congress of the United States has great weight with the United States Government, and I think with the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept that statement.

Mr. VORYS. The Richards amendment was devised in committee and after long conversations with the executive branch. This amendment was devised this morning in committee. I understand the executive branch has no objection to the words in it. We feel it is better to leave it this way.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I may be of some use to the gentleman. I have studied this carefully. The difference is this, as I see it. There is no Locarno Treaty for Asia such as Mr. Eden mentioned. There is an EDC. You are talking about a treaty in being in the Richards amendment, and you are not talking about a treaty in being in this amendment. Therefore, if anything, there can certainly be no question here of a sense resolution rather than tying it down, because there is nothing to tie it down to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see the gentleman's position. He is consistent, but my friend from Ohio seems to me somewhat inconsistent. But I am going to follow him again in the language of the amendment. I had an amendment here to strike out those words, but I realized the difficulty confronting the committee. I think this represents, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] said, a very fine move and a decidedly advantageous amendment. But may I ask my friend this. I notice in the newspapers that Mr. Churchill when he arrived here said he was coming over to try to settle some family troubles. Is my memory correct? Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. VORYS. I think he said "family matters."

Mr. McCORMACK. Family matters, yes. Of course, in any little family the main support usually has a pretty potent voice in family matters, does he not, the one who provides for the family?

Mr. VORYS. Not in our house.

Mr. McCORMACK. The one who pays the freight does not have much to say, does he? Does not the gentleman think that as we are paying the freight here pretty well we ought to have quite a voice in any of these family matters?

Mr. VORYS. I think so. I still believe in the Declaration of Independence and cooperation.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will leave the Declaration of Independence out of it now.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate and approve the candid and courteous way with which the gentleman from Massachusetts has dealt with a very delicate matter. No person likes to take exception to anything said by such a distinguished foreign guest as is in our midst—one for whom we have such great admiration. But he and his foreign minister have been very frank, and I am sure they expect us to be the same. To keep the record straight, it has to be said that the statement by the British Prime Minister that he came over here to discuss some "family matters" was to say the least unfortunate. It could have only the most mischievous effects on people who live east of Suez. The single biggest handicap and liability which the United States has in Asia—and I speak carefully—is that it generally is too closely allied, or appears to the Asians to be too closely allied, with the European colonial powers.

The heart of our President's foreign-policy problem is this: How to hold together our alliance with the countries of Western Europe and at the same time to prevent their giving East Asia away, or losing our influence in Asia through being identified in Asian minds with British and French policies. This is a tough one but we have to do both.

When Mr. Churchill gives the impression that the British and we are all just parts of one special family, it is made to order for the Kremlin. That is what the people in the Far East largely believe, that when the chips are down the United States will always stand with France and England, in a white man's club, even at the expense of the peoples east of Suez.

Therefore, and I say this not in criticism of our British guests but in defense of my own country's interests, I think the United States and the Congress must disassociate themselves most emphatically from the notion that we have peculiar ties or obligations or attachments to our Anglo-Saxon forebears, proud as we are of that ancestry. We do not belong to any other family than the human family. We are concerned for the freedom of all people. And this bill's purpose is to help all people who are fighting for freedom wherever they are or whatever their color or tongue.

We support England and France in Europe not because they are England and France, or because they are of the same race as we, but because they are

trying to remain free. We do not support their empires and some of their policies in Asia. We stand beside and support all people there who are trying to become or to remain free.

If the United States could just get it through to the whole world that our policy is everlastingly to support the efforts of people everywhere to be free regardless of their race or language or their ethnical background or otherwise, the effect would be electrifying.

The people of the world are still waiting hopefully, and almost desperately, to hear this great Republic say in word and deed, "We stand as we did at our own beginning, against any effort by anybody to impose his will upon other people."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I always have been a supporter of past legislation. I realize the situation. But to any of my friends who might be uncertain and who might ask themselves the question: Why should we do this? Let me suggest that they ask themselves an additional question, namely: Suppose we do not do this? What then? What about the other side? Of course, there are calculated risks, but on the other hand it is best to refer to these unnecessary gratuitous observations because it is constructive and it is for the benefit of those who say they are our friends, and certainly we have shown our friendship for them.

Mr. Chairman, from a constructive angle, I want also to state I resented very much Eden's speech in Commons. I thought it was intemperate before coming over to America to engage in a high conference with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to make publicly and officially the statement he did. The President is my President and the Secretary of State is my Secretary of State. They may be Republican by politics and I might criticize them, but I am not going to stand for criticism of them from abroad—not criticism of that kind. When they are coming over for high policy meetings, I thought it was somewhat contemptuous for such a statement to be made where it was made. These are my observations and they are made so that they might have the benefit of the views of one who has always supported this legislation, and one who has supported this kind of legislation because I consider it to be in the national interest of the United States. It happens also to be in the national interest of other countries who want to be free from the domination of communism. I think in making these frank observations, I am doing good not only for ourselves but for some of our friends of yesterday who protest their friendship, but whose actions seem to indicate a parting of the ways. I am very much concerned over the meeting of Nehru and Chou, and their entering into a nonaggression pact. I am wondering if Churchill and Eden knew that Nehru was going to meet with Chou. It would be a strange thing if they did not know. I am wondering if Churchill and Eden made a deal with France and Red China at Geneva. Those are things that enter my mind looking at it in my own way and because I have the national interest of my own country at heart. So in voting for this bill, I want to make these observations so that they will know that these are some of the questions which are in the minds of some Members of Congress, and also in the minds of some Americans. Friendship is a two-way street, not a one-way street. England has recognized Red China. We have not. Do they expect us to enter into a Locarno agreement, so-called, which would mean at least a de facto recognition of Red China? They might not have difficulty in making such an agreement, but we would because we have not recognized Red China. Furthermore, there is an additional question. Suppose you enter into a nonaggression pact? It is supposed to be upon the basis of friendship and in the very next few days enter into a Southeastern Asia Defense Agreement, which is the opposite of the nonaggression pact; is it not? In other words, you make a nonaggression pact and then the very next step, make a defense pact saying that if one of the parties to the nonaggression pact violates it, we would go to the defense of the country members of a defense pact. Both seem to me to be inconsistent with one another.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Prime Minister Churchill and Eden in coming to this country, came in a spirit of friendship and confidence. When they class themselves as part of the family in visiting us, I accept their friendly statement. I believe they do think they are part of the family of free nations and of free people. I feel further that while they are guests in this country, there are many of us, and I am one of those people specifically, who are glad to have them here and really glad to have discussions on a friendly basis of confidence.

Whether or not the conferees have come up with an agreement, at least they have talked as free and independent people. There is a knowledge of the basis upon which our two great nations and their peoples are acting. Such frank discussion and friendly visit reaps a real benefit. We should thank Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden for their friendly interest and courtesy in coming so far to talk over our mutual serious problems with us.

I would further state that I am one of those who does not want the power of money used on our friends and allies as a club or a whip. I think we can move along by basic principles and cooperation instead of using an authorization bill of this type, to insert a smear amendment without even stating the basis or reasons for it.

In conclusion, surely we have our troubles with our allies. They have their troubles with us, too. We have friends and relatives and employees who do not always do right.

We free nations have our disagreements, but we should not let those disagreements divide these long friendships, because it is our security and our freedom that are at stake, and we must bear the burden of it.

A good thing about Congress is this, that you have to stand here and justify yourself. You have to do it on your own feet and say what you think. If anything, I admire the British for saying what they think ahead of time, when they are considering or are about to do something, which would affect our United States position and policy. So on this amendment we are guessing that they might go into a Locarno-type treaty in the Orient. We do not know about it. But we are saying by this amendment that if they should, it is the sense of Congress that we might take the money away.

For me, I want to welcome Churchill and Eden. I hope they come back again and I hope that in future years I may be able to stand side by side with the British people and the Italian people and the French people and the German people, about whom this debate has been had today. Some of us have to state these basic positions. It may not be popular, but we are standing with these people and we mean it.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

On page 13, line 17, after "President", strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of lines 18 through line 24, and the word "addition" in line 25.

And on page 14, line 7, after the word "1955", strike out the balance of line 7 and all of line 8.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the authorization of $800 million for Indochina. This bill, as reported by the committee, in reauthorizations and in new money, provides for Indochina $2,200,000,000. The effect of this amendment would be to reduce that to $1,400,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, when we speak of flexibility, of which we have heard a great deal today, we should recognize that never before in any of this sort of legislation has such absolute power, such flexibility, been given to the executive branch as in this provision dealing with Indochina. It has always been the custom, and the proper custom, for the executive to come forward and justify what it intended to do with funds asked of this Congress to be authorized. In this case the executive did that by evidence in support of the Navarre plan. It supported it with tables, charts, and testimony. All of that is now defunct, and this proposal is now, without any evidence to support it—it says that sometime, someday, we are going to formulate a policy in Indochina, and the Congress gives the money in advance in approval of it. I think that is bad policy to surrender the power of this Congress over the purse and over appropriations.

I listened with a great deal of interest a moment ago to the splendid statement in support of the President of the United States made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack]. I subscribe to that. I agree with that. Of course, the payoff of that is that Vice President Nixon made his speech on last Saturday night. I have not forgotten the insolent effrontery of the Governor of New York when he referred to the words "Democrat" and "treason" as being synonymous. I approve of not countering that with similar unjustified statements. On the other hand, I am not going back to my people and plead guilty to the charge of granting to the bureaucrats in the State Department and the Pentagon: "We have such confidence in you that we give you $2,200,000,000 without any accounting whatsoever."

I cannot say, "Go ahead and do what you want to do with it; we have confidence in you and do not want any accounting on your part." I cannot give that kind of support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the remarks of our friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Harrison], of course, strike a responsive note in everyone's heart. It would be so nice if we could do the sort of thing he proposes.

He is perfectly right, that a situation might develop in southeast Asia where not a cent of this new money would be used; but that would be an almost unbelievable catastrophe for the United States, for it would be because that whole area had gone over to the enemy; and its manpower, and its resources, and its strategic bases for Russian submarines on the Indian Ocean and in the southwest Pacific would all be in the hands of the forces that are dedicated to our destruction.

This authorization was voted last year to be used just in Indochina—or the Associated States, as they ought to be called now, because they are no longer 1 French colony but 3 independent countries, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Everybody knows the unfavorable developments in Vietnam and in fact in that whole portion of the world and recognizes that things could get steadily worse for a time. Anyone who looks at the map must realize why that very fact means this year we need to authorize the appropriation to be available on a flexible basis for the defense of the whole area, to use in whatever ways and places will be most effective.

Surely, the loss of one engagement, even though it be a very important engagement, does not mean that we are going to follow the advice of some who seem to be suggesting that we should scuttle and run or surrender to the enemy. We have got to find effective ways to build strength in that part of the world. The purpose of the funds is to hold in the free world as much as possible of southeast Asia and the western Pacific. That includes the Philippines and Japan, in case anyone has forgotten.

I hope that the members of the Committee of the Whole have examined the figures on page 18 of our committee report where the populations of these various Far Eastern countries is outlined in detail. What do the figures there mean? They mean that the thing the Communist world already has most of is boys; the thing the free world has fewest of is boys. Are we going to turn over to the other side pretty nearly one-third of the people of the world—potential producers and consumers, but also potential soldiers—by telling them in advance by the action proposed here today that since things look bad, we are going to quit? We wish the situation might have been different but since it seems to be going from bad to worse, we intend to withdraw our support. On the contrary, I think we must make every effort to save as much as possible of that part of the world.

For many long years I have warned on every possible occasion about the seriousness of the Communist expansion in China, Korea, and southeast Asia. But there is no reason for those who would not pay attention then, to become panicky now.

I am not as pessimistic about that part of the world as some are who until a few months ago refused to be as alarmed as the facts deserved. If we would just get it over to the people in Asia that they can count on Uncle Sam, I think you would quickly find far greater strength there than you witness today.

When we were in Burma last fall we talked with a member of the government, a very intelligent and alert young official, who said: "You folks do not like our position of neutralism." He volunteered the observation. We would have got around to the subject sooner or later and asked him about it, but he brought it up himself. He said: "We have an 800-mile border with Communist China. We have 19 million people, Communist China has 450 million. We have an army of a few hundred thousand; Communist China has 4½ million. How," he asked, "can you expect us to stand up and defy Communist China right across the border when some of your allies half way around the world insist that you accept Communist China? We cannot resist them, if the West is going to embrace them."

I did not have any good answer.

One reason some of those countries are weakening today is because they are not sure of us; and the gentleman's amendment if passed would indicate that there is reason not to be sure of us.

I came back from two trips to Asia last year with about five main impressions.

First. Many of the people living there are more keenly aware of the nature of communism and its objectives than many here are.

Second. They are afraid of it, because they know it will destroy the newly won independence for which they fought for scores, even hundreds of years. They do not want to lose it.

Third. They want to be on our side because they know that offers their best hope to retain their precious freedom.

Fourth. With the exception of the Philippines, in every one of those countries we found a haunting anxiety, or at least uncertainty, as to the clarity and the constancy of American purpose and American policy. They are afraid that we will go to some conference, and Molotov or Chou will make a big proposal that looks like a "settlement" and promises to give peace and security to us in the West; and that we will buy it, no matter what it does to them.

Fifth. They know that we in the West have the power, but they also know we do not as yet have the will and the unity. They know the Communists have the will; they do not as yet have the power. Probably this whole world struggle depends on who gets first both the will and the power.

Mr. Chairman, unless we want to commit suicide, we cannot in my opinion, adopt these proposed gestures which would not save money, but would weaken our allies, weaken our security, and thus cost us more money for our own defenses. Much of Asia will crumble once it becomes convinced the Communists are going to win. We must not take any action that would justifiably give the impression that we are resigned to the continued successful advance of the Communists. That would be the way to war, not to peace.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee, not because I feel that the dollars and cents involved in this section will solve the tremendous and continuing difficulties and problems that are the lot of the free nations of the world attempting to stem Communist aggression in Indochina and elsewhere. I think that in light of the criticism and implied criticism that has been directed at some of those with whom we are allied, perhaps a word should be said at this point in debate, in the way of a word of praise, a word of understanding, a word of encouragement, to one of the nations with whom we are allied that has had the temerity and the intestinal fortitude to stand up and face the Russian bear unafraid. Some of our other allies, some of those who appear to live in fear and trembling for what tomorrow may bring, could well look to Turkey as an example of not only how to stand up and be proud and sovereign in one's own right but how to utilize wisely and well the aid that has been furnished in such tremendous sums by this Nation.

The gentleman from Minnesota has spoken of the fears of the peoples of many nations in southeast Asia. Those concerns and those fears are shared in large part by the American people. It is a matter of concern to all Americans whether or not southeast Asia can be saved from Communist aggression. It is my personal feeling that under the conditions presently existing it is a most difficult, if not an entirely impossible, situation. I cannot conceive that the peoples of Vietnam, the peoples of Laos and Cambodia, are willing to exchange the aggression of the Soviet Union, of Red

China, the international aggression of communism, for a continued colonial status under a European power. It seems that one of the conditions precedent to any successful defense of southeast Asia is the complete and unqualified independence of those nations. Freemen, fighting for their own freedom upon the soil of their homelands, are more likely to strike substantial blows than those who strive only to retain an uncertain status halfway between slavery and liberty.

Secondly, it seems to me there can be no good purpose served in that part of the world unless those free nations that still remain unfettered are willing to band together on their own initiative, first of all, and then present to us and to the other allies a plan of action which will be developed by them themselves and brought forward. We have tried to draft here in Washington in the executive and in the legislative branches blueprints for the defense of the world, and I must say that all of those blueprints, when they are reduced to terms of effective support for our efforts, show pretty much on the debit side of the ledger. We have not bought any friendship with the hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars we have spent.

Third, in relation to Indochina, a question which was asked of me a great many times during my recent visit to my district in California was "What thought is being given to the utilization of the divisions of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa"? Those are the divisions which General Van Fleet paid the high compliment to by saying of them that they were among the best he ever reviewed. These troops, in truth and in fact, are immobilized in Formosa and of no use to the Eastern World, the Western World, or anybody else. I hope that some consideration is being given to putting that force to effective use.

As one individual member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I submit that those three points, the matter of the mutual-assistance pact in southeast Asia, the matter of the independence of those nations who are expected to carry the fight for southeast Asia, and the utilization of forces that are readily available in that part of the world, the utilization of which forces could blunt in large part the Communist propaganda that this is a war between the white man and the yellow man—these things, I think, are deserving of serious consideration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to this debate for 2 days there comes to my mind certain impressions, and I think that now is as good a time as any to express them in view of the fact that on tomorrow or the next day we will have before us a bill which affects the economy of this great Nation of ours more than any other considered or passed this session. I refer to the Hope bill coming out of the Committee on Agriculture, the so-called one-package farm bill. I heard over the airwaves last night considerable oratory, having for its mistaken purpose the building up of pressure upon us in behalf of Mr. Benson's flexible price support program. I term it "mistaken" because Mr. Benson's program, if adopted, would depress farm income and bring to our doors the beginning of another depression. Mr. Benson and his supporters cry out to heaven against the cost of our price support program. Yet, here in this one foreign aid bill we have three times the amount for foreigners than the total net realized loss of the price support program during the 20 years have amounted to. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] so aptly said yesterday, it is time to begin to reappraise our line of thinking upon all of these important matters. It is time, perhaps, to consider whether we could not knock off $400 million, at least, of this authorization and on the other hand be a little liberal to our own farmers in helping to maintain the price level of our own economy. Drop the price level on our basic farm commodities and you will cut down by $4 billion the purchasing power of agriculture. Do you not think it is about time to do a little serious thinking along that line? Is the prosperity of our own people not more important than many things in this bill? Is it not more important to see to it that our great dairy industry in America will be able to produce sufficient milk for the children of generations to come by giving the farmers an incentive through a fair price for that which he produces through long hours of labor? Is it not more important to do that? Or shall we dump $85 million for example into India alone, in just one item here in the bill before us, an item under the heading "Development Assistance." What do we propose to do with this $85 million?

By the way, I want to say to you that my subcommittee had an hour's conference with a very fine gentleman, the head of the Indian Government, Mr. Nehru, last October. But, never once during that hour's conference did Mr. Nehru even express a semblance of gratitude for the $200 million that we have donated to that country in foreign aid in the last 3 years. It made me stop and think. Yet we have another $85 million here for such things as what? Deep wells for irrigation, railroad rolling stock, a fertilizer plant, transmission lines, a dam to avert flood danger. Yet we had a $10 million flood damage just the other day in the great State of Iowa. Has the Congress done anything about that?

Yes, here is an item of $5 million for the transmission and distribution of electric power. And yet, the other day, Nebraska was denied, by the conferees on the Interior Department bill, an item for the building of a transmission line to take Missouri River power into that State; and my own transmission line leading into Minnesota from the same river cannot be completed into its logical loop arrangement because of the cost.

When last fall I saw this program of 2,650 deep wells coming into being in India at a cost of $8,000 each to the taxpayers of the United States, those same deep wells each bringing into being 700 or 800 acres of top cotton production, to take away much of our own market in the Orient, it set me to thinking whether or not the Congress was being foolishly generous toward people abroad, and whether the Congress should not be thinking a little bit more of our own people. Perhaps it is not so glamorous to help our own. I did see much in India which was good.

I saw there the wonderful work being done under the point 4 program, the program of technical cooperation. We show them how to live in decency and cleanliness. We teach junior county agents, who in turn teach their own people. That is fine work. I am for that. But I am not for sinking 2,650 deep wells to help them increase production to a point where we will lose our cotton markets. I am not for that kind of foolishness. I am not for the sort of foolishness that will give them $5 million for a transmission line when Nebraska and Minnesota cannot get what they need. Let us give to these people our "know-how," but let us not be extravagant and spend millions of dollars for production of competing goods—yes, millions of dollars we must first borrow and add to our $275 billion debt. Even now Congress must raise our debt limit.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As a member of the subcommittee on appropriations, which will later bring in the appropriation bill under this authorization act, I hope to be instrumental in cutting out about $400 million from this bill and utilizing that $400 million instead to hold price supports beneath the basic commodities of this great Nation of ours, the farm commodities which are the basis of our economy; the farm commodities which determine whether or not your people in the cities are going to have enough to eat and jobs for your people. If you crush down the prices of those farm commodities, as Secretary Benson would like you to do, and go into flexible price supports, you will see what will happen to our economy. Why must we gamble with our own financial security?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentleman should clarify a statement that he has made. He said that the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, did not express appreciation of the help that he got from us. Mr. Nehru did express some appreciation because, when our planes were on a mission of mercy to help the garrison at Dien Bien Phu in Indochina, he made those planes fly an extra 1,500 miles out of the way.

Also, on yesterday, while this bill provides more help for him, he had a meeting with the Premier of Red China, ganging up against us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I repeat that in the conference that Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, Mr. HUNTER, of California, and I had with Mr. Nehru, lasting some 55 minutes, not once did he suggest in my hearing any gratitude for the $200 million that we have poured into India in

3 years. I think the time has come when we should be blunt. I think the time has come to give a little bit of this largess, if you will, to some of our own people.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman realize that he is preaching a very revolutionary doctrine when he suggests that if we have got anything to give away that we ought to give it away here?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Revolutionary or not, I hope the Congress will follow my suggestion and remove from this bill any item which is not strictly a defense item, or which is not technical cooperation. I cannot vote for a bill of this magnitude. There is nearly $1 billion too much in it.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC BENEFITS DERIVED FROM MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, many times when we consider the mutual-security program authorizing huge sums to assist foreign countries in the mutual-defense effort we are prone to think of them as giveaway programs which in turn do not benefit the United States. The justification for the mutual-security program rests on its contribution to the security and well-being of the United States in carrying out important elements of United States foreign policy. Reference to the justification in these terms, however, allows to pass unnoticed the benefits which many United States citizens—workers, farmers, manufacturers, and others—can see and feel from day to day in measurable form. As part of the whole picture these benefits should be borne in mind. They accrue immediately from dollars spent under the program in the United States, and accrue ultimately from dollars spent overseas, since virtually all dollars must eventually find their way back to be spent in the United States. Benefits to the following groups within the United States are illustrative:

First. Farmers:

(a) Farmers are benefited by the extensive purchases of United States agricultural commodities for use in the program. These purchases totaled over $535 million in fiscal year 1953 and the first 8 months of fiscal year 1954, and an additional $228 million in agricultural surplus has been purchased or contracted for fiscal year 1954 with section 550 funds. Even greater purchases are anticipated in fiscal year 1955.

(b) Farmers are benefited by the opening of new markets as the economic development of foreign countries increases standards of living and per capita food consumption.

Second. Manufacturers:

(a) Manufacturers of civilian items ranging from bulldozers to needles, and their employees, are benefited by purchases of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of civilian products annually. As an example of the scope of these purchases, during fiscal year 1953 and the first 7 months of fiscal year 1954 over $720 million of paid shipments for such items were financed by FOA from the United States and its possessions.

(b) Manufacturers of items for military use and their employees are benefited by the purchase of billions of dollars' worth of their equipment for delivery to foreign countries.

(c) Manufacturers of farm machinery and their employees are benefited by increased sales as technical cooperation programs train people in underdeveloped countries in the use and advantages of United States plows, tractors, and other modern implements. For example, since the technical cooperation farm machinery program began in Peru 10 years ago, tractor sales in Peru by private United States firms have increased from $453,000 to $5,700,000. They are benefited also by irrigation projects which increase the amount of arable land, creating a need for efficient modern equipment.

(d) The same principle applies to other types of equipment and material used in technical cooperation and development assistance programs. An illustration of the relationship between these programs and sales by private United States manufacturers is the 800-percent increase in the annual sale of United States pharmaceutical products in Latin America since the technical cooperation health program began there 12 years ago. As the standard of living of these countries increases, the demand for United States products and the purchasing power to secure such products increases.

Third. Small-business owners: The owners of small businesses are benefited by increased business opportunities arising from the activities in the Office of Small Business, FOA, including:

(a) Distribution overseas of 60,000 copies of a special directory listing 15,000 United States manufacturers.

(b) Placing United States firms in contact with foreign firms seeking business contracts, and

(c) Supplying United States firms with advance information about contracts which are to be financed by FOA.

Fourth. Investors: United States investors are benefited by increased overseas investment possibilities. The Investment Guaranty Program insures overseas investments against the nonbusiness risks of expropriation and nonconvertibility of foreign currency. Over $45 million in private overseas investments have already been guaranteed, with 50 applications for convertibility guaranties of about $60 million pending, and 27 applications for expropriation guaranties of about $30 million pending.

Fifth. Church groups and voluntary relief agencies: Many church groups and other organizations which ship articles of relief—clothing, food, medicine, and so forth—to overseas destinations are benefited by the provision of shipping facilities without cost to destinations throughout the world. Over 120 million pounds of relief supplies valued at $43 million have been shipped without cost as of March 31, 1954.

Sixth. Engineering firms: Engineering firms have entered into industrial contracts as part of programs financed by the Foreign Operations Administration of a value of over $60 million during the past 6 years.

Seventh. Universities and colleges: Twenty-five universities and colleges within the United States are participating, as of May 15, 1954, in 35 contracts of a value of $10,619,038 with foreign colleges and universities as part of programs financed by the Foreign Operations Administration. In fiscal year 1955 it is anticipated that approximately 50 new contracts will be entered of a value of about $15 million.

I was one of the sponsors of the provision in this bill, under section 103 (c) which limits the procurement of materials outside the United States when it has an adverse effect on the economy of this country. The purpose of this provision is to prevent unfair competition with production in this country, and give an equal opportunity to procure the same items here, especially from distressed labor areas such as those that have been placed in group 4 by our Labor Department.

I helped sponsor the provision in this bill which would dispose of $500 million agricultural surplus products abroad. This should be of great benefit to the farmers.

I supported the provisions in this bill which are designed to be of assistance to small business in helping them secure their share of defense contracts.

I also offered an amendment in committee which would have prohibited the use of our troops in Indochina for combat duty unless there has been previous approval by the Congress. The adoption of such an amendment, I believe, has been taken care of by section 102 of this bill. The report—page 11—bears out that fact:

> This section makes clear that United States military personnel can be assigned to foreign nations solely for noncombatant duty, including the furnishing of training and advice. This language is included to give reassurance that military assistance authorized in this bill does not include participation by United States forces in combat.

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

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, including the time allotted to the gentleman from Virginia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time because I want to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. On page 21 of the committee report there appears a tabulation of offshore procurement. It shows that for the fiscal year 1954 there was $56 million for the offshore procurement of ships. The table below indicates it is

tentatively planned to procure $28 million worth of ships offshore for the next fiscal year. Presumably that amount of money is in this bill. Can the gentleman tell me whether I am reading this proposition correctly?

Mr. VORYS. For offshore procurement of ships?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. That is all I know of. These are coastwise ships. I think, though, there are some vessels for Korea mentioned in another part of the bill.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to know first of all whether the committee has any fixed position that we must procure these valuable ships offshore at a time when our own shipbuilding industry is in such bad condition?

Mr. VORYS. The committee attempted to put language in section 103 which would limit offshore procurement. That is on page 4 of the bill, line 9 to the bottom of the page and onto the next page. All of section 103 (c) has to do with limitations on offshore procurement, that I think would have an effect on the shipbuilding industry.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. I have read that provision, but I still note it is tentatively planned to procure $28 million worth of ships overseas at a time when they are building more ships than we are and their shipbuilding industry is in a healthier condition than ours. It makes me a little sick when I see one of the great navy yards of this country, located in my district, that in World War II employed 45,000 people to keep our Navy ships building and in fighting condition, reduced now to 13,000, which is a little more than 20 percent below the peak which it occupied during Korea, not during World War II but during Korea. Where can these people go? There is no other industry to accommodate them. Their skills and know-how are going to be dissipated.

What is the answer we get from the Navy? The Navy says we are trying to carry on all of the shipbuilding industry in the United States. There is no merchant shipbuilding.

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

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman can straighten this out for me, I would be happy to yield, but if we spend 1 dime of this $28 million for offshore procurement of ships when our industry is in such poor condition, it is awfully poor judgment, in my book.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to join with the gentleman from Virginia in the statement he is making. I think it should be brought to the attention of this committee so far as offshore procurement of offshore vessels is concerned that what we are doing is bolstering up the yards abroad, which are much more vulnerable than our yards, which we are allowing to go by the wayside.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman. That is not only true, but the truth of the matter is we are weakening our own productive capacity to the point that if we are attacked any time soon we will be vulnerable.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Yesterday, during general debate, I called attention to the millions in this bill for more offshore procurement. I am glad to see the gentleman from Virginia get up here this afternoon as one of the first on the floor of the House to speak out against this business of gutting American industry and especially labor.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. On page 310 is the description of these vessels. I read from the testimony of Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Director of Offshore Procurement, Department of Defense:

> The new ship construction consists of two destroyer escorts which for special military reasons the Navy desires to purchase in Italy.

Note it is for special military reasons.

Mr. HARDY. If that is the case, I am going to ask the Navy for those reasons.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman ought to do that.

> The balance consists of inshore minesweepers—small vessels of a type produced only in Europe—and one net tender. There is a great advantage in such purchases in what the Navy designates as the user-builder principle. Under this, where practicable, the nation for which the ship is intended will build it.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman understand that testimony to mean we cannot build those ships in this country?

Mr. JUDD. It says that type of ship is not being built in this country; they are being built at this time only in the parts of Europe where they are to be used.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, let us get our minds back on the Harrison amendment. This amendment would effectively paralyze the plans and policy which our Government is formulating in the fluid and critical condition in Indochina and east Asia.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to talk about this amendment. You have a carryover of $500 million.

Mr. VORYS. That is right; $1,390,000,000 are involved. The amendment would leave the carryover, but would strike out the new money.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. You only spent $175 million last year?

Mr. VORYS. Yes, because the money for this year goes to the French to reimburse them for expenses in their calendar year of 1954. Their budget is different from ours, and so based on what has already been done, we will be making payments until the spring of next year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand that the minority views on page 2 state that the executive branch witnesses did not give you any details. Is that true?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct. This was left quite fluid.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to yield the remaining time to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope this amendment does not prevail. Of course, we all realize the necessity for passing this authorization bill. It will subsequently be followed by an appropriation bill, when again we will have another look at all of these items. I do not like to vote on items such as this when you cannot spell out definitely and distinctly exactly everything that you expect to do. But I have heard enough in the last few weeks and months to convince me that this situation in southeast Asia and in the western Pacific, as it has developed, is of such vital interest to the national defense of this country and to our security and welfare that it would be a terrible mistake to strike out this money.

As the gentleman from Ohio has said, the situation there is fluid. It changes from day to day. Under that sort of circumstance, no one is in a position to say at this moment just where this money would be used. All of us hope that part of Indochina at least can be saved. But whatever happens in Indochina, there are other great sections in that part of the world involved which, if they should fall, could well seriously threaten and would seriously threaten the security of our country. Certainly this is no time for us to back off. This is no time for us to evidence an abandonment of interest in that area of the world. I am afraid that the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia would be exactly in that direction.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader. Conditions are such in Asia and in the Pacific area at this time that it would be very unwise not to provide this money and it would be very unwise if we did not also provide the flexibility which is so necessary to meet any situation which might arise there.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may I say this particular item and the broad authority given to the President was discussed and agreed upon at the State Department at a very large bipartisan meeting. Now I do not mean to say for a minute that any such bipartisan group can bind the House of Representatives or the Committee of the Whole, but this broad authorization has not been decided on lightly and has not been passed on without the fullest information as to the difficult and dangerous situation which we face.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 122. Production for forces support: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955, to be made available on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds,

as he may specify, not to exceed $75 million for manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft required by United Kingdom forces for the defense of the North Atlantic area. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations made pursuant to section 102 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1955, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation made pursuant to the second clause of that section is authorized to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 14, line 9, strike out all of section 122, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 122. Production for forces support: The unexpended balances of appropriations made pursuant to section 102 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1955."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, this section which we have here is for the purpose of authorizing $75 million for the manufacture in Great Britain of military aircraft required by the United Kingdom forces.

I have this sheet which I showed when I was speaking on the other amendment, which is a status summary of the mutual-security program, as of April 30, 1954. Last year our dear friends and cousins received for this purpose for military aircraft from us the sum of $85 million. Looking on this summary we find as of April 30, 1954, there has remained of that sum, not only unexpended but also unobligated, $85 million—the entire amount. In other words, the executive branch has not yet been able to make up its mind how to expend or obligate those funds.

The amendment would reauthorize the unexpended amount last year, but would strike out any new money, which is $75 million.

I have here a statement which the Foreign Operations Administration got me through the American Embassy in London when I asked the question, "How much assistance does the British Government give to their Government aircraft industry?" In other words, I wanted to know whether this $75 million was for British military aircraft or British civil aircraft. Dr. FitzGerald says it is very difficult to answer my question because it is almost impossible to separate out assistance to commercial aircraft development from assistance to development of military aircraft. Quoting from this memorandum from our Embassy, I would like to read:

It is virtually impossible to determine quantitatively the amount of British Government assistance to civil aircraft development since the war. This is true for several reasons:

As in the United States, military and civil research and development are inextricably interrelated, and a method of determining the amount of government assistance properly allocable to each is not known to have been developed by the British.

The British often adapt to military use aircraft that have been originally developed for civil transport.

All engines used by British civil aircraft were developed for the military under military development contracts.

However, here, too, a division of the government aid between the military and civil has never been made, so far as the Embassy has been able to ascertain.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if you agree to the provision of this $75 million of new funds for the British military aircraft industry, you may very well some day find that you have voted for the subsidization of the British civilian aircraft industry.

In the time remaining to me, I would like to ask the distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Ohio, if he cares in his own individual capacity, not necessarily speaking as floor leader, to give me his own opinion as to whether this aid to the United Kingdom is justified with reference to the military aircraft—if he cares to do so at this time.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman embarrasses me somewhat. I cannot speak for the committee viewpoint on this item because, as the gentleman well knows, since this was outside our JCS force goal set up for Britain, I did not feel that it was the kind of economic aid that was necessary. However, the committee voted otherwise.

Mr. BENTLEY. I regret having embarrassed the gentleman, but I did value his individual viewpoint.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Would the gentleman please answer me as to what happened to the money we allocated last year to both France and Britain?

Mr. BENTLEY. In the case of France new money has not been requested, so I cannot give any details concerning it. But I know that, as of April 30, not a single penny of the British allocation has been spent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, is it not true that this is economic aid?

Mr. BENTLEY. Surely; it is direct budgetary support for the United Kingdom.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out here once again—I had planned to wait until the appropriation bill which presumably will follow this bill in support of this authorization—to make clear and to point out that in this bill what we are largely doing is underwriting our competitors in practically every direction that you may look.

I think it is wholly appropriate for us to pause a moment and realize just what is involved here in view of the farm bill which is to be taken up by this House immediately following disposition of the pending bill.

Did you know that under the terms of this bill they have been building 2,600 deep wells in India in order to irrigate land to enable them to compete with us for the cotton markets?

Did you realize that under mutual security and the preceding loans program that we set Italy up in the manufacture of synthetic fibers at the loss of markets to the farmers of the United States?

Did you realize that it is here we are underwriting the civilian air-manufacturing facilities of the British in years ahead to compete with our own?

Did you realize that by paying the bills of foreign countries through the years that we have had this program we have financed more soil conservation in those countries, 3 to 1, than we have in our own country?

Did you know that by financing the bills of these countries that we have reforested far more land in foreign countries than we can hope to get through this Congress to take care of our own?

Here is the point I want to make: In addition to what is in this bill, at a time when we have a stockpile of $104 billion worth of military materiel, when we spend $40 billion annually for national defense because of the dangerous international situation, we find the Secretary of Agriculture and the Vice President of the United States on the air saying that we should cut back our farm production in this country practically to that necessary to meet domestic needs. We have only about $6½ billion worth of so-called surplus commodities. Those commodities are not surplus to world needs, nor actually are they surplus to our security needs. Those commodities, due to the actions of those in Mutual Security and in the State Department, are not moving in world trade on a competitive basis. When offered they are offered on a prevailing price basis. That means that we offer at the prevailing world price; then when foreign countries reduce or discount theirs, we are not meeting their competitive price. We hold ours back. We therefore are merely a residual supplier. Remember the Commodity Credit Corporation has the authority to sell now—but by administrative policy the Corporation is prevented from doing so.

I say to you today, Mr. Chairman, that when we continue through this foreign aid program to underwrite the competition against the United States in every field throughout the world, and then by a trade policy limit our commodities to domestic consumption, and as a result have the administration strike at the program which protects American agriculture, you are being awfully shortsighted. I think it is time, just before the farm bill comes up for consideration, to realize that in addition to the foreign aid you provide here, you are also, as Government policy, holding American farmers out of the markets that our people have enjoyed over the years. The policy in effect limits American agriculture to producing for the domestic market only. I say that does not lead to peace, it does not lead to security at home for a prosperous agriculture is the basis for our whole economy.

May I point out that the commodities that may be provided through this bill, are not given to the peoples of these countries; they are given to incumbent governments which sell them to the people of their countries, most of whom think we are making a profit. If through this means we underwrite the existing factions in control of the countries of the world, what fix are we going to be in

when the outs finally do get in in those countries? They do not differ from our own. Here we are running overboard to increase the authorization for foreign aid when there is more than $9 billion now that have not been committed and that have not been used. You would authorize even before they used the last we gave them.

I do not have to remind you that when we voted for the Marshall plan, we set a limit of 4 years, yet years later we are doing the same thing, pouring out the natural resources of the United States to every country in the world so that they may have the markets we need. The same leadership that sponsors this bill will be here in less than 2 days asking you to reduce the supports on American agricultural products and to force reductions in production almost to normal needs, all at a time when this Government is holding our commodities off world markets at competitive prices. By the bill before us you will create new competitors.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, because of the widespread interest in the subject matter involved, I take this opportunity of advising the House of a statement that has just been made by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Commission announced today that it had reached a decision in the matter of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

The Commission by a vote of 4 to 1 decided that Dr. Oppenheimer should be denied access to restricted data. Commissioners Strauss, Murray, Zuckert, and Campbell voted to deny clearance for access to restricted data, and Commissioner Smyth voted to reinstate clearance for access to restricted data. Messrs. Strauss, Zuckert, and Campbell signed the majority opinion; Mr. Murray concurred with the majority decision in a separate opinion. Dr. Smyth supported his conclusion in a minority opinion.

Certain members of the Commission issued additional statements in support of their conclusions. These opinions and statements follow:

UNITED STATES,
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1954.

The issue before the Commission is whether the security of the United States warrants Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's continued access to restricted data of the Atomic Energy Commission. The data to which Dr. Oppenheimer has had until recently full access include some of the most vital secrets in the possession of the United States.

Having carefully studied the pertinent documents, the transcript of the hearings before the Personnel Security Board (Gray Board), the findings and recommendation of the Board, the briefs of Dr. Oppenheimer's counsel, and the findings and recommendation of the General Manager, we have concluded that Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance for access to restricted data should not be reinstated.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 lays upon the Commissioners the duty to reach a determination as to the character, associations, and loyalty of the individuals engaged in the work of the Commission. Thus, disloyalty would be one basis for disqualification, but it is only one. Substantial defects of character and imprudent and dangerous associations, particularly with known subversives who place the interests of foreign powers above those of the United States, are also reasons for disqualification.

On the basis of the record before the Commission, comprising the transcript of the hearing before the Gray Board as well as reports of Military Intelligence and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we find Dr. Oppenheimer is not entitled to the continued confidence of the Government and of this Commission because of the proof of fundamental defects in his character.

In respect to the criterion of "associations," we find that his associations with persons known to him to be Communists have extended far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint which are to be expected of one holding the high positions that the Government has continuously entrusted to him since 1942. These associations have lasted too long to be justified as merely the intermittent and accidental revival of earlier friendships.

Neither in the deliberations by the full Commission nor in the review of the Gray Board was importance attached to the opinions of Dr. Oppenheimer as they bore upon the 1949 debate within the Government on the question of whether the United States should proceed with the thermonuclear weapon program. In this debate Dr. Oppenheimer was, of course, entitled to his opinion.

The fundamental issues here are apart from and beyond this episode. The history of their development is as follows:

On December 23, 1953, Dr. Oppenheimer was notified that his security clearance had been suspended, and he was provided with the allegations which had brought his trustworthiness into question. He was also furnished with a copy of the Atomic Energy Commission's Security Clearance Procedures, and was informed of his right to a hearing under those procedures. By telegram dated January 29, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer requested a hearing. On March 4, 1954, after requesting and receiving three extensions of time, he submitted his answer to the letter of December 23, 1953. On March 15, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer was informed that Mr. Gordon Gray, Mr. Thomas A. Morgan, and Dr. Ward V. Evans would conduct the hearing.

The hearing before the Gray Board commenced on April 12, 1954, and continued through May 6, 1954. Dr. Oppenheimer was represented by 4 lawyers. He was present to confront all witnesses; he had the opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses; his counsel made both oral and written argument to the Board.

The Board submitted its Findings and Recommendation to the General Manager of the Commission on May 27, 1954. A majority of the Board recommended against reinstatement of clearance, Dr. Evans dissenting.

Dr. Oppenheimer had full advantage of the security procedures of the Commission. In our opinion he had a just hearing.

On May 28, 1954, the General Manager notified Dr. Oppenheimer of the adverse recommendation of the Personnel Security Board and forwarded to him a copy of the Board's Findings and Recommendation. The General Manager informed Dr. Oppenheimer of his right to request review of his case by the Personnel Security Review Board. Dr. Oppenheimer was also informed that upon consideration of the record in the case—including the recommendation of the Personnel Security Review Board in the event review by that Board was requested—the General Manager would submit to the Commission his own recommendation as to whether or not clearance should be reinstated and that the Commission would thereafter make the final determination.

By letter of June 1, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer waived his right to a review of his case by the Personnel Security Review Board. He requested immediate consideration of his case by the Commission. On June 7, 1954, his counsel submitted a written brief to the Commission. The General Manager reviewed the testimony and the Findings and Recommendation of the Gray Board and the briefs; his conclusion that Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance should not be reinstated was submitted to the Commission on June 12, 1954.

Prior to these proceedings, the derogatory information in Government files concerning Dr. Oppenheimer had never been weighed by any board on the basis of sworn testimony.

The important result of these hearings was to bring out significant information bearing upon Dr. Oppenheimer's character and associations hitherto unknown to the Commission and presumably unknown also to those who testified as character witnesses on his behalf. These hearings additionally established as fact many matters which previously had been only allegations.

In weighing the matter at issue, we have taken into account Dr. Oppenheimer's past contributions to the atomic energy program. At the same time, we have been mindful of the fact that the positions of high trust and responsibility which Dr. Oppenheimer has occupied carried with them a commensurately high obligation of unequivocal character and conduct on his part. A Government official having access to the most sensitive areas of restricted data and to the innermost details of national war plans and weapons must measure up to exemplary standards of reliability, self-discipline, and trustworthiness. Dr. Oppenheimer has fallen far short of acceptable standards.

The record shows that Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently placed himself outside the rules which govern others. He has falsified in matters wherein he was charged with grave responsibilities in the national interest. In his associations he has repeatedly exhibited a willful disregard of the normal and proper obligations of security.

As to "character":

(1) Dr. Oppenheimer has now admitted under oath that while in charge of the Los Alamos laboratory and working on the most secret weapon development for the Government, he told Colonel Pash a fabrication of lies. Colonel Pash was an offcer of military intelligence charged with the duty of protecting the atomic weapons project against spies. Dr. Oppenheimer told Colonel Pash in circumstantial detail of an attempt by a Soviet agent to obtain from him information about the work on the atom bomb. This was the Haakon Chevalier incident. In the hearings recently concluded, Dr. Oppenheimer under oath swears that the story he told Colonel Pash was a "whole fabrication and tissue of lies" (tr., p. 149).

It is not clear today whether the account Dr. Oppenheimer gave to Colonel Pash in 1943 concerning the Chevalier incident or the story he told the Gray board last month is the true version.

If Dr. Oppenheimer lied in 1943, as he now says he did, he committed the crime of knowingly making false and material statements to a Federal officer. If he lied to the board, he committed perjury in 1954.

(2) Dr. Oppenheimer testified to the Gray board that if he had known Giovanni Rossi Lomanitz was an active Communist or that Lomanitz had disclosed information about the atomic project to an unauthorized person, he would not have written to Colonel Lansdale of the Manhattan District the letter of October 19, 1943, in which Dr. Op-

penheimer supported the desire of Lomanitz to return to the atomic project.

The record shows, however, that on August 26, 1943, Dr. Oppenheimer told Colonel Pash that he (Oppenheimer) knew that Lomanitz had revealed information about the project. Furthermore, on September 12, 1943, Dr. Oppenheimer told Colonel Lansdale that he (Oppenheimer) had previously learned for a fact that Lomanitz was a Communist Party member (tr., pp. 118, 119, 128, 129, 143, 875).

(3) In 1943, Dr. Oppenheimer indicated to Colonel Lansdale that he did not know Rudy Lambert, a Communist Party functionary. In fact, Dr. Oppenheimer asked Colonel Lansdale what Lambert looked like. Now, however, Dr. Oppenheimer under oath has admitted that he knew and had seen Lambert at least half a dozen times prior to 1943; he supplied a detailed description of Lambert; he said that once or twice he had lunch with Lambert and Isaac Folkoff, another Communist Party functionary, to discuss his (Oppenheimer's) contributions to the Communist Party; and that he knew at the time that Lambert was an official in the Communist Party (tr. pp. 139, 140, 877).

(4) In 1949, Dr. Oppenheimer testified before a closed session of the House Un-American Activities Committee about the Communist Party membership and activities of Dr. Bernard Peters. A summary of Dr. Oppenheimer's testimony subsequently appears in a newspaper, the Rochester Times Union. Dr. Oppenheimer then wrote a letter to that newspaper. The effect of that letter was to contradict the testimony he had given a congressional committee (tr. pp. 210–215).

(5) In connection with the meeting of the General Advisory Committee on October 29, 1949, at which the thermonuclear-weapon program was considered, Dr. Oppenheimer testified before the Gray Board that the General Advisory Committee was "surprisingly unanimous" in its recommendation that the United States ought not to take the initiative at that time in a thermonuclear program. Now, however, under cross-examination, Dr. Oppenheimer testifies that he did not know how Dr. Seaborg (one of the nine members of Dr. Oppenheimer's committee) then felt about the program, because Dr. Seaborg "was in Sweden, and there was no communication with him." On being confronted with a letter from Dr. Seaborg to him dated October 14, 1949—a letter which had been in Dr. Oppenheimer's files—Dr. Oppenheimer admitted having received the letter prior to the General Advisory Committee meeting in 1949. In that letter Dr. Seaborg said: "Although I deplore the prospects of our country putting a tremendous effort into this, I must confess that I have been unable to come to the conclusion that we should not." Yet Dr. Seaborg's view was not mentioned in Dr. Oppenheimer's report for the General Advisory Committee to the Commission in October 1949. In fact, the existence of this letter remained unknown to the Commission until it was disclosed during the hearings (tr. pp. 233, 237–241).

(6) In 1950, Dr. Oppenheimer told an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that he had not known Joseph Weinberg to be a member of the Communist Party until that fact became public knowledge. Yet on September 12, 1943, Dr. Oppenheimer told Colonel Lansdale that Weinberg was a Communist Party member (tr., p. 875).

The catalog does not end with these six examples. The work of Military Intelligence, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Atomic Energy Commission—all, at one time or another have felt the effect of his falsehoods, evasions and misrepresentations.

Dr. Oppenheimer's persistent and willful disregard for the obligations of security is evidenced by his obstruction of inquiries by security officials. In the Chevalier incident, Dr. Oppenheimer was questioned in 1943 by Colonel Pash, Colonel Lansdale and General Groves about the attempt to obtain information from him on the atomic bomb project in the interest of the Soviet Government. He had waited 8 months before mentioning the occurrence to the proper authorities. Thereafter for almost 4 months Dr. Oppenheimer refused to name the individual who had approached him. Under oath he now admits that his refusal to name the individual impeded the Government's investigation of espionage. The record shows other instances where Dr. Oppenheimer has refused to answer inquiries of Federal officials on security matters or has been deliberately misleading.

As to "associations":

"Associations" is a factor which, under the law, must be considered by the Commission. Dr. Oppenheimer's close association with Communists is another part of the pattern of his disregard of the obligations of security.

Dr. Oppenheimer, under oath, admitted to the Gray Board that from 1937 to at least 1942 he made regular and substantial contributions in cash to the Communist Party. He has admitted that he was a fellow-traveler at least until 1942. He admits that he attended small evening meetings at private homes at which most, if not all, of the others present were Communist Party members. He was in contact with officials of the Communist Party, some of whom had been engaged in espionage. His activities were of such a nature that these Communists looked upon him as one of their number.

However, Dr. Oppenheimer's early Communist associations are not in themselves a controlling reason for our decision.

They take on importance in the context of his persistent and continuing association with Communists, including his admitted meetings with Haakon Chevalier in Paris as recently as last December—the same individual who had been intermediary for the Soviet consulate in 1943.

On February 25, 1950, Dr. Oppenheimer wrote a letter to Chevalier attempting "to clear the record with regard to your alleged involvement in the atom business." Chevalier used this letter in connection with his application to the State Department for a United States passport. Later that year Chevalier came and stayed with Dr. Oppenheimer for several days at the latter's home. In December 1953 Dr. Oppenheimer visited with Chevalier privately on two occasions in Paris and lent his name to Chevalier's dealings with the United States Embassy in Paris on a problem which, according to Dr. Oppenheimer, involved Chevalier's clearance. Dr. Oppenheimer admitted that today he has only a "strong guess" that Chevalier is not active in Communist Party affairs.

These episodes, separately and together, present a serious picture. It is clear that for one who has had access for so long to the most vital defense secrets of the Government and who would retain such access if his clearance were continued Dr. Oppenheimer has defaulted, not once but many times, upon the obligations that should and must be willingly borne by citizens in the national service.

Concern for the defense and security of the United States requires that Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance should not be reinstated.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is hereby denied access to restricted data.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.
EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,[1]
Commissioner.
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,[1]
Commissioner.

[1] See additional statements by Commissioners Zuckert and Campbell, and separate opinion, concurring with the decision, by Commissioner Murray.

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER ZUCKERT

1. BASIS OF AGREEING TO DENY ACCESS

In subscribing to the majority decision and the substance of the Commission opinion, I have considered the evidence as a whole and no single factor as decisive. For example, Dr. Oppenheimer's early Communist associations by themselves would not have led me to my conclusion. The more recent connections, such as those with Lomanitz and Bohm, would not have been decisive. The serious 1943 incident involving Chevalier would not have been conclusive, although most disturbing and certainly aggravated by the continuation of the relationship between Chevalier and Dr. Oppenheimer. Individual instances of lack of veracity, conscious disregard of security considerations and obstruction of proper security inquiries would not have been decisive.

But when I see such a combination of seriously disturbing actions and events as are present in this case, then I believe the risk to security passes acceptable bounds. All these actions and events and the relation between them make no other conclusion possible in my opinion than to deny clearance to Dr. Oppenheimer.

There follow some additional observations of my own which I believe are pertinent in the consideration of this case and the problems underlying it.

It is a source of real sadness to me that my last act as a public official should be participation in the determination of this matter, involving as it does, an individual who has made a substantial contribution to the United States. This matter certainly reflects the difficult times in which we live.

2. SECURITY IN 1954

The fact is that this country is faced with a real menace to our national security which manifests itself in a great variety of ways. We are under the necessity of defending ourselves against a competent and ruthless force possessed of the great advantage that accompanies the initiative. There is no opportunity which this force would not exploit to weaken our courage and confuse our strength.

The degree of attention which Dr. Oppenheimer's status has evoked is indication of the extent to which this force has imposed upon us a new degree of intensity of concern with "security." There has always been a recognition of the need for security precautions when war threatened or was actually in progress. It is new and disquieting that security must concern us so much in times that have so many of the outward indications of peace. Security must indeed become a daily concern in our lives as far as we can see ahead.

In this Nation, I believe we have really commenced to understand this only within the past 10 years. It would be unrealistic to imagine that in that brief period of time we could have acquired a well-rounded understanding, much less an acceptance, of the implications of such a change in our way of life. It will not prove easy to harmonize the requirements of security with such basic concepts as personal freedom. It will be a long and difficult process to construct a thoroughly articulated security system that will be effective in protecting strength and yet maintain the basic fabric of our liberties.

It is clear that one essential requirement of the struggle in which this Nation is engaged is that we be decisive and yet maintain a difficult balance in our actions. For example, we must maintain a positive armed strength, yet in such a manner that we do not impair our ability to support that strength. We must be vigilant to the dangers and deceits of militant communism without the hysteria that breeds witchhunts. We must strive to maintain that measure of discipline required by real and present-day danger without destroying such freedoms as

the freedom of honest thought. Our Nation's problem is more difficult because of a fundamental characteristic of a democratic system: We seek to be a positive force without a dominated uniformity in thought and action dictated by a small group in power.

The decision in this particular matter before us must be made not in 1920 or 1930 or 1940. It has to be made in the year 1954 in the light of the necessities of today and, inevitably, with whatever limitations of viewpoint 1954 creates. One fact that gives me reassurance is that this decision was reached only after the most intensive and concerned study following a course of procedure which gave the most scrupulous attention to our ideas of justice and fair treatment.

The problem before this Commission is whether Dr. Oppenheimer's status as a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission constitutes a security risk.

3. THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY RISK

One of the difficulties in the development of a healthy security system is the achievement of public understanding of the phrase "security risk." It has, unfortunately, acquired in many minds the connotation of active disloyalty. As a result, it is not realized that the determination of "security risk" must be applied to individuals where the circumstances may be considerably less derogatory than disloyalty. In the case of Dr. Oppenheimer the evidence which convinced me that his employment was not warranted on security grounds did not justify an accusation of disloyalty.

The "security risk" concept has evolved in recent years as a part of our search for a security system which will add to the protection of the country. In that quest, certain limited guidelines have emerged. With respect to eligibility of people for sensitive positions in our Government we have said, in effect, that there must be a convincing showing that their employment in such positions will not constitute a risk to our security. Except in the clearest of cases, such as present Communist membership, for example, the determination may not be an easy one. In many cases, like the one before us, a complex qualitative determination is required. One inherent difficulty is that every human being is to some degree a security risk. So long as there are normal human feelings like pain, or emotions like love of family, everyone is to some degree vulnerable to influence, and thus a potential risk in some degree to our security.

Under our security system it is our duty to determine how much of a risk is involved in respect to any particular individual and then to determine whether that risk is worth taking in view of what is at stake and the job to be done. It is not possible, except in obvious cases, to determine in what precise manner our security might be endangered. The determination is rather an evaluation of the factors which tend to increase the chance that security might be endangered. Our experience has convinced us that certain types of association and defects of character can materially increase the risk to security.

Those factors—many of which are set forth in the majority opinion—are present in Dr. Oppenheimer's case to such an extent that I agree he is a security risk.

4. POSSIBILITY OF AN ALTERNATIVE ACTION

There have been suggestions that there may be a possible alternative short of finding Dr. Oppenheimer a security risk. One possibility suggested was that the Commission might merely allow Dr. Oppenheimer's consultant's contract to lapse when it expires on June 30, 1954, and thereafter not use his services. I have given the most serious consideration to this possibility and have concluded that it is not practical.

The unique place that Dr. Oppenheimer has built for himself in the scientific world and as a top Government adviser make it necessary that there be a clear-cut determination whether he is to be given access to the security information within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

As a scientist, Dr. Oppenheimer's greatest usefulness has been as a scientific administrator and a scientific critic. He has been looked to for scientific judgment by people within the profession. He is a personality in whom students place particular reliance for leadership and inspiration. These qualities, coupled with a nature that enables him to keep in active touch with great numbers of people in the scientific professions, have given him a unique place in the scientific community.

The Commission's clearance has permitted Dr. Oppenheimer to carry out his role as an active consultant of scientists. For example, Los Alamos Laboratory reports on the most intimate details of the progress of the thermonuclear and fission programs have continued to flow to him. I would gather that these reports were sent to Dr. Oppenheimer because his leadership and scientific judgment were recognized, and it was felt that he should be kept intensively abreast of the development of the weapon art.

I think the Commission is clearly obligated to determine whether Dr. Oppenheimer may continue to carry out this function and whether scientists may continue to call upon him as they have in the past in regard to highly classified material.

In addition, the scope of Dr. Oppenheimer's activities as a top adviser to various agencies of Government on national security policies make imperative a determination of his security status.

After the development of the atomic bomb and the end of World War II, Dr. Oppenheimer was quite suddenly projected into a far more important capacity than he had held as a scientist and laboratory director at Los Alamos. He was given responsibilities for the formulation of international controls of atomic energy. His post as chairman of the General Advisory Committee and a host of other committees in the Defense Establishment made him an adviser on national security problems at the top level of Government. His advice was sought on many matters in which science or technical aspects of atomic energy were important, but important as incidentals and background. With his unique experience, his intellect, his breadth of interests, and his articulateness, it was almost inevitable that he was consulted on a growing number of national security policy matters. As a result, his degree of access to the detailed essentials of our most secret information was, in my opinion, among the greatest of any individuals in our Government. I doubt that there have been contemporaneously more than a handful of people at the highest levels who have possessed the amount of sensitive information which was given to Dr. Oppenheimer.

Since Dr. Oppenheimer's retirement from the General Advisory Committee he has been employed as a consultant to the Commission. It is true that since 1952 the Commission has used him very little. Commission clearance has, however, been a basis for other agencies using him in connection with delicate problems of national security. It is logical to expect that would continue. For example, the Commission has recently received a letter from Dr. DuBridge, chairman of the Science Advisory Committee, Office of Defense Mobilization, which says:

"Our committee is planning to undertake during the coming months an intensive study of important matters related to national security on which Dr. Oppenheimer's knowledge and counsel will be of critical importance."

I believe that the outlined facts concerning Dr. Oppenheimer's activities in the scientific profession and employment by the Government demonstrate that the Commission could not decide the matter on any other basis than to grant or deny clearance. Any other action would merely postpone the problem. His activities cannot be compartmented to some particular area of scientific effort. It is only reasonable to expect that he would be used in connection with broad assignments such as he has had in the past. Inevitably the question would arise whether he should be given access to the most sensitive restricted data which is under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Therefore, there must be a determination as to his security status with respect to this data.

All of the facts concerning Dr. Oppenheimer's activities, scientific and governmental, and the consequent access to vital information emphasize the degree of his security responsibility.

For the reasons outlined in the first paragraph of these comments, I conclude that he falls substantially below the standard required by that responsibility. There seems to me no possible alternative to denying Dr. Oppenheimer clearance.

5. THERMONUCLEAR CONTROVERSY DISREGARDED

There is one final comment which I should add. My decision in this matter was influenced neither by the actions nor by the attitudes of Dr. Oppenheimer concerning the development of thermonuclear weapons. Nor did I consider material any advice given by Dr. Oppenheimer in his capacity as a top-level consultant on national security affairs.

In my judgment, it was proper to include Dr. Oppenheimer's activities regarding the thermonuclear program as part of the derogatory allegations that initiated these proceedings. Allegations had been made that Dr. Oppenheimer was improperly motivated.

The Gray Board, although doubting the complete veracity of Dr. Oppenheimer's explanations, found that these most serious allegations were not substantiated. I have carefully reviewed the evidence and concur in the finding.

CONCURRING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL

On November 7, 1953, Mr. William L. Borden, legislative secretary to the late Senator Brien McMahon in 1948 and later Executive Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1949 to June 1953, addressed a letter to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation relative to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

In this letter Mr. Borden, who had previously had access to the Atomic Energy Commission files and FBI reports concerning Dr. Oppenheimer, made very grave accusations, allegations, and charges pertaining to the character, loyalty, and associations of Dr. Oppenheimer. Upon receipt of this letter, the FBI prepared a summary report on Dr. Oppenheimer, and November 30, 1953, distributed that report and the Borden letter to interested agencies of the Government, including the Office of the President.

On December 10, 1953, the Commission unanimously voted to institute the regular procedures of the Commission to determine the veracity or falsity of the charges. At the direction of, and with the unanimous approval of the Commission, the General Manager on December 23, 1953, informed Dr. Oppenheimer of the substance of the information which raised the question concerning his eligibility for employment on Atomic Energy Commission work and notified him of the steps which he could take to assist in the resolution of the question.

At the request of counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer, an extension of time was granted Dr. Oppenheimer for the preparation of his case. Other extensions were subsequently granted. On March 15, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer was no-

tified that Mr. Thomas A. Morgan, Mr. Gordon Gray, and Dr. Ward V. Evans had been selected for the Personnel Security Board. On March 17, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer, by letter, advised the Commission that he had received the notification of the membership of the Board and that he knew of no reason why he should challenge any member of that Board, as it was his right to do under the personnel security procedures of the Atomic Energy Commission.

As early as January 18, 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer's counsel discussed the possibility of securing Q clearance with the Chairman and the General Manager of the Commission, and he was notified that clearance would be expedited as rapidly as possible if he would submit the required papers. These papers were not submitted until March 26, 1954—over 60 days later.

During the week of April 5 through 9, the Personnel Security Board met and familiarized themselves with the pertinent files relative to Dr. Oppenheimer. On April 12 the hearings began and were continued until May 6. After a 10-day recess the Board convened again on May 17.

On May 17, 1954, counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer submitted a brief to the Personnel Security Board which was included in the record.

On May 18, 1954, the Commission moved that each step the case of Dr. Oppenheimer be brought to the Commission for a vote. This motion was carried 3 to 2. I voted against this motion since I felt that this was a very definite change in the official procedures. In my opinion, it was not desirable to change the rules in the midst of the proceedings. At this same Commission meeting on May 18, I moved that the procedures, as published in the Federal Register, be revised to indicate that, after determination had been made by the General Manager, the Commission would make the final determination in this matter. This motion did not carry by a vote of 3 to 2.

A recommendation was submitted by the Personnel Security Board to the General Manager on May 27, 1954. In essence the recommendation of the Personnel Security Board, by a 2-to-1 majority, was that: "We have, however, been unable to arrive at the conclusion that it would be clearly consistent with the security interests of the United States to reinstate Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance and, therefore, do not so recommend."

Upon receipt of the recommendation of the Board, the General Manager notified counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer on May 28 of the majority and minority recommendations of the Board and furnished a copy of the Personnel Security Board report. At the same time notification was given that Dr. Oppenheimer was entitled to make an appeal to the Personnel Security Review Board. The General Manager further stated that following such an appeal he would make a recommendation and the Commission would then make a final determination in the case.

By letter of June 1, counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer responded that they would waive the right of appeal to the Personnel Security Review Board and instead wished to present oral arguments and a written brief directly to the Commission for a final determination.

On June 3, 1954, the Commission denied the counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer the privilege of oral agrument before the Commission but granted permission to file a written brief with the provision that the brief be presented on or before June 7. It was my personal opinion that this permission constituted another departure from the procedures, but my view was not sustained by my colleagues.

Counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer filed a brief with the Commission on June 7, 1954.

On June 12, the general manager submitted his findings to the Commission in which he reaffirmed the recommendation of the Gray board. The general manager's letter stated:

"I have reviewed the entire record of the case, including the files, the transcript of the hearing, the findings and recommendation of the Personnel Security Board and the briefs filed by Dr. Oppenheimer's attorneys on May 17, 1954, and June 7, 1954, and have reached the conclusion that to reinstate the security clearance of Dr. Oppenheimer would not be clearly consistent with the interests of national security and would endanger the common defense and security."

In addition, Mr. Nichols stated:

"In regard to Dr. Oppenheimer's net worth to atomic energy projects, I believe, first, that through World War II he was of tremendous value and absolutely essential. Secondly, I believe that since World War II his value to the Atomic Energy Commission as a scientist or as a consultant has declined because of the rise in competence and skill of other scientists and because of his loss of scientific objectivity probably resulting from the diversion of his efforts to political fields and matters not purely scientific in nature. Further, it should be pointed out that in the past 2 years since he has ceased to be a member of the General Advisory Committee, his services have been utilized by the Atomic Energy Commission on the following occasions only:

"October 16 and 17, 1952.

"September 1 and 2, 1953.

"September 21 and 22, 1953.

"I doubt that the Atomic Energy Commission, even if the question of his security clearance had not arisen, would have utilized his services to a markedly greater extent during the next few years. * * * Dr. Oppenheimer. * * * is far from being indispensable. * * * Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance should not be reinstated."

On June 28, 1954, the question of the clearance of Dr. Oppenheimer was presented to the Commission and by a vote of 4 to 1 it was decided that clearance should be denied him.

My vote was to sustain the recommendations of the Gray Board and the General Manager for the following reasons:

1. I have had no personal associations with Dr. Oppenheimer and no personal knowledge as to his contributions to the atomic energy program. Neither do I have any personal knowledge as to his character, loyalty, and associations.

The responsibility of a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission in a proceeding of this type is, in my view, an appellate responsibility.

2. Having examined the transcript of the hearings, it is established that Dr. Oppenheimer had an opportunity prior to the hearings to challenge the members of the Board and did not choose to do so. At all times, Dr. Oppenheimer was represented by four attorneys. At no time during the course of the hearings has the integrity, honesty, and impartiality of any of the Board members been subject to challenge by any parties to the proceedings. Dr. Oppenheimer, through his counsel, has had the opportunity to produce any witnesses he desired to call on his behalf. Through his counsel he had opportunity to cross-examine any persons who testified on items which he might have considered to be of a derogatory nature. Ample opportunity was given to Dr. Oppenheimer's counsel to present their case. In fact, extensions and delays were granted, which by some might be considered unreasonable, so that there can be no possibility that there was any pressure of time in the presentation of the information which Dr. Oppenheimer desired to place before the Board.

3. From an examination of the transcript and from the report, both majority and minority of the Board, it is evident that the members of the Board were fully aware of the criteria which had been established by the Atomic Energy Commission and by the various Executive orders and public laws relative to the clearance of individuals for classified work. At no time was any question raised by any party to the proceedings as to the competence of the Board insofar as its knowledge of the criteria and procedures under which the hearing was being conducted.

4. I have carefully studied the recommendations of the General Manager and have concluded that from the presentation of the testimony before the Personnel Security Board and the information made available to the parties in the proceedings from the investigative files, the General Manager has arrived at the only possible conclusion available to a reasonable and prudent man.

The finding, by the General Manager, that the services of Dr. Oppenheimer are not indispensable to the atomic-energy program, is compelling.

5. I have read the brief submitted by counsel for Dr. Oppenheimer to the Atomic Energy Commission and though this brief is argumentative and perhaps persuasive to some, it contains no new evidence and it does not directly or indirectly charge that Dr. Oppenheimer has been unfairly treated or deprived of a full and complete opportunity to make the best possible presentation available in his defense.

(I neither concur nor dissent from the findings of the Personnel Security Board and the General Manager relating to the allegation that Dr. Oppenheimer initially opposed and later declined to cooperate in the program for the development of thermonuclear weapons. It is my view that the opinions and judgments of Dr. Oppenheimer on this subject were not relevant to the inquiry. I, therefore, have made my determination as to Dr. Oppenheimer's fitness for continued employment upon other evidence and testimony presented which bears on his loyalty, character, and associations.)

CONCLUSION

I conclude, therefore, that serious charges were brought against Dr. Oppenheimer; that he was afforded every opportunity to refute them; that a Board was appointed, composed of men of the highest honor and integrity, and that in their majority opinion Dr. Oppenheimer did not refute the serious charges which faced him; that the record was reviewed by the General Manager, keenly aware of his serious responsibility in this matter, and that he concurred, and even strengthened the findings of the Personnel Security Board.

If the security system of the United States Government is to be successfully operated, the recommendations of Personnel Security Boards must be honored in the absence of compelling circumstances. If the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission is to function properly, his decisions must be upheld unless there can be shown new evidence, violations of procedures, or other substantial reasons why they should be reversed.

Therefore, I voted to reaffirm the majority recommendation of the Personnel Security Board and to uphold the decision of the General Manager. Clearance should be denied to Dr. Oppenheimer.

CONCURRING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER THOMAS E. MURRAY

I concur in the conclusion of the majority of the Commission that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's access to restricted data should be denied. However, I have reached this conclusion by my own reasoning which does not coincide with the majority of the Commission. Therefore, I submit my separate opinion.

In my opinion the Personnel Security Board report and the recommendations of the General Manager as well as the majority opinion do not correctly interpret the

evidence in the case. They do not make sharply enough certain necessary distinctions. They do not do justice to certain important principles. What is more important they do not meet squarely the primary issue which the case raises.

The primary issue is the meaning of loyalty. I shall define this concept concretely within the conditions created by the present crisis of national and international security. When loyalty is thus concretely defined, and when all the evidence is carefully considered in the light of this definition, it will be evident that Dr. Oppenheimer was disloyal.

There is a preliminary question. It concerns Dr. Oppenheimer's opposition to the hydrogen-bomb program and his influence on the development of the program. On this count I do not find evidence that would warrant the denial to Dr. Oppenheimer of a security clearance.

I find that the record clearly proves that Dr. Oppenheimer's judgment was in error in several respects. It may well be that the security interests of the United States were adversely affected in consequence of his judgment. But it would be unwise, unjust, and dangerous to admit, as a principle, that errors of judgment, especially in complicated situations, can furnish valid grounds for later indictments of a man's loyalty, character, or status as a security risk. It has happened before in the long history of the United States that the national interests were damaged by errors of judgment committed by Americans in positions of responsibility. But these men did not for this reason cease to merit the trust of their country.

Dr. Oppenheimer advanced technical and political reasons for his attitude to the hydrogen-bomb program. In both respects he has been proved wrong; nothing further need be said.

He also advanced moral reasons. Here two comments are necessary. First, in deciding matters of national policy, it is imperative that the views of experts should always be carefully weighed and never barred from discussion or treated lightly. However, Dr. Oppenheimer's opinions in the field of morality possess no special authority. Second, even though Dr. Oppenheimer is not an expert in morality, he was quite right in advancing moral reasons for his attitude to the hydrogen-bomb program. The scientist is a man before he is a technician. Like every man, he ought to be alert to the moral issues that arise in the course of his work. This alertness is part of his general human and civic responsibilities, which go beyond his responsibilities as a scientist. When he has moral doubts, he has a right to voice them. Furthermore, it must be firmly maintained, as a principle both of justice and of religious freedom, that opposition to governmental policies, based on sincerely held moral opinions, need not make a man a security risk.

The issue of Dr. Oppenheimer's lack of enthusiasm for the hydrogen-bomb program has been raised; so too has the issue of his failure to communicate to other scientists his abandonment of his earlier opposition to the program. Here an important distinction is in order. Government may command a citizen's service in the national interest. But government cannot command a citizen's enthusiasm for any particular program or policy projected in the national interests. The citizen remains free to be enthusiastic or not at the impulse of his own inner convictions. These convictions remain always immune from governmental judgment or control. Lack of enthusiasm is not a justiciable matter.

The point that I shall later make in another connection is pertinent here. The crisis in which we live, and the security regulations which it has rendered necessary in the interests of the common good, have made it difficult to insure that justice is done to the individual. In this situation it is more than ever necessary to protect at every point the distinction between the external forum of action and omission, and the internal forum of thought and belief. A man's service to his country may come under judgment; it lies in the external forum. A man's enthusiasm for service, or his lack of it, do not come under judgment; they are related to the internal forum of belief, and are therefore remote from all the agencies of law.

The citizen's duty remains always that of reasonable service, just as the citizen's right remains always that of free opinion. There is no requirement, inherent in the idea of civic duty, that would oblige a man to show enthusiasm for particular governmental policies, or to use his influence in their favor, against his own convictions; just as there is no permission, inherent in the idea of intellectual freedom, that would allow a man to block established governmental policies, against the considered judgment of their responsible authors.

The conclusion is that the evidence with regard to Dr. Oppenheimer's attitude toward the hydrogen-bomb program, when it is rightly interpreted in the light of sound democratic principles, does not warrant the denial to Dr. Oppenheimer of a security clearance.

The primary question concerns Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty. This idea must be carefully defined, first, in general, and second, in concrete and contemporary terms.

The idea of loyalty has emotional connotations; it is related to the idea of love, a man's love of his country. However, the substance of loyalty does not reside solely in feeling or sentiment. It cannot be defined solely in terms of love.

The English word "loyal" comes to us from the Latin adjective "legalis," which means "according to the law." In its substance the idea of loyalty is related to the idea of law. To be loyal, in Webster's definition, "is to be faithful to the lawful government or to the sovereign to whom one is subject." This faithfulness is a matter of obligation; it is a duty owed. The root of the obligation and duty is the lawfulness of the government, rationally recognized and freely accepted by the citizens.

The American citizen recognizes that his Government, for all its imperfections, is a government under law, of law, by law; therefore he is loyal to it. Furthermore, he recognizes that his Government, because it is lawful, has the right and the responsibility to protect itself against the action of those who would subvert it. The cooperative effort of the citizen with the rightful action of American Government in its discharge of this primary responsibility also belongs to the very substance of American loyalty. This is the crucial principle in the present case.

This general definition of loyalty assumes a sharper meaning within the special conditions of the present crisis. The premise of the concrete, contemporary definition of loyalty is the fact of the Communist conspiracy. Revolutionary communism has emerged as a world power seeking domination of all mankind. It attacks the whole idea of a social order based upon freedom and justice in the sense in which the liberal tradition of the West has understood these ideas. Moreover, it operates with a new technique of aggression; it has elaborated a new formula for power. It uses all the methods proper to conspiracy, the methods of infiltration and intrigue, of deceit and duplicity, of falsehood and connivance. These are the chosen methods whereby it steadily seeks to undermine, from within, the lawful governments and communities of the free world.

The fact of the Communist conspiracy has put to American government and to the American people a special problem. It is the problem of protecting the national security, internal and external, against the insidious attack of its Communist enemy. On the domestic front, this problem has been met by the erection of a system of laws and Executive orders designed to protect the lawful Government of the United States against the hidden machinery of subversion.

The American citizen, in private life, the man who is not engaged in governmental service, is not bound by the requirements of the security system. However, those American citizens who have the privilege of participating in the operations of government, especially in sensitive agencies, are necessarily subject to this special system of law. Consequently, their faithfulness to the lawful Government of the United States, that is to say their loyalty, must be judged by the standard of their obedience to security regulations. Dr. Oppenheimer was subject to the security system which applies to those engaged in the atomic-energy program. The measure of his obedience to the requirements of this system is the decisive measure of his loyalty to his lawful Government. No lesser test will settle the question of his loyalty.

In order to clarify this issue of the meaning of loyalty, the following considerations are necessary: First, the atomic-energy program is absolutely vital to the survival of the Nation. Therefore, the security regulations which surround it are intentionally severe. No violations can be countenanced. Moreover, the necessity for exact fidelity to these regulations increases as an individual operates in more and more sensitive and secret areas of the program. Where responsibility is highest, fidelity should be most perfect.

Second, this security system is not perfect in its structure or in its mode of operation. Perfection would be impossible. We are still relatively unskilled in the methods whereby we may effectively block the conspiratorial efforts of the Communist enemy without damage to our own principles. Moreover, the operation of the system is in the hands of fallible men. It is therefore right and necessary that the system should be under constant scrutiny. Those who are affected by the system have a particular right to criticize it. But they have no right to defy or disregard it.

Third, the premise of the security system is not a dogma but a fact, the fact of the Communist conspiracy. The system itself is only a structure of law, not a set of truths. Therefore this system of law is not, and must not be allowed to become, a form of thought control. It restricts the freedom of association of the governmental employee who is subject to it. It restricts his movements and activities. It restricts his freedom of utterance in matters of security import, not in other matters. It restricts his freedom of personal and family life. It makes special demands on his character, moral virtue, and spirit of sacrifice. But no part of the security system imposes any restrictions on his mind. No law or Executive order inhibits the freedom of the mind to search for the truth in all the great issues that today confront the political and moral intelligence of America. In particular, no security regulations set any limits to the free-ranging scientific intelligence in its search for the truths of nature and for the techniques of power over nature. If they were to do so, the result would be disastrous; for the freedom of science is more than ever essential to the freedom of the American people.

Fourth, the preservation of the ordered freedom of American life requires the cooperation of all American citizens with their Government. The indispensable condition of this cooperation is a spirit of mutual trust and confidence. This trust and confidence must in a special sense obtain between governmental officials and scientists; for their partnership in the atomic energy program

and in other programs is absolutely essential to the security interests of the United States. It would be lamentable if conscientious enforcement of security regulations were to become a danger to the atmosphere of trust and confidence which alone can sustain this partnership. In order to avert this danger, there must be on the part of Government a constant concern for justice to the individual together with a concern for the high interests of the national community. On the part of scientists there should be a generous disposition to endure with patient understanding the distasteful restrictions which the security system imposes on them.

Finally, it is essential that in the operation of the security system every effort should be made to safeguard the principle that no American citizen is to be penalized for anything except action or omission contrary to the well-defined interests of the United States. However stringent the need for a security system, the system cannot be allowed to introduce into American jurisprudence that hateful concept, the "crime of opinion." The very security of America importantly lies in the steady guarantee, even in a time of crisis, of the citizen's right to freedom of opinion and of honest and responsible utterance. The present time of crisis intensifies the civic duty of obedience to the lawful government in the crucial area of security regulations. But it does not justify abridgment of the civic right of dissent. Government may penalize disobedience in action or omission. It may not penalize dissent in thought and utterance.

When all these distinctions and qualifications have been made, the fact remains that the existence of the security regulations which surround the atomic energy program puts to those who participate in the program a stern test of loyalty.

Dr. Oppenheimer failed the test. The record of his actions reveals a frequent and deliberate disregard of those security regulations which restrict a man's associations. He was engaged in a highly delicate area of security; within this area he occupied a most sensitive position. The requirement that a man in this position should relinquish the right to the complete freedom of association that would be his in other circumstances is altogether a reasonable and necessary requirement. The exact observance of this requirement is in all cases essential to the integrity of the security system. It was particularly essential in the case of Dr. Oppenheimer.

It will not do to plead that Dr. Oppenheimer revealed no secrets to the Communists and fellow travelers with whom he chose to associate. What is incompatible with obedience to the laws of security is the associations themselves, however innocent in fact. Dr. Oppenheimer was not faithful to the restrictions on the associations of those who come under the security regulations.

There is a further consideration, not unrelated to the foregoing. Those who stand within the security system are not free to refuse their cooperation with the workings of the system, much less to confuse or obstruct them, especially by falsifications and fabrications. It is their duty, at times an unpleasant duty, to cooperate with the governmental officials who are charged with the enforcement of security regulations. This cooperation should be active and honest. If this manner of cooperation is not forthcoming, the security system itself, and therefore the interests of the United States which it protects, inevitably suffer. The record proves Dr. Oppenheimer to have been seriously deficient in his cooperation with the workings of the security system. This defect too is a defect of loyalty to the lawful government in its reasonable efforts to preserve itself in its constitutional existence. No matter how high a man stands in the service of his country he still stands under the law. To permit a man in a position of the highest trust to set himself above any of the laws of security would be to invite the destruction of the whole security system.

In conclusion, the principle that has already been stated must be recalled for the sake of emphasis. In proportion as a man is charged with more and more critical responsibilities, the more urgent becomes the need for that full and exact fidelity to the special demands of security laws which in this overshadowed day goes by the name of loyalty. So too does the need for cooperation with responsible security officers.

Dr. Oppenheimer occupied a position of paramount importance; his relation to the security interests of the United States was the most intimate possible one. It was reasonable to expect that he would manifest the measure of cooperation appropriate to his responsibilities. He did not do so. It was reasonable to expect that he would be particularly scrupulous in his fidelity to security regulations. These regulations are the special test of the loyalty of the American citizen who serves his Government in the sensitive area of the atomic energy program. Dr. Oppenheimer did not meet this decisive test. He was disloyal.

I conclude that Dr. Oppenheimer's access to restricted data should be denied.

THOMAS E. MURRAY,
Commissioner.

JUNE 29, 1954.

DISSENTING OPINION OF HENRY DEWOLF SMYTH

I dissent from the action of the Atomic Energy Commission in the matter of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. I agree with the "clear conclusion" of the Gray Board that he is completely loyal, and I do not believe he is a security risk. It is my opinion that his clearance for access to restricted data should be restored.

In a case such as this, the Commission is required to look into the future. It must determine whether Dr. Oppenheimer's continued employment by the Government of the United States is in the interests of the people of the United States. This prediction must balance his potential contribution to the positive strength of the country against the possible danger that he may weaken the country by allowing important secrets to reach our enemies.

Since Dr. Oppenheimer is one of the most knowledgeable and lucid physicists we have, his services could be of great value to the country in the future. Therefore, the only question being determined by the Atomic Energy Commission is whether there is a possibility that Dr. Oppenheimer will intentionally or unintentionally reveal secret information to persons who should not have it. To me, this is what is meant within our security system by the term "security risk." Character and associations are important only insofar as they bear on the possibility that secret information will be improperly revealed.

In my opinion, the most important evidence in this regard is the fact that there is no indication in the entire record that Dr. Oppenheimer has ever divulged any secret information. The past 15 years of his life have been investigated and reinvestigated. For much of the last 11 years he has been under actual surveillance, his movements watched, his conversations noted, his mail and telephone calls checked. This professional review of his actions has been supplemented by enthusiastic amateur help from powerful personal enemies.

After reviewing the massive dossier and after hearing some 40 witnesses, the Gray Board reported on May 27, 1954, that Dr. Oppenheimer "seems to have had a high degree of discretion reflecting an unusual ability to keep to himself vital secrets." My own careful reading of the complete dossier and of the testimony leads me to agree with the Gray Board on this point. I am confident that Dr. Oppenheimer will continue to keep to himself all the secrets with which he is entrusted.

The most important allegations of the general manager's letter of December 23 related to Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct in the so-called H-bomb program. I am not surprised to find that the evidence does not support these allegations in any way. The history of Dr. Oppenheimer's contributions to the development of nuclear weapons stands untarnished.

It is clear that Dr. Oppenheimer's past associations and activities are not newly discovered in any substantial sense. They have been known for years to responsible authorities who have never been persuaded that they rendered Dr. Oppenheimer unfit for public service. Many of the country's outstanding men have expressed their faith in his integrity.

In spite of all this, the majority of the Commission now concludes that Dr. Oppenheimer is a security risk. I cannot accept this conclusion or the fear behind it. In my opinion the conclusion cannot be supported by a fair evaluation of the evidence.

Those who do not accept this view cull from the record of Dr. Oppenheimer's active life over the past 15 years incidents which they construe as proof of fundamental defects in his character and as alarming associations. I shall summarize the evidence on these incidents in order that their proper significance may be seen.

Chevalier incident: The most disturbing incidents of his past are those connected with Haakon Chevalier. In late 1942 or early 1943, Chevalier was asked by George Eltenton to approach Dr. Oppenheimer to see whether he would be willing to make technical information available for the Soviet Union. When Chevalier spoke to Dr. Oppenheimer he was answered by a flat refusal. The incident came to light when Dr. Oppenheimer, of his own accord, reported it to Colonel Pash in August 1943. He did not at that time give Chevalier's name and said that there had been three approaches rather than one. Shortly thereafter, in early September, Dr. Oppenheimer told General Groves that, if ordered, he would reveal the name. Not until December 1943 did General Groves direct him to give the name. It is his testimony that he then told General Groves that the earlier story concerning three approaches had been a "cock and bull story." Not until 1946 were Eltenton, Chevalier, and Dr. Oppenheimer himself interviewed by security officers in this matter. When interviewed by the FBI in 1946, Dr. Oppenheimer recounted the same story of the incident which he has consistently maintained ever since. He stated explicitly in 1946 that the story told to Colonel Pash in 1943 had been a fabrication. In the present hearings before the Gray Board he testified, before the recording of the Pash interview was produced, that the story told to Colonel Pash was a fabrication to protect his friend Chevalier. The letter which he wrote Chevalier in February 1950 concerning Chevalier's role in the 1943 incident stated only what Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently maintained to the FBI and to the Gray Board concerning Chevalier's lack of awareness of the significance of what he was doing.

The Chevalier incident involved temporary concealment of an espionage attempt and admitted lying, and is inexcusable. But that was 11 years ago; there is no subsequent act even faintly similar; Dr. Oppenheimer has repeatedly expressed his shame and regret and has stated flatly that he would never again so act. My conclusion is that of Mr. Hartley Rowe, who testified, "I think a man

of Dr. Oppenheimer's character is not going to make the same mistake twice."

Dr. Oppenheimer states that he still considers Chevalier his friend, although he sees him rarely. In 1950, just before Chevalier left this country to take up residence in France, he visited Dr. Oppenheimer for 2 days in Princeton; in December 1953, Dr. Oppenheimer visited with the Chevaliers in Paris at their invitation. These isolated visits may have been unwise, but there is no evidence that they had any security significance. Chevalier was not sought out by Dr. Oppenheimer in Paris but, rather, the meeting was proposed by the Chevaliers in a letter to Mrs. Oppenheimer. The contact consisted of a dinner and, on the following day, driving with Chevalier to meet Andre Malraux, the famous French literary figure for whom Chevalier was a translator. Malraux in the later years of his political life has been an active anti-Communist advisor to General deGaulle. These short visits were followed 2 months later by Chevalier's use of Dr. Oppenheimer's name in connection with clearance for employment by UNESCO. Dr. Oppenheimer's action in this matter seems quite correct. When Chevalier mentioned the problem, Dr. Oppenheimer suggested that the proper place for advice was the American Embassy and that Dr. Geoffrey Wyman, the scientific attaché, might be in a position to give the advice. Before seeing Chevalier, Dr. Oppenheimer had lunched at the Embassy with Dr. Wyman, a former classmate, but it is clear from Dr. Wyman's affidavit in the record that Dr. Oppenheimer did not at that time or later mention or indorse Chevalier.

Associations: It is stated that a persistent and continuing association with Communists and fellow travelers is part of a pattern in Dr. Oppenheimer's actions which indicates a disregard of the obligations of security. On examination, the record shows that, since the war, beyond the two visits with the Chevaliers, Dr. Oppenheimer's associations with such persons have been limited and infrequent. He sees his brother, Frank Oppenheimer (an admitted former Communist who left the party in 1941) not much more than once a year and then only for an evening together. By chance, while returning from the barber, he ran into Lomanitz and Bohm on the streets of Princeton in May 1949. Dr. Peters called on him once to discuss testimony given by Dr. Oppenheimer before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has seen Bohm and one or two other former students at meetings of professional groups. I find nothing in the foregoing to substantiate the charge that Dr. Oppenheimer has had a persistent and continuing association with subversive individuals. These are nothing more than occasional incidents in a complex life, and they were not sought by Dr. Oppenheimer.

Significance has been read into these occasional encounters in the light of Dr. Oppenheimer's activities prior to 1943.

The Gray Board found that he was an active fellow traveler, but that there was no evidence that he was a member of the party in the strict sense of the word. Dr. Oppenheimer's consistent testimony, and the burden of the evidence, shows that his financial contributions in the 1930's and early 1940's were directed to specific causes such as the Spanish Loyalists, even though they may have gone through individual Communists.

The Communists with whom he was deeply involved were all related to him by personal ties: his brother and sister-in-law, his wife (who had left the party before their marriage), and his former fiancee, Jean Tatlock. Finally, while there are self-serving claims by Communists on record as to Dr. Oppenheimer's adherence to the party, none of these is attributed to Communists who actually knew him, and Steve Nelson (who did know him) described him in a statement to another Communist as not a Marxist. The evidence supports Dr. Oppenheimer's consistent denial that he was ever a Communist.

Dr. Oppenheimer has been repeatedly interrogated from 1943 on concerning his associations and activities. Beyond the one admitted falsehood told in the Chevalier incident, the voluminous record shows a few contradictions between statements purportedly made in 1943 and subsequent recollections during interrogations in 1950 and 1954. The charges of falsehood concerning Weinberg and Lambert relate to such contradictions, and are dependent on a garbled transcript. In my opinion, these contradictions have been given undue significance.

Peters letter: I find it difficult to conclude that the letter written by Dr. Oppenheimer in 1949 following his testimony about Dr. Bernard Peters before a congressional committee is evidence of any fault in character. This carefully composed letter, a copy of which was sent to the congressional committee, was not an attempt to repudiate the testimony relating to Dr. Peters' background but, rather, was a manifestation of a belief that political views should not disqualify a scientist from a teaching job. He was led to this action by the protests of Dr. Bethe, Dr. Weisskopf, and Dr. Peters himself, and of Dr. Condon, and by the "overwhelming belief of the community in which I lived that a man like that ought not to be fired either for his past or for his views, unless the past is criminal or the views led him to wicked actions." One might disagree with this belief without taking it as evidence of untrustworthiness.

Lomanitz deferment: It is clear that in cross-examination in 1954, Dr. Oppenheimer was led into contradictions concerning the induction into the Army of Rossi Lomanitz in 1943. These contradictions, understandable as errors of memory, are serious only if Dr. Oppenheimer's behavior at that time was improper. Actually, Dr. Oppenheimer's letter to Colonel Lansdale in 1943 says: "Since I am not in possession of the facts which led to Mr. Lomanitz' induction, I am, of course, not able to endorse this request in an absolute way. I can, however, say that Mr. Lomanitz' competence and his past experience on the work in Berkeley should make him a man of real value whose technical service we should make every effort to secure for the project." The letter was sent to Colonel Lansdale, the man to whom Dr. Oppenheimer had given information on Lomanitz' Communist affiliation and the man who had told Dr. Oppenheimer that Lomanitz had been indiscreet with information.

Obstruction of security officers: The majority opinion cites the Chevalier incident as an instance of obstruction of security officers and states without specification that there are other instances. I have sought to identify these other instances. The only instance I have found is a refusal by Dr. Oppenheimer in 1950 to answer FBI questions about Dr. Thomas Addis and Dr. Jean Tatlock on the ground that they were dead and could not defend themselves. This reticence to discuss the activities of a friend and of a former fiance years after their deaths may have been an error. But in the circumstances it seems understandable hesitation and does not indicate a persistent "willful disregard" of security.

Seaborg letter: Before the October 1949 meeting of the General Advisory Committee at which the H-bomb program was discussed, Dr. Seaborg, a member of the General Advisory Committee, who was unable to be present, sent Dr. Oppenheimer a letter on the topics to be discussed. In Dr. Oppenheimer's letter to the Commission reporting the unanimous view of the eight members present at the General Advisory Committee meeting there is no mention of Dr. Seaborg's views. It is hard to see how Dr. Oppenheimer could have forgotten the letter, but it is still harder to see what purpose he could have hoped to achieve by intentionally suppressing it—and then turning it over to the Commission in his files. At the next meeting of the General Advisory Committee in December 1949 the action of the October meeting was reviewed, and the minutes show that Dr. Seaborg raised no objection. It seems likely that Dr. Seaborg himself did not consider that he had expressed any formal conclusions. His letter of October 14, 1949, opens as follows:

"I will try to give you my thoughts for what they may be worth regarding the next GAC meeting, but I am afraid that there may be more questions than answers. * * * It seems to me that conclusions will be reached, if at all, only after a large amount of give-and-take discussion at the GAC meeting" (p. 238).

The instances that I have described constitute the whole of the evidence extracted from a lengthy record to support the severe conclusions of the majority that Dr. Oppenheimer has given proof of fundamental defects in his character and of persistent continuing associations. Any implication that these are illustrations only and that further substantial evidence exists in the investigative files to support these charges is unfounded.

With the single exception of the Chevalier incident, the evidence relied upon is thin, whether individual instances are considered separately or in combination. All added together, with the Chevalier incident included, the evidence is singularly unimpressive when viewed in the perspective of the 15 years of active life from which it is drawn. Few men could survive such a period of investigation and interrogation without having many of their actions misinterpreted or misunderstood.

To be effective a security system must be realistic. In the words of the Atomic Energy Commission security criteria:

"The facts of each case must be carefully weighed and determination made in the light of all the information presented whether favorable or unfavorable. The judgment of responsible persons as to the integrity of the individuals should be considered. The decision as to security clearance is an overall, commonsense judgment, made after consideration of all the relevant information as to whether or not there is risk that the granting of security clearance would endanger the common defense or security."

Application of this standard of overall commonsense judgment to the whole record destroys any pattern of suspicious conduct or catalog of falsehoods and evasions, and leaves a picture of Dr. Oppenheimer as an able, imaginative human being with normal human weaknesses and failings. In my opinion the conclusion drawn by the majority from the evidence is so extreme as to endanger the security system.

If one starts with the assumption that Dr. Oppenheimer is disloyal, the incidents which I have recounted may arouse suspicion. However, if the entire record is read objectively, Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty and trustworthiness emerge clearly and the various disturbing incidents are shown in their proper light as understandable and unimportant.

The Chevalier incident remains reprehensible; but in fairness and on all of the evidence, this one admitted and regretted mistake made many years ago does not predominate in my overall judgment of Dr. Oppenheimer's character and reliability. Unless one confuses a manner of expression with candor, or errors in recollection with lack of veracity, Dr. Oppenheimer's testimony before the Gray Board has the ring of honesty. I urge thoughtful citizens to examine this testimony for themselves, and not be content with summaries or with extracts quoted out of context.

With respect to the alleged disregard of the security system, I would suggest that the system itself is nothing to worship. It is a necessary means to an end. Its sole purpose, apart from the prevention of sabotage, is to protect secrets. If a man protects the secrets he has in his hands and his head, he has shown essential regard for the security system.

In addition, cooperation with security officials in their legitimate activities is to be expected of private citizens and Government employees. The security system has, however, neither the responsibility nor the right to dictate every detail of a man's life. I frankly do not understand the charge made by the majority that Dr. Oppenheimer has shown a persistent and willful disregard for the obligations of security, and that therefore he should be declared a security risk. No gymnastics of rationalization allow me to accept this argument. If in any recent instances, Dr. Oppenheimer has misunderstood his obligation to security, the error is occasion for reproof but not for a finding that he should be debarred from serving his country. Such a finding extends the concept of security risk beyond its legitimate justification and constitutes a dangerous precedent.

In these times, failure to employ a man of great talents may impair the strength and power of this country. Yet I would accept this loss if I doubted the loyalty of Dr. Oppenheimer or his ability to hold his tongue. I have no such doubts.

I conclude that Dr. Oppenheimer's employment "will not endanger the common defense and security" and will be "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security." I prefer the positive statement that Dr. Oppenheimer's further employment will continue to strengthen the United States.

I therefore have voted to reinstate Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance.

HENRY D. SMYTH,
Commissioner.

JUNE 29, 1954.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in section 122 of the bill we have offshore procurement in its rankest form. According to the figures submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], there is already $85 million unexpended for the purpose of procuring aircraft from the British. This would add another $75 million to that amount, or a total of $160 million to be spent on aircraft produced in Britain at a time when the unemployed ranks in this country are being increased by virtue of lay-offs in the aircraft industry.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], to cut out the $75 million. I would have offered a motion, and will offer a motion if this amendment is defeated, to strike out the entire authorization, that is, the $75 million in new money plus the authorization for use of the unexpended $85 million. Let us take care of the people of this country, and if we have anything left, spread it over the world.

In connection with foreign aid, in the May 28, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report, I found this small item:

Harry Truman, when President, entered into a secret deal with the British Government promising a definite amount of dollar aid each year without informing Congress of the deal. When Congress failed to provide specific funds to meet the commitment a year ago, funds had to be diverted from other programs to make good on the deal with Britain.

I wonder if the Committee on Foreign Affairs or any other committee of Congress has ever inquired into this statement which appeared in that issue of U. S. News & World Report asserting that Harry Truman, when President of the United States, entered into a secret agreement with the British, promising a definite amount of aid each year without informing Congress of the deal. I am wondering if this $75 million authorized here for offshore procurement of aircraft or the $85 million that was authorized previously had anything to do with carrying out the secret commitments that were made by a President of the United States behind the back of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan ought to be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment put into the bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its considered judgment. I believe it my duty to justify what is planned on the ground that it is in the national interest of the United States. I think it is right and in the national interest, and I intend to justify it to the Committee of the Whole.

I am not a special expert on this subject, but I just could not sit and let this amendment go by. Either we are doing things that we know something about, or we do not, and it is high time we found out.

The RAF is the No. 3 air force in the world. It comes after the United States and Soviet Russia. We have on British soil enormous air installations of very considerable consequence. The RAF showed itself in World War II to be as scrappy an air force as there is in the world. It stood up against all of the German might, all of the German power, for a time practically on its own.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. I am indebted to my colleague. I generally find in this House, if the Committee is not in order, it does not want to be, and if the Members are not interested, there is nothing to do about it. But, it is my bounden duty to stand up for this provision in the bill which was put in by the committee in a considered way, and is backed by the administration in a considered way.

Now, the British RAF, as I say, is the third largest air force in the world. After the United States and the Soviet Union comes the RAF. We have great installations over there. The British showed themselves very scrappy in World War II, particularly in fighter planes. They have been leading developers in the world of turbo-jets and ramjets and rockets, and in that research they had a very leading part and made enormous contribution to the strength of the free world.

We provided $85 million for exactly this kind of an operation to strengthen the RAF, in the 1953 bill. It took about a year to negotiate that contract. As everybody knows who has had experience in these fields, it takes a long time to negotiate a contract for new types of aircraft, and I am in a position to state to the House authoritatively, notwithstanding what has been said in support of this amendment, that the $85 million provided for last year has been fully obligated in contracts signed. We have a memorandum to that effect sent to the committee table by the representatives of the administration who are up in the gallery. That is the situation today.

The administration has represented to us, not on the word of an administrator, but on the word of General Stewart, the Defense Department's representative who put this program before us, as follows, as stated at page 30 of the committee report:

It is an overall plan in an effort to increase the finest air force outside of the United States, on the western side. * * * In the event of war all these forces are available for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This whole plan is an effort to build up the RAF to support the NATO forces between ourselves in the event of war.

This is pretty serious business, Mr. Chairman, and I, for one, am not going to take the responsibility of turning down this particular provision which has been put in in a considered way to strengthen such extremely important sinews of free world defense as the Royal Air Force, which has certainly demonstrated that it is on our side, on the side of freedom, in the most effective way known to date, by its heroic actions in World War II.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the author of the amendment.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman says that the Royal Air Force is on the side of freedom; I believe, to a large extent, that is true. But certainly the gentleman can think of some areas of the world where that air force may have to be used in the cause of colonialism; and can the gentleman guarantee that those planes will not be used in those areas?

Mr. JAVITS. We have the guarantee of General Stewart who has testified that this particular provision is to support NATO. I am all for NATO. I think the House is overwhelmingly for NATO. I do not think that we ought to just blindly accept this amendment just because it is said $75 million can be cut, rather, we must look to the essential security interest involved, and on that basis the amendment should be rejected.

As I said before, I rise to call the House to its responsibility in a matter of the national security interest.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORANO. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York. If we strike this section, we strike a blow at our own national security.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Why do not the British build their own planes?

Mr. JAVITS. The British are building their own planes to their utmost limit. That is the justification for this that we want them to have more fighting planes than they can build on their own. These are military planes. It is definitely in the interest of our national security to assist in this strengthening of the RAF.

Mr. GROSS. Why do we not build the planes here, then, and send them over there?

Mr. JAVITS. We could not build them here because they are British-type planes, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], any more than they would be asked to build our B-47's or B-52's for us.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York on this question.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

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

I rise in support of the amendment of my distinguished colleague, Mr. BENTLEY, of Michigan. The fact is I was about to offer the same amendment, but I am happy to yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

This bill proposes to subsidize the British to the extent of an extra $75 million in aircraft production. The British aircraft production is high and going strong. This is a clear-cut case of subsidy and would take away an extra $75 million of our taxpayers' money at a time when American aircraft manufacturers are laying off workers. I am opposed to further subsidizing many foreign nations and especially under the guise of strengthening those who are in no need of it. I am highly in favor of this amendment and urge its adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues who are of the same mind may also extend their remarks on this matter at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, would not want to deprive our British cousins of anything to which they were entitled or any benefit we might bring to them in the way of the North Atlantic area defense, but I would like to recall to my colleagues in the House, a number of years ago when we were doing our utmost to build up the defense forces of the United Nations. Korea had happened on June 24, 1950. Other things were happening along the line. There was a great need for military aircraft. We were doing our best and producing all we could. But they were not so interested in military aircraft in Britain at that time as were we, even though the Soviets were practically on their borders. They were building jet commercial transport aircraft for the purpose of recapturing the transportation market in British-made aircraft and were satisfied to let us concentrate on military aircraft.

At that time I had it out with one of the leading gentlemen in the aviation field of Britain. I chided him somewhat on their being more interested in transport aircraft than they were in military aircraft. They were building advanced types of commercial transports far beyond anything we had had time to build or even design at that point. His reply to me was, "We in Britain must recapture the trade of the world, and build transport aircraft and cargo vessels and passenger vessels to recapture our trade." That premise seemed to be more important to him at the moment than even the defense of their own country and the free world. They had been shipping prototypes of their excellent jet engines for the Soviets to copy and use in the MIG 15.

It seems to me that this $75 million for manufacture in the United Kingdom of military aircraft required by the United Kingdom had better be given a second thought by this House.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman may be interested in knowing that in the near future there will be news to the effect that one of our major airlines is going to procure a large number of the British turboprop air transports.

Mr. HINSHAW. Our people have been so busy making fighting planes in this country they have not had time to build transports of modern design. Hence, as the gentleman says, our own transport people will be buying jet transports from Great Britain. Think of it. We have furnished to the world transport aircraft with which to compete in air transportation against our own flag air carriers, and now we are to furnish Britain money to do what—to build fighter planes for their own use, while they build commercial jet transports with their money to sell to American air transport concerns. Something is wrong with that picture—very. You might think she were doing us a favor by letting us protect her, and that we had to hire her to do part of the protecting of herself. It was only a dozen years ago, a little over, that the British were begging us to help defend Europe, including Britain. Now we are back again in the old commercial rivalry.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest this: I wonder if the Members of the House are aware of the fact that some of the most advanced jet engines and other plane parts have been sold by Britain behind the Iron Curtain. I wonder what assurance we can have that if we appropriate additional money that policy will be discontinued.

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring up one matter which has not been answered in connection with the arguments of the opponents of this amendment. That is the statement that this money is needed in the event of war to bolster up the Royal Air Force. This is an offshore procurement matter. What is the purpose of offshore procurement? It is to build up manufacturing facilities across the ocean close to where we might expect to do the fighting. But in this particular case, we are concerned with aircraft, and the aircraft factories which might be located in the United Kingdom to make them. If located in the United Kingdom they would be just as close to the enemy today as they were in World War II. In other words, you have aircraft, the most mobile weapon of war involved here, and we should not spend funds for facilities to build them which are located right in the shadow of the guns which are going to wreck those factories in the event that hostilities break out. Build them elsewhere. This amendment will cut this foolishness of subsidizing aircraft factories in the front lines where they can be destroyed the minute hostilities begin.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. I compliment the gentleman for his remarks and I would like to associate myself with the Bentley amendment and also compliment Mr. BENTLEY for introducing it.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. Can the gentleman explain to those of us from the southern California area, how we can go home and tell our people who are employed in the aircraft industry at a time when aircraft contracts are thinning down that we feel aircraft should be procured overseas?

Mr. HOSMER. No. I do not think you or I or anybody else can explain to any sound-thinking American who has the defense of our Nation in mind the expenditure of any money for construction of aircraft manufacturing facilities in the front lines instead of in areas like San Diego, Long Beach, southern California, and other parts of this country, and perhaps in Canada or elsewhere far behind the front lines of the free world where those facilities can reasonably be expected to be in operation after D-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 85, noes 50.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ran out of time a while ago, but I want to pursue just a little bit further the question of offshore procurement of ships. I have read with a great deal of interest—real interest—the provisions with respect to the findings which must be made by the President or the determinations which must be made by the President in connection with offshore procurement. It seems to me that already our shipbuilding industry is in such a depressed state as to require discontinuance of offshore procurement of ships.

It seems to me imperative that all funds available for shipbuilding should be spent in our own yards. I call attention to the fact that already the Navy shipyards have an average reduction in their personnel of more than 21 percent since Korea. I do not have the figures with respect to the private yards.

In addition, there are further substantial reductions in employment in the Navy yards in the immediate prospect.

This morning some of my constituents were in my office in connection with this question of offshore procurement. I was amazed to be informed that at the present time there are contracts in existence for the construction of 90 ships in this offshore procurement program. I was further amazed to be told that there are two ships currently under construction in Yugoslavia. I called the Chief of the Bureau of Ships to confirm the information and I was advised that that was in error; that there were 3 ships being built in Yugoslavia instead of 2.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the situation is with respect to the shipbuilding industry in Yugoslavia, but from information that is currently available to me the shipbuilding industry on the continent of Europe appears to be in a much healthier condition than it is in these United States. It would seem to me we ought to devote what funds we have for the construction of ships to trying to maintain our shipbuilding skill in this country.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am glad to hear the gentleman's comment on the condition of the shipbuilding industry in the United States and in continental Europe. The gentleman may be interested to know that as of October this year we will have only 3 ships on ways in our commercial yards; that in ship construction we now rank sixth in the world. As of January 1 of this year there were on order or being constructed in Great Britain 559 ships as compared with 48 in the United States.

Mr. HARDY. The information which the gentleman has given to this House saddens me, but I am glad the gentleman has given us the facts.

There should be some indication from this House today as to its concept of the health of the shipbuilding industry in the United States.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I have felt that our industry needs protection on this score. I am one of those who have come up with an amendment to this bill which the gentleman may not have noticed. It is on page 4.

Mr. HARDY. Yes. I am familiar with it. I appreciate the gentleman's calling attention to it.

Mr. FULTON. I am in no surplus unemployment area, but since we have raised a howl in the committee they have brought back a couple of hundred thousand.

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

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Due to disastrous conditions of unemployment in our private and Government shipyards here in America, caused me to offer in the Foreign Affairs Committee an amendment to prohibit offshore procurement of ships. The workweek in major Atlantic coast shipyards has dwindled in 2 years from 34 hours a week to the present average of 16 hours a week. According to a statement made by the CIO, was that the imminent collapse of the private shipbuilding industry in this country constituted a potential catastrophe should this country become involved in another war. Employment has decreased in the shipyards in America from an all high in 1943 of about 1,300,000 to 113,000 as of May 1954.

I lost this amendment in committee and as a result was one of the authors of section 103 (c) which I hope opens the door to enforce the proper authority to authorize the production of ships here in the United States as a result of these conditions.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I have always opposed aid to Yugoslavia, and regret any offshore production in that country.

Mr. HARDY. Let me put it this way: I congratulate the gentlewoman for her efforts and for the language that is now in the bill.

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

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I must object. We have discussed this at some length. If we are going to finish the bill today we cannot have extended discussions when no amendment is pending. We have, I understand, a series of amendments pending which I hope can be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard to the consent request.

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

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

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the Chair will recall, the time was set before the last vote. There has been no reading by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman that time was fixed on the Bentley amendment which was voted on.

The gentleman from Virginia gained the floor on a pro forma amendment, was recognized for 5 minutes, and his time has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], a member of the committee, has been recognized for 5 minutes on a pro forma amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FULTON. For the purpose of recognizing the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot recognize anyone. He can yield if a Member asks him to yield.

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

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman because I just want to make one point before I sit down.

It seems to me, based on the information which has been presented to this House this afternoon in connection with our Nation's shipyards, information that I presented, information presented to us by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] in connection with our private yards, it is about time this Congress indicated its impression as to whether or not these funds should be spent in our own shipyards, and if the record would simply show that I would be most happy.

Mr. FULTON. In order that the House will know what the viewpoint of the committee is, I direct their attention to page 4, line 14, subsection (1) of subsection (c), where there is provided appropriate screening for areas of labor surplus which would mean any place where plants were idle, or upon the industrial mobilization base which would be broader than an area of labor surplus. There must be this screening on these two bases. For various reasons, we did not want to put in the specific prohibition.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the observation which the gentleman has made. I think it may be wise, though, not to have a specific prohibition in this bill, but I think it is well for this Congress to indicate its wish in connection with this business of building ships so that policies will be followed which will aid the shipbuilding industry in this country.

Mr. FULTON. I feel this needs to be said so that the Congress shall know and the departments shall know what the intent is.

I may say that it has not been just myself alone who has been active in this, but members of the committee also, the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others. I think now we all know what we want.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he thinks that the language on page 4 is adequate? I ask this because it has been my experience that in judging the heavily unemployed areas they lump everything in an area together. We had the situation in some areas a couple of years ago where all shipbuilders were out of work and the shipyards were down with no work, yet because there was general employment in other fields they did not consider the shipyards at all.

Mr. FULTON. As I say, there are 2 things in that provision of the bill: No. 1 is whether there are "labor surplus areas," a designation which is well known, and the next phrase is "or upon the industrial mobilization base." This takes it out of a particular line and puts it on a broader base, so that it will not be just on the fact that one line is down and this is not that particular line, but they must look at the broad area and see if the mobilization base, if our general base level, is low.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may insert their remarks in reference to their interest in the matter of offshore production and the protection of the wonderful industries in their district at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

I am for offshore procurement. I appreciate its importance. But I am not for offshore procurement which deprives distressed industries of vitally needed construction and employment.

To construct ships overseas, which can be built in this country, at a time when our entire ship construction industry is almost flat on its back—at a time when our ship construction yards, vital to our mobilization base, are threatened with closing down, due to lack of work, seems to me to be contrary to our whole policy of national defense. It just does not make sense.

I trust that the administration will be guided accordingly under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, when the level of shipbuilding in our own American shipyards is at such a low ebb as at the present time, together with the fact that it has been getting to a less and less active industry for too long a time, I question that it is in our national interest to have so much and such frequent offshore shipbuilding, under this present bill, or, under any enacted legislation.

Even you of my distinguished colleagues who live far from the great shipyards in our Nation, know by report and clear-cut evidence that the know-how and the skills of the shipbuilding industry are not only highly technical; but you also know that they cannot be acquired except by long years of toil and experience. Furthermore, it is self-evident; it has been proven in every national emergency where our marine was needed, that a going, ready, able and adequate shipbuilding personnel is absolutely necessary in the best interests of our own national defense.

For three terms in this great legislative body I represented a congressional district in Los Angeles County, where is situated the great Los Angeles Naval Base and several private shipyards, too. The important Long Beach Naval Shipyard is there.

Together with firsthand knowledge and observation thus gained by me during these 6 years, as well as my observations as a private citizen for many years in the same area, I have been privileged as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services to become even much better informed on the subject involved in this "offshore" problem.

Yes, I know the Navy yards always do a handsome job of performance. But, Mr. Chairman, the Navy cannot do the work or take the place of the private shipyard in our national economy. It never has and cannot also fulfill the mission of private industry in this field. We need both at all times as efficient, adequate, on the job. The 11 Navy yards as authorized by statute must likewise always be kept alert with top skills and experience.

Nor do I begrudge any reasonable aid to shipbuilding of our friendly allies. But, is it reasonable to neglect and practically abandon our own knowhow in this vital area? I am glad this bill in section 122 makes a clear avenue to the door of official responsibility so that a full showing can be made of basic reasons why our own domestic yards must not be left sick and sore, in favor of "offshore" favors. Only after a most exhaustive consideration and cooperation with our own American private shipyard building industry, so that there is a continuous workload adequate to create and present strong, skillful, workers, should we go "offshore." Nor should this workload be intermittent and indefinite or uncertain. Our shipbuilding on our own shores must be kept at a level consistent with not being or becoming dependent on foreign nations, all or any of whom might not be able longer to supply us or fullfill their contracts.

Some thousands of men living in my congressional district and nearby districts are engaged directly and indirectly in shipbuilding and related industry in Los Angeles County.

I assume this administration will heed the expressed intent of Congress and not jeopardize our own private shipyards over the Nation. Already, the hazard has been too great and too much damage has been done. Unless it is corrected forthwith we should declare a policy of "onshore shipbuilding" as our national program.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pro forma amendment. Since the Mutual Security Act of 1951 first authorized a program of ship construction in foreign countries with American money I have been following the course of the program with interest and with increasing concern. My concern has increased almost daily with mounting unemployment in American shipyards, and any sympathy I might have had for any program of offshore ship procurement at one time has now reached the vanishing point. There may have been a time in the postwar period when the European shipbuilding industry needed an economic shot in the arm to put it back on its feet. That time has passed. There may have been a time when the production base for combat vessels in European shipyards was inadequate to meet a possible demand for such craft in the mutual defense effort. That time is past. There may have been a time when the staggering European economy provided some justification for funneling American dollars into England and the friendly part of the Continent through any practical channel; but that time has also passed. At the present time European shipyards are booming while American yards are practically busted. While the American economy has been floundering in a recession for the past several months the production index for the 17 western countries in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation has continued to hit new highs. The gold and dollar reserves of the rest of the free world continue to rise. Under these conditions there is no justification for a continuation of the program for building ships in foreign countries with American money which would be far better spent putting our unemployed shipyard workers back on the job. What is needed now is a little shoreside procurement in the United States.

In March of this year former Navy Capt. Gordon W. Rule, who was chief contracting officer for the Bureau of Ships at the inception of the offshore procurement program and for some time thereafter, and who placed millions of dollars worth of these contracts in European shipyards during that time, wrote a letter in which he neatly summarized the ridiculous picture we present in keeping this program going. The captain stated:

> The offshore procurement program has been presented and sold to the Congress on the theory that the military needed to build up a defense production base in the principal nations that are joined in the mutual defense in Europe.
>
> This is perfectly sound for some items being bought offshore where no production base exists. But it is ludicrous to suppose that England, France, Italy, Denmark, Holland, Germany, etc., need to have the United States build them a production base for shipbuilding. Five of these countries now lead the world in active facilities, backlogs of work, etc. They will take our orders and simply proceed to build the ships in going yards that long ago comprised an aggregate productive potential and productive base second to none in the world.
>
> What about the building yards in this country? I need not labor the situation existing in the shipbuilding industry in the United States because I am sure you know only too well its present sorry plight. No other major industry is as badly off.

Captain Rule spent a number of months in Europe placing contracts for ships and getting a first-hand knowledge

of actual conditions in the shipbuilding industry there. He also knows what he is talking about when he speaks of the sorry plight of the shipbuilding industry here.

In February of this year total employment in the shipyards of the United States, private and navy yards included, totaled 229,900. For 14 consecutive months prior to that each month saw a decline in the number employed, and although figures are not yet compiled for later months I know that the trend has continued. In February the private shipyards in the United States had only about 100,000 employees on the payrolls. This in an industry which at its wartime peak needed well over 1,500,000. Pacific coast private yards now provide work for only about 8,000 men. Over 400,000 worked in those yards during the war. If that is not a sick industry, I do not know what is—and if this will not be a sick country should a sudden need for ships arise I am badly mistaken.

Since World War II we have calmly sat back and allowed the shipbuilding defense production base of the United States go to pot while in the last 3 years we have spent almost $300 million to build up a production base in foreign countries where they already are building more ships in a week than we put out in a year. It has been estimated that the money we spent in offshore procurement of ships during 1952 and 1953 would have provided a full year's work for 40,000 men in the shipyards of the United States. That work for our shipyards would have done 10 times as much for the mutual defense effort as it did in keeping European yards booming, because when the chips are down and we have to defend ourselves it will be United States shipyards which produce the ships just as in the last war. If the European yards are doing any shipbuilding it will probably be for Russia. I am sure they will be grateful to us for keeping them going while our own yards decay.

Just how close to decay our yards are, is illustrated by the fact that by October 1st of this year there will be only three commercial vessels under construction on United States ways, with no orders in sight. And yet the bill we have here asks us to put $28 million more into European yards while the administration and Congress have failed to complete a single constructive step to revitalize our own industry. We have heard talk about a shipbuilding program since shortly after the administration came into power, but talk does not build ships. If the administration had used the authority available to it under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to continue the program inaugurated by the Truman administration in launching the Mariner ship construction, we would not now be in quite so sorry a fix and some of our shipyard workers would have steady work instead of a day here and a day there. Instead they have refused to use that authority and up until very recently had proposed nothing. Let us hope that they are now prepared to put their money where their mouth is and use it to put some ships on the ways of our dead and dying shipyards.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the indefinite language inserted in this bill with the stated purpose of protecting United States labor and industry will be properly interpreted when the time comes to award contracts for building ships. I particularly hope that the words "areas of labor surplus" are understood to apply not only to geographic areas, but to industry situations as well. During the past 2 or 3 years I put in a considerable amount of time persuading the Office of Defense Mobilization to exempt the shipbuilding industry from the application of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 which gives preference to surplus labor areas in awarding of defense contracts. It took a lot of work on my part to prove to ODM that the shipbuilding industry was a distressed industry and that, although the area in which any particular yard was located might not be classed as having surplus labor, the people who should be working in that yard were just as unemployed, and should not suffer the loss of a contract to another yard whose business might be booming even though the city in which it was located had surplus labor. I, therefore, want the record to be perfectly clear in indicating that section 103 (c) (1) of the bill is intended to protect a distressed industry as well as a distressed geographic area.

Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious to me, although it may not be so obvious to some of the Cloud 16 boys in the State Department or the Foreign Operations Administration, that when in mid-1953 there were some 7 million-plus tons of dry cargo and passenger vessel construction under way in the shipyards of the world, with none of this construction for the order of the United States merchant fleet in United States shipyards, it was time to begin worrying about our own shipbuilding industry rather than that of the rest of the world. Here it is mid-1954 and the picture is still not clear to our policymakers. I strongly recommend that Congress take the first step in opening their eyes by stopping them short on the offshore vessel procurement program.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] with reference to offshore procurement as it affects the American shipyards. Our ship-building industry has stagnated to the point of virtual destruction. Efforts have been made to divert some of the work from our naval yards to private shipbuilding yards, which has not contributed substantially to the stabilization of the private yards, and of course had had a serious consequence on the naval shipyards. As long as the American shipbuilding industry ranks only sixth in the world, it seems to me inexcusable that we should be subsidizing foreign yards to build vessels that could well be built in our own yards. I also have a strong feeling that the Pacific coast yards have been especially discriminated against. Speaking as one Member of this body, I therefore hope that the House will see fit to protect the American shipyards.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the effort of the gentleman of Pennsylvania to protect American industry it does not go far enough.

Section 103 (c) (1), which he cites, limits the relief "with special reference to any areas of labor surplus."

There can be and are areas that are particularly hard hit in one or more phases of industry that are not in labor surplus areas. Let me illustrate. In the San Francisco Bay area, in California, the shipbuilding industry is very hard hit. We are building no substantial tonnage of new ships.

It was in the San Francisco Bay area that records in shipbuilding were made during the war. This is not a labor surplus area at this time. With the closure of automobile plants and the slowdown in durable goods production it is hard to say how long we can keep out of that category.

Seasonal employment in the food canning and processing industry is high, at this season, as it should be. This percentagewise makes it appear that we have employment in the area but shipyard workers, autoworkers and many production workers have no jobs. The usage of the statistical section of the Department of Labor is misleading. If we are to have our proper portion of shipbuilding, for instance, we must get ships to build.

I am not against offshore procurement, but I believe that charity begins at home. I would like to see the shipyard workers in other lands busy and employed but not at the cost of seeing shipyard workers in America without jobs.

In our own selfish interest we must retain the "know-how"—the skills in our shipbuilding and other production industries.

I hope that in the interpretation and administration of this section that the President will give thoughtful consideration to our own people.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I supported the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] in placing in this bill the language contained in section 103 (c) which would protect United States industry from unfair competition from abroad, and would be especially helpful to areas in which there is surplus labor, which have been declared to be in class IV areas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, too many people, it seems to me, have come to give unthinking currency to that old phrase "giveaway program" when they refer to our mutual-security operations. This program is, in fact, one which is vital to the defense of the United States of America—just as much as the vast sums which we have shown our willingness to grant freely to our own Armed Forces. The program which we have before us today is complex; it includes a great variety of activities in many different parts of the world. But they are all linked, directly or indirectly, by the contribution they are making, and will continue to make, to the safety of our own country and our own free way of life.

That way of life is challenged in every part of the world today. The immediate form of the challenge varies from place

to place; therefore, the defense against it must vary from place to place. But everywhere the ultimate target of the Communist challenge can be seen to be this very Nation of ours, citadel of liberty and enterprise. And, therefore, it is up to us to act to resist the challenge as best we can wherever it rears its ugly head, with whatever means are appropriate in a particular place, with whatever allies we can obtain in a particular situation—before our own country becomes the immediate target of a Communist surge which shall have engulfed the other continents of earth. We in America can count ourselves blessed that that menace is still at long range, that we have some time left to shore up the defenses of the whole free world—defenses which constitute the outer bulwarks of our own national security.

And the great virtue of this mutual-security program is that it is so carefully devised to meet the particular dangers which exist in each particular area with the particular weapons—military, economic, educational, psychological—which offer the best prospect, within the prudent limits of our means, to counter those dangers area by area.

We are not putting all our eggs in one basket.

We are not putting all our reliance on the atom bomb to deter communism. We know the Communists can infiltrate areas where we dare not risk using the atom bomb.

We are not putting all our reliance on our own Armed Forces. We know that we do not possess the manpower to police the world.

We are not putting all our reliance on conventional armaments in the hands of others. We know that unpopular governments can be subverted by Communists from within even where the Communists would hesitate or be unable to use direct armed force from without.

We are not putting all our reliance on large-scale economic development assistance. We know that some countries cannot absorb it and that too-rapid social change may sometimes simply throw oil on the leaping flames of communism.

We are not putting all our reliance on technical assistance. We know that the widespread benefits of point 4 cannot in every case improve the situation fast enough to meet the Communist challenge.

We are not putting all our reliance on unilateral American action in these fields. We know that often a particular activity is more acceptable to other peoples if handled through the United Nation, free from suspicion of United States pressure.

So we are presenting to the House a program which integrates these various partial solutions, dovetailing them to the varied circumstances and needs of the free peoples. To be sure, the world situation is still fluid, especially in the Far East. We must leave the administrators leeway to make future adjustments. But the House and the American people should be reassured to know that the authorization now before us has already been subjected to most intensive scrutiny and criticism. The Foreign Affairs Committee held daily hearings for almost three months—twice a day during the last 3 weeks. Every executive proposal for substantial expenditures, in every country concerned, has been minutely examined, both separately and from the viewpoint of an integrated program. The result is a plan of authorization which merits confidence.

My Democratic friends will recognize that this represents the continuation of several programs which our party initiated. And may I say that although there have been times in recent months when Democrats were legitimately disturbed at what seemed to be the hesitation of this administration to grasp the hand of bipartisanship which we have so freely extended—still this particular bill constitutes a fine example of nonpartisan, painstaking congressional activity in which the participants on both sides can properly take pride. Democrats and Republicans alike deserve credit for important contributions to the bill that is before us. Correspondingly, my fellow partisans should avoid the temptation to stand smugly aside and point a finger of scorn at an overseas program which is obviously not succeeding everywhere. We cannot expect it to. As Americans, we can only do our best, and seek to persuade others to do likewise.

The objective is the defense of the United States—to be achieved through a defense in depth—not the kind of a defense which would begin by fatalistically conceding to the Communists the population and resources of half the world. We intend to do our best to work with the non-Communist peoples of the earth to keep them non-Communist—not to attempt to remake them in our own image, not to turn them into semicolonial dependencies of the United States, but to encourage and assist them to be come self-governing and progressive, imbued with national self-respect and determined to maintain a position independent of Moscow and Peiping.

We have suffered setbacks in these efforts. We are suffering setbacks today, mainly in southeast Asia. These setbacks give us cause for grave concern—but surely do not justify any abandonment or suspension of our activities in that area, which is so vital to our whole defensive position in the Far East.

We should take heart from the notable successes which our programs have achieved in other areas of the world—in Europe, in the Middle East, in Korea, and Japan. In all of these places the chances of Communist triumphs in the near future seem smaller than at any time since 1947. The immediate crisis area has been narrowed to southeast Asia. There it may be that we are bound to experience Communist gains as long as neither our own Government nor our allies show the willingness to intervene more actively. But in the apparent absence of a will to do so, this House should at least recognize that the kind of varied, flexible program which we are presenting today goes as far as is feasible to salvage as much as possible from the grasping claws of Asian communism. Half a loaf is better than none—and we ourselves may find it more digestible than the whole loaf of direct intervention.

We must take guard also that we do not allow our frustrations in southeast Asia to undermine the successes we have achieved elsewhere in building situations of growing strength through cooperation with allies and friendly peoples. It is bad enough to lose ground in Indochina without then compounding the evil by tearing apart the Big Three alliance, merely in order to allocate the blame.

I certainly believe that the establishment of a position of strength in southeast Asia—and in Indochina itself—is a vital national interest of the United States. But I also know that whatever happens in that area, we Americans are going to continue to need in many places—and ought to value—the cooperation of those few other great peoples of earth who share with us a long tradition of democratic self-government and adhere to Western principles of justice. The very preservation of our civilization in the fullest sense requires a ready interchange of the resources of the Western world—not just the material resources, however indispensable they may be, but also the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources of the various nations which share our Christian heritage. We will impoverish our minds if we shut our ears to the ideas of our close allies, just as we would impoverish our material capacity to resist communism if we were to isolate ourselves from the great areas of the world. We have got to keep these channels open.

We should remember that it is not much better to shut ourselves off from the advice of our friends merely because of an exaggerated sense of our own righteousness, than it would be to shut ourselves off because of base timidity. Lately the course of events in southeast Asia has led us toward moral and political pitfalls. Many Americans seem to the parading our national piety, and adopting toward friendly but hard-pressed peoples a holier-than-thou attitude, which is of course deeply offensive to them—and which in turn threatens to produce in ourselves an inbreeding of thought that could disastrously blind us to the realities of the world in which we live. Pride, including spiritual pride, "goeth before a fall." It would be well for all Americans to keep this in mind in voicing judgment upon our allies for their reluctance always to go along with us.

We cannot escape our position of world leadership. And wise leadership, like love, suffers long and is kind.

We can still learn from those we lead.

Nor is it we who are doing all the suffering. The principle of mutual security is a principle of proportionate sacrifice for joint defense. The defense burdens individually borne by our allies may not approach ours in dollar totals—but they are being carried by peoples with much lower standards of living than ours, who are eager as we are to improve their standards. In many cases for them to increase their own defense burdens would simply play directly into the hands of the Communists—with the result that the net gain in will and capacity for defense would negligible.

At the NATO headquarters in Paris, a French colonel with decades of service—including World War II and two 3-year tours of combat duty in Indochina—receives no more pay than an American master sergeant. We prosperous Americans need to think a little more deeply about the real meaning of equality of sacrifice whenever we are tempted to bandy about the notion that FOA is a giveaway.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the bright hope—and I have not yet despaired of its fulfillment—that this legislation might be viewed as a symbol of our acceptance of leadership of the peoples of the world who are eager for peace, conditioned by justice and decency; that the positive phases of this great program would be emphasized; and that no one might say, whatever differences as to detail should develop, that we do this grudgingly and only because of the fears and tensions that exist. There are compelling reasons for this legislation, Mr. Chairman. I am firmly convinced that it is in America's interest. The fact that it is also in the interest of others who are still free to determine their own destiny and to build their own structures of government, does not make it less in our own Nation's interest. I believe the day will come when everyone of us who takes this view will recall with satisfaction having had a share in one of the most significant enactments of the postwar period.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and subject to amendment at any point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion to strike out all after the enacting clause and report the bill back to the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts moves to strike out all after the enacting clause and report the bill back to the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this matter of offshore purchasing is dangerous, it is bad economically for us and it is also dangerous as a matter of national defense. If our workers go into other industries as a result of not being able to work in the navy yards and shipyards, we lose the skill of those men and, therefore, we will not be able to construct the vital naval equipment that is so necessary for our national defense.

We in Massachusetts are being terribly hard hit insofar as work in our navy yards is concerned and some of the State is in the surplus labor and distressed area. I talked to the Navy Department just a few minutes ago and one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy said he was very sympathetic and very sorry over the condition that exists in all navy yards. I repeat, Massachusetts has been especially severely cut—the United States should not give our shipbuilding trade to other areas.

It is incredible to me that Member after Member will get up on the floor of the Congress here and say that we must develop our national defense, but instead we are developing the national defense of other countries, countries that may be attacked at any time.

I hope that the language referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will protect our shipbuilding industries and our workers and our country, but it does not offer enough protection.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. With the protection of this amendment, the gentlewoman can go to the Foreign Operations Administration and the various Government departments, and ask if they have screened these offshore procurement contracts, show them the facts in your district, and have this work done in this country when there is unemployment or labor surplus.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. While I represent part of metropolitan Boston and many from my district are employed there, the Charlestown Navy Yard is in the gentleman's district and he does a great deal of work in behalf of the yard and its workers.

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes. I realize that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts in offering her motion, does so that we may protect our shipyard industry. The other morning a group of the Massachusetts delegation visited the Pentagon with the Secretary of the Navy. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts was there. And I now direct my remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we made reference to the fact that through offshore procurement ships were going to be built and were being built in Yugoslavia and in other sections of Europe and in other sections of the world, whereas at the present time at home in the Boston Naval Shipyard scheduled to be laid off on July 24 are 759 men. We asked the Secretary of the Navy at that time if it were possible under this offshore procurement act in the mutual security bill to designate that that work be given to the Boston Navy Yard. We directed this remark to Mr. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy. I am sure that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will bear me out. He said that to his knowledge the Navy had nothing whatsoever to do with the Mutual Security Act or the assigning of the building of ships. You will recall that Admiral Liggett was there also and he corrected that statement. We have a man at the head of the Navy Department at the present time who not only does not know how to interpret the law, he does not even know the law.

I hope that this debate calls to the attention of Secretry of the Navy Thomas that the Navy has a definite program established under this act. Section 103, lines 14 through 23 on page 4, gives the authority to the administration to assign work to the Boston Naval Shipyard and any other areas where the economy of the United States is adversely affected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say this, there are already many out of work out at the navy yard and private shipyards at the present time. In September there will be more workers laid off and there will be further layoffs in other shipyards in September. The amendment which would provide that work could be done in the United States in an area where there is unemployment ought to be helpful if properly carried out, but I am very cynical because I find especial help for surplus areas has proved to be rather a farce.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this motion and in defense of people in another section of the United States. A hungry South Carolinian is just as hungry as a hungry New Englander. The shipbuilding industry in the whole United States, notably in my part of the world, has felt the pinch of the depression which has hit the shipbuilding industry. Take the naval shipyards in this country. I know something about them. I know the plight of the one in Boston, and it is in a bad fix, a bad condition. The same is true of the one in Norfolk, and the one in Philadelphia, and the one in Brooklyn, and those on the west coast, and certainly those in the South. I want you to know that there are 11 naval shipyards created by statute. Every one of them has had to carry the entire burden of all the shipbuilding industry, particularly those under the Maritime Commission about which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], has been talking, and if it were not for our naval shipyards in this country, we would have no shipbuilding industry. And, just now we are waking up to the fact that if we do not take care of our own shipbuilding, we will have none in this country. Now, why could not these desperately needed ships be given out of our surplus supply? In my own shipyard in Charleston we have ships in mothballs that could be taken out and given to these people. Some people say that some are being built in Italy, but because of security reasons that could not be discussed. Let me tell you this: We do not even have base rights in Italy. I said that a while ago. By the shotgun method we are being refused base rights, and they are trying to get us into Trieste. I know that and you know that. The same condition prevails in France. Why should we pay our taxpayers' money and subsidize shipyards, the shipbuilding industry, in other nations and get out of our own shipbuilding industry? It just does not make sense. And, I think we should alert our people. I have heard the lip service of my friend from Pittsburgh. That is lip service, is it not? You know it. Let us take some affirmative action here and stop this nonsense.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman should stress the fact that in shipbuilding it is the know-how to build as well as the actual, physical yards. That is a thing that is disappearing. We

are losing the skills of the people which are just as important as shipyards.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course. They are not going to the shipyards; they are going to the boneyard. When World War II broke out, we had no shipping, and the cost of shipping our war materiel in the so-called allied ships went up 2,500 percent. I think we are literally cutting our own throats. It reminds me of a story Judge Tarver used to tell about the colored man in his part of the world who had a little catfish. The little catfish was still wobbling and the old colored man said "Hold still, little catfish. I am just going to gut you." That is all we are doing with the shipbuilding industry. We are asking them to hold still long enough so that we can gut them. It just does not make sense. And, I am letting you know in my own terminology, I am "agin" it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 123. Common use items: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $70 million for the provision of any common-use equipment, materials, commodities, or services which are to be used by military forces of nations receiving assistance under chapter 1 of this title. Programs authorized by this section shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of chapter 1 or chapter 3 of this title.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with great interest to a discussion of the problem which confronts the shipbuilders of America. The shipbuilders are not the only ones that are suffering because of this unfair situation of our offshore procurement.

I was in India last fall where we are helping to dig, and paying almost all the cost of digging, 2,650 deep wells. The contractor who had the contract for 750 of those wells could not buy American-made goods, because of the fact that the specifications were so written that American manufacturers could not meet those specifications for motors and well pipe and hence the American manufacturers lost that business.

Also may I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the Bureau of Reclamation in the fiscal year 1953 bought 62 percent of all of their generators for hydroelectric power plants and related facilities from foreign manufacturers, because the domestic manufacturers of those items were underbid to the point where the Bureau of Reclamation was forced to buy those articles in foreign countries.

Since I made public some of these matters that I have just talked about I have had letters from manufacturers of many many commodities in most every section of the United States of America complaining because they are losing business to foreign countries. I hope something can be done in this bill that will guarantee, to a reasonable degree, that the American people who pay taxes here will get at least their fair share of this business that is being given to foreign countries under our foreign aid setup. As much as we want to help other nations, after all, there is a limit to all things.

Our farmers are not very happy about it, either. We have sent hundreds upon hundreds of our agricultural technicians and experts all over the world to teach the people of almost every nation on this side of the Iron Curtain how to raise more farm products per acre. I am not too much opposed to that. But then we hear people who should know better lecturing to us as to how we must sell more farm products around the world.

Listen to this as a fair example. Last fall I was in a cornfield in France, it was making over 60 bushels to the acre, I asked, "How many bushels per acre did you used to raise before we gave you hybrid seed corn and showed you how to raise it?" And they said, "20 to 25 bushels."

The same is true of cotton, sugarcane, wheat, hogs, and poultry, and so forth. Now I am not complaining too much, but it disgusts me when I hear self-appointed experts stand on the floor of this House or go on the radio or before television and say we must have more foreign trade in our farm products, when I know, and you know, farm-products exports are dwindling and will continue to dwindle for the reason I have just explained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before the vote comes on final passage of this foreign-aid bill now under discussion, may I again remind my colleagues that we, the people of the United States of America, have a Federal deficit of over $270 billion, which is more than the combined deficits of all the other nations on earth.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has just informed me that on July 1, next Thursday, there will be over $2 billion unobligated and over $9 billion unexpended from funds previously appropriated for this purpose.

This bill provides for an additional $3,400,000,000. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no Member of this House in my desire to help peace-loving, freedom-loving peoples of the world to ward off communism to the limit of our ability, but there is a limit to our own ability to pay out of the pockets of the already overburdened taxpaying American people.

Tomorrow this House will start consideration of the agriculture bill. A move is on foot to reduce the farm income, the basic item which governs our national income from which we are collecting local, State, and Federal taxes of over $90 billion annually, or over 30 percent of every American's income on an average. I shall vote "no" on final passage in the hope that the Appropriations Committee will reduce the amount requested in this bill to a figure I can support.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me preface with a question these remarks on the general subject of foreign aid, as embodied in the measure now before the House. Where in the Constitution of the United States does the Federal Government get the power to seize the American taxpayers' money and send it abroad as free gifts to foreign governments?

That, Mr. Chairman, is a constitutional question, which I believe too long has been permitted to remain unanswered. It is a question which has been permitted to go by default by our foreign policymakers over a period of nearly a decade, in their eagerness to buy friends and allies in the fight against Communist aggression. It is a question which I believe we must answer without delay.

Nobody sensibly can deny that in the years immediately following World War II, many of the European nations which fought gallantly were left prostrate. We were justified in helping them to struggle out of the wreckage of war. The argument that rehabilitation of our wartime allies was a measure of American national defense constituted a valid argument in those days.

But the situation then was far different from the one we face today. Then our wartime allies were, indeed, prostrate economically. Many hundreds of thousands, if not millions, were starving; commerce and industry were paralyzed, and in many instances actually nonexistent. In those days Western Europe lay helpless before the Communist threat. But today those nations no longer are helpless.

Today most of those nations are fully as strong economically as they were prior to World War II. They have all of the manpower and the industrial productivity which enabled them to put hundreds of well-equipped and well-trained divisions into the field. That they stand today ill-prepared, or not prepared at all, to face the Communist threat—that the NATO and the EDC have fallen into desuetude—cannot be attributed to economic weakness.

The failure of our putative friends and allies to ready themselves for strong resistance to Communist aggression, it would seem, can be attributed now to a total unwillingness to face the grim facts. It can be attributed to a desire only to enjoy the fruits of that prosperity made possible by American generosity, while leaving to the United States the terrible necessity of defending the free world almost unaided.

One can count on the fingers of one hand the nations, other than the United States, which are girding for defense to the full extent of their ability. And those nations, almost without exception, are relatively small and weak.

Because of these things, Mr. Chairman, the constitutional argument that our tremendous volume of foreign aid—excepting, perhaps, in some instances, that of a purely military nature—is a direct measure of national defense, has ceased to be a valid argument. Foreign aid has become in essence merely a mechanism whereby we try to buy the loyalty of allies. Allies who would rather, it seems, trade with our mutual enemy than resist him.

Screaming headlines, warning the public of the dangers of losing Europe and Asia, should we fail to feed all the hungry billions of the earth, are misleading, and unsupported by the record of past experience. If we continue large-scale foreign aid, without strict curbs on use of the money, and without demanding even cooperative friendship in return, we

shall be doing as it was done by ancient Rome. We shall build a system of satellite nations, which would give us as much cause for fear as do our enemies.

We are haunted by a fear of losing the support of those nations we have aided in the hope they would serve as our outer guard. Apparently we are afraid to cut off foreign aid lest our supposed allies join the enemy and kill us with our own weapons. We have been bankrupting ourselves to support some nations of the free world, while the Communists have plundered and absorbed others. Russian prestige has grown, while ours has dwindled.

Since the end of World War II, Mr. Chairman, total expenditures by the United States in foreign aid have totaled approximately $44,327,000,000. If one includes all the expenditures, such as lend-lease and military aid before and after the war, the total approximates $113 billions. The foreign-aid appropriation for the year still current totaled $6,776,800,000, as high or higher than in any previous peacetime year.

Since 1940 our contributions to Great Britain have reached the equivalent of more than a quarter of Britain's natural wealth. Yet today, as we have seen within the past week, Great Britain is less friendly and co-operative than before receiving our billions. Since 1944 we have given Italy $2,865,000,000, yet Communist Party strength there has increased from 4 million in 1944 to 6 million in 1954. Since 1944 we have given France about $5 billions. Yet today 1 French voter out of 3 votes the Communist ticket. One French soldier out of every 4 is a Communist.

If it is not now apparent to everyone, Mr. Chairman, it should be apparent that the Communists have succeeded in expanding their activities and their influence in every part of the world, despite the broadcasting of American billions. We have that influence right now in our own back yard. We are not sure even now that the patriotic citizens of Guatemala have succeeded in ousting completely the Communist regime set up in that little country, supposedly inspired with the aid and connivance of the Kremlin. And Guatemala is within 6 hours flying time of the Panama Canal.

And while all these things are going on, our own citizens are overburdened with taxes, a very substantial part of which goes to finance still further this disastrous experiment in buying friends and allies; in buying loyalty to the tenets of human liberty. In our Federal Government there is a clamor for additional pay increases for employees of numerous departments and agencies. Pay raises for the Coast Guard and for the Post Office Department are being investigated, but with the idea that little can be done about it, because no more taxes can be imposed to meet these demands.

My own community of Chicago, Mr. Chairman, and indeed the entire State of Illinois, now are taxed to the saturation point. Yet in Chicago there is a justified demand for pay increases for teachers, policemen, firemen, and other municipal employees. What are we going to do about these demands, Federal and local? What can we do while billions in tax money are being sent abroad as free gifts to foreign nations?

When these things are considered in the light of reason, it becomes apparent that our foreign aid programs now have reached a point where they are serving directly to lower the standard of living in the United States. For take note of this significant fact. Had we appropriated nothing for foreign aid in 1953, when the total was $6,776,800,000 for the 1954 Government fiscal year just now ending, we would have been able to balance the Federal budget in this year. Foreign aid represented almost exactly the total of the Federal deficit.

It should be understandable, then, Mr. Chairman, why I am opposed to the bill, identified as the Mutual Security Act of 1954, H. R. 9678. The objectives sought to be accomplished in this measure are defined in the following language:

> To promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

Fine language, indeed.

But the bill is replete with high-sounding platitudes, oratorical outbursts, and glib generalities, which add nothing to the measure by way of enlightening the public. The wording of the bill tends only to enmesh the United States more and more in the subtle trickery, the illusory policies, and the power politics of the Eastern Hemisphere.

This piece of legislation calls for billions to be handed out in just about every foreign nation identified on the global map, just as did similar bills approved by Congress over the past 8 years. The original bill was designed to provide aid for the suffering millions in Europe, who lost their livelihoods and even their hopes of the future as a result of World War II. But that is largely untrue today.

Had the later foreign aid bills been confined to this laudable purpose, undoubtedly there would have been an end of approval of them long before this. The bills latterly would not have met with the strong opposition that developed through the years. The growth of this opposition is indicated by the voting records of Illinois Members of the House.

When the foreign aid bill was submitted in 1949 to the 81st Congress, all Republican Representatives from Illinois, except four, recorded their votes against it. Only two Illinois Members of the House, who voted at all, voted in supported of the measure. Opposition to the foreign aid bills has grown stronger ever since.

The present bill is primarily one designed to delegate to the President all authority to carry out its terms. The bill calls for total appropriations of $3,440-608,000. However, to this total must be added the funds the President would be authorized to take from unexpended balances available because of appropriations previously made by Congress for foreign aid. It is reliably reported that about $11 billion comprising this surplus now are available for distribution under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, in addition to the current appropriations.

Here are some illustrations, Mr. Chairman, indicative of where the money that Congress is being asked to appropriate may go in the event that it is made available for distribution.

The President is authorized to make contributions to infrastructure programs of the NATO. A total of $27 million would go to encourage and expedite development of advanced design weapons by nations or international organizations eligible to receive military assistance. Provision is made that no money in this category is to go to nations which have not signed the NATO agreement. But we do not know for sure as yet just which nations are bound by the terms of that agreement.

It would seem to me that the millions made available for development of weapons of advanced design comes at a rather late date, in view of past events. The spies in our midst seem to have sent most of our advanced designs to Russia.

The bill provides for a gift of $800 million to support the armed forces of the states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, in Indochina, the armed forces of France now in that area, and for other purposes connected with implementation of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. This sum is only $175 million short of the total amount appropriated this year by Congress for extending and improving the entire highway system of the United States.

Under the category of development assistance, $130 million is appropriated for assistance designed to promote the economic development of the Near East and Africa; also $85 million for development of south Asia, comprising chiefly India, which refused American transport planes a right-of-way in flying French soldiers to the defense of Indochina.

Other provisions would authorize expenditure of $9 million for economic development of Latin American nations and non-self-governing territories in the Western Hemisphere; also $17,958,000 for making contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance. Another $500 million would go to purchase surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for distribution to needy populations abroad.

My point in citing all these provisions of the bill, Mr. Chairman, is simply to drive home the fact that the money of American taxpayers is being taken, without authority under the Constitution, for distribution throughout the entire world. To drive home the further fact that this is being done, while American public works are being neglected, while American workers in governments, both Federal and local, are unable to get cost-of-living pay increases, which can affect the standard of living in the United States in many respects.

Now in conclusion, I should like to make a few observations. With respect to the failure of postal workers to get a justified pay raise, let me say that it is reliably reported that it costs $5,000 a year to maintain an American soldier abroad, while the average postal employee starts with a base pay of only $3,300. Yet the postal employee usually supports and educates a family, while

the soldier, usually without dependents, too often spends his time guarding the property of foreign nationals in a land beyond the seas.

Let me observe, also, that we face a dire situation throughout all of South and Central America. Communist inspired riots and political uprisings sporadically occur in most of the Latin American countries. In Argentina currently is ruled by a dictator who has made common cause with the Communists and other left-wing elements of the country. In Chile recently we witnessed a mass meeting of college students, who burned the flag of the United States, and hanged in effigy our President.

In British Guiana, Communist infiltrators of the local government tried to take over, and were prevented from doing so only when the British Government sent in troops and put the country under martial law.

All of these things followed upon the expenditure of many millions by the United States Government in promoting what is referred to as the "good neighbor" policy. Today there is more unrest, and less respect and regard for the United States, than ever before in Latin America.

Among our most loyal and cooperative of allies may be numbered the Scandinavian countries, the Low Countries comprising the Netherlands and Belgium, and incidentally the Republic of Ireland. Yet these countries have not made continuous demands for replenishment of their national treasuries with American dollars, under threat of going Communist should their demands be refused.

West Germany, a country which has been gradually rebuilt by its inhabitants on the ashes of national destruction and despair, is bypassed when it comes to American foreign-aid handouts; handouts that are virtually imposed by main force on the NATO signatory nations.

Israel, the latest nation on the face of the globe to achieve the goal of self-determination, has made superhuman efforts to establish a successful commonwealth where refugees of Hebrew origin cast up by World War II may find asylum. This infant republic, dedicated to human liberty, has been allotted the paltry sum of only $33 million of grants in aid by the provisions of the bill now before the House.

At the same time, provision is made for further coddling of Tito, the erstwhile disciple of Josef Stalin, who asks us to take his word for it that he no longer obeys the orders of the Kremlin. Who knows but what his country of Yugoslavia may yet become the Trojan Horse of the Communists, should a worldwide atomic war break out?

Again let me observe, that the tax savings embodied in the tax reduction bill now before the Congress would total approximately $1,250 million a year. The foreign-aid expenditures next year, including the money now asked to be appropriated and the unexpended balances on hand, would be at least three times the total of the tax savings that are contemplated.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, let me make this one last observation. If it is true that the rest of the free world will go our way only if we continue to carry it on our backs, we can be sure of one thing. The rest of the free world will ride us until we die of economic exhaustion. Foreign governments will continue to take everything we are willing to give. Judging from past experience, they will not use those gifts to promote human freedom. They will use them to finance their own socialistic experimentation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read and open to amendment. I do not think there are any further amendments to title I.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of title I is as follows:

CHAPTER 3—DEFENSE SUPPORT

SEC. 131. General authority: (a) The President is hereby authorized to furnish, to nations and organizations eligible to receive military assistsance under chapter 1 of this title, commodities, services, and financial and other assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort. In furnishing such assistsance, the President may provide for the procurement and transfer from any source of any commodity or service (including processing, storing, transporting, marine insurance, and repairing) or any technical information and assistance.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 to carry out the provisions of this section, not to exceed—

(1) $45,000,000 for Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey);

(2) $81,850,000 for the Near East (including Greece and Turkey), Africa, and South Asia; and

(3) $96,430,000 for the Far East and the Pacific. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 541 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this subsection through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized for the same area by this subsection: *Provided*, That portions of such unexpended balances which have been allocated to assistance for Greece and Turkey shall be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by paragraph (2) of this subsection.

SEC. 132. Korean program: (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $230,000,000 to be expended, upon terms and conditions specified by the President, for defense support, relief and rehabilitation, and other necessary assistance (including payment of ocean freight charges on shipments for relief and rehabilitation, without regard to sec. 409 of this act) in those parts of Korea which the President shall have determined to be not under Communist control. In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore allocated for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation in Korea pursuant to the paragraph entitled "Relief and Rehabilitation in Korea," chapter VII, Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, and unobligated balances of the appropriation for "Civilian Relief in Korea," title III, Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954, are hereby authorized to be continued available for the purposes of this subsection through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this subsection.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized, at any time prior to 24 mor ths from the date of enactment of this act, to transfer to the Republic of Korea, by sale or charter and on such terms and conditions as he may specify, title to not more than eight CI-M-AVI vessels. Any agency of the United States Government owning or operating such vessels is authorized to make such vessels available for the purpose of this subsection. Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the purpose of this subsection.

(2) Such transfers shall be made at prices determined under section 3 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U. S. C., App. 1736): *Provided*, That such vessels shall be placed in class in accordance with minimum requirements of the American Bureau of Shipping by the owning or operating agency, and the expense of placing in class shall be reimbursed to such agency.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $11,300,000 for making contributions to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency or expenditure through such other agency for relief and rehabilitation in Korea as the President may direct. In addition, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made pursuant to the last sentence of section 303 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this subsection through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this subsection. Sections 141 and 142 of this act shall not apply with respect to assistance furnished under this subsection.

(d) To the extent necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section (1) assistance may be furnished under this section without regard to the other provisions of this chapter and (2) the authority provided in section 306 may be exercised in furnishing assistance under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 133. Terms of assistance: Assistance under this chapter may be furnished on a grant basis or on such terms, including cash, credit, or other terms of repayment, as may be determined to be best suited to the achievement of the purposes of this act.

CHAPTER 4—GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 141. Conditions of eligibility for assistance: No assistance shall be furnished under this title to any nation or organization unless the President shall have found that furnishing such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace. No such assistance shall be furnished to a nation unless it shall have agreed to the provisions required by section 142, and such additional provisions as the President deems necessary to effectuate the policies and provisions of this title and to safeguard the interests of the United States.

SEC. 142. Agreements: No assistance shall be furnished to any nation under this title unless such nation shall have agreed to—

(1) join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace;

(2) take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;

(3) fulfill the military obligations, if any, which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party;

(4) make, consistent with its political and economic 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;

(5) take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities;

(6) take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the assistance fur-

nished under this title in furtherance of the policies and purposes of this title;

(7) impose appropriate restrictions against transfer of title to or possession of any equipment and materials, information, or services furnished under chapter 1 of this title, without the consent of the President;

(8) maintain the security of any article, service, or information furnished under chapter 1 of this title;

(9) furnish equipment and materials, services, or other assistance consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to the United States or to and among other nations to further the policies and purpose of chapter 1 of this title;

(10) permit continuous observation and review by United States representatives of programs of assistance authorized under this title, including the utilization of any such assistance, or provide the United States with full and complete information with respect to these matters, as the President may require; and

(11) in cases where any commodity is furnished on a grant basis under any provision of this act other than chapter 1 of title I under arrangements which will result in the accrual of proceeds to the recipient nation from the import or sale thereof, establish a special account, and—

(i) deposit in the special account, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon, currency of the recipient nation in amounts equal to such proceeds;

(ii) allocate to the use of the United States Government not less than 10 percent of the amounts deposited in the special account; and

(iii) utilize the remainder of the special account for programs agreed to by the United States to carry out the purposes for which new funds authorized by this act would themselves be available.

Any unencumbered balances of funds deposited in the special account after the effective date of this act which remain in the account upon termination of assistance to such nation under this title shall be disposed of in such manner as may be authorized by act or joint resolution of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. Authorization: (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955, not to exceed—

(1) $130 million for assistance designed to promote the economic development of the Near East and Africa, and for other types of assistance designed to help maintain economic and political stability in the area

(2) $85 million for assistance designed to promote the economic development of South Asia and to assist in maintaining economic and political stability in the area; and

(3) $9 million for assistance designed to promote economic development in the other American Republics and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Such assistance may be furnished on such terms and conditions as the President may specify, except that not less than 50 percent of the assistance furnished under each paragraph of this subsection shall be furnished on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505.

(b) In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sections 206 and 302 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and unexpended balances of funds allocated to the emergency economic aid program for Bolivia are hereby authorized to be continued available for the purposes of this section through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriations authorized by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, respectively.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 22, strike out lines 12 through 15.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out $85 million of economic aid for India. There is in this bill in aid earmarked for India a total of $104.5 million. Of that total $85 million is in this title II, development assistance, which means economic aid. There is in another portion of the bill, title III, which provides $19.5 million for technical cooperation. My amendment would remove the $85 million but would have no effect on the $19.5 million in the technical cooperation section of this bill.

I must call the attention of the committee to the fact that as it is now written any funds provided under this section of this bill would be subject to the limitation that not less than 50 percent of the assistance be furnished on a loan basis. However, since we have been contributing substantial funds to India, we have contributed roughly $186 million in the period 1952–54. This money has been integrated and tied in with the 5-year plan of India for her own recovery. That plan was begun in 1951, but this country did not begin to participate until 1952. The money which is available in this $85 million item is to be used as planned for these purposes. I think it is important for the Members of the House to realize that as we consider this amendment. It is to be used with emphasis on nonagricultural development—including industry, transport—railroad rehabilitation, and electric power for economic expansion. If you leave this money in this bill, those are the things for which you are providing funds. The programs which have met with the greatest degree of success in India, that is those which come under the general heading of technical cooperation are not disturbed. Those are the programs whereby our experts go into various communities in India and teach the people how to do things for themselves for their own benefit and their own betterment. We, by removing this $85 million, will simply be removing the economic aid to that nation. It seems to me the question which is before the House this afternoon, as we consider this point is this: Is it good for India and is it good for our country to leave this amount of money in the bill for the purposes I have specified? Certainly, we have many friends in that great country, and I am sure they realize that they have many friends here, but it becomes a matter of weighing the benefits of such a program. It seems to me that here is the opportunity for the House to express its opinion upon a question not of military aid, not of technical assistance, but of economic aid. Therefore, I think it very proper that this amendment be adopted and the $85 million removed from the bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in defense of the authorization of aid for India as contained in this bill. As the Members know, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS and I were congressional delegates to the Eighth General Assembly of the United Nations. During that 3 months' assignment, we had dealings with the delegates from India which were not always pleasant. As Americans we were sometimes surprised and shocked by Indian statements and inferences about the United States' conduct of its foreign policy. In our report to the Congress—House Report No. 1695—we expressed our criticism in very plain words, for we felt that the Congress should be aware of that situation and we hoped that the attitudes of your representatives would be brought sharply to the attention of the Government of India.

I am pleased that the minority report on this bill quoted our remarks on India because it gives me an opportunity to illustrate an important principle which should guide this House in its consideration of all matters dealing with American foreign policy. That principle is that our first consideration must always be to protect and further the best interests of the United States. To that end, I sincerely believe that by authorizing this money for India we will be considering the best interests of the United States.

India is a newly independent nation of 400 million people. For the past 200 years they have been governed by outsiders, leaving them highly suspicious of the West, even when our overtures were made in friendship and good faith. We know their fears are unreasonable, but we must recognize that they exist. We should also recognize that the leaders of India, when they make rash and unjustified statements, often are playing upon the prejudices and fears of their people. We on the American political scene are too often guilty of this same practice!

The authorization which we are considering today will go as aid to the Indian people. If such efforts contribute to better standards of living which would most certainly tend to bring about a better understanding of our endeavors in their behalf, I feel certain it will do more to change the public statements of their leaders than any criticism we direct at the Indian leaders alone.

But even aside from an apparent lack of appreciation shown by the Indian Government, we must never lose sight of the fact that India is an independent, democratic country, demonstrating, by its very existence, that a free people can survive and prosper in Asia. In our never-ending psychological battle with communism in Asia we could have no better demonstration of the basic strength of our way of life than the example of a free India.

Moreover, India is a going concern. Its people are no longer willing to accept conditions under which they have lived for centuries. They are helping themselves. But without outside economic assistance can they progress rapidly enough?

Asia, as you all know, is in terrible ferment. Upheavals in underdeveloped areas have caused, in part, many of the troubles on that great continent. India

is emerging as a leader of the Asian nations. Other countries of that area look to India for guidance in policy because they believe that India has been recognized across the world as a major power. We have a vested interest in India's position if only to be sure that India and not Red China becomes the spokesman in Asia.

I hardly need tell you that the Soviets are exerting a tremendous effort in India. The necessity to Sovietize India and China was openly expressed during numerous sessions of the Comintern. India must build itself a strength with which to resist communism, now in control of neighboring China. This she can do as she realizes her own potentialities and is given time to develop maturity and political wisdom.

What will happen if India is engulfed by communism? Aside from the disastrous psychological effect on all Asia, let me point to some of the United States import lists. We receive from India 37 percent of our manganese, 63 percent of our mica, 53 percent of our ilmenites, and many other strategically important minerals. Moreover, India contains one of the world's richest deposits of iron ore, coal, and bauxite.

I feel that this authorization for aid to India is very definitely in the first and best interest of the United States.

Let me say in conclusion that to me we are not buying India's friendship. Surely we are not stupid enough to think we could do so in India or in any other country. But we believe that by helping the Indian people when and as they so desire in the building of better standards of living we shall be able to strengthen those within India who are fighting communism vigorously and wholeheartedly.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request with reference to time on this amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield if this is taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. CELLER. Then I cannot yield further.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, to cut out aid to India would be tragic, unrealistic, unwarranted surgery. It would be a knife at the heart of our own foreign policy. The injury to ourselves, I might venture to say, would be greater than even we can calculate at this moment. With one such act of deletion, we have spoken a great democracy's—our democracy's—indifference to want and poverty; we alienate not only the people of India but those who watch and weigh our leadership in world affairs. What are our objectives? An expression of irate impatience? Or finding the one road to peace?

For years we have heard much criticism on the loss of China. The debate continues in fury. Yet here we contemplate a deed so fraught with tragedy for the whole free world that generations hence will ask whence came these blind spots.

India wants peace. This I know. It is not only that India wants peace; she desperately needs peace, peace that will give her time, she argues, time to work out the enormous problems, economic and social, that face her. Nehru says:

> If we delay too long, perils will envelop us, both external and internal, so we must have a sense of urgency.

This is India's thinking. We know as well as India knows the thousands of miles of common border she faces with Red China. The dilemma is there for her. One of her ways to solve it, she believes, is to adopt, as she calls it, a dynamic neutralism. We may not agree that that is the way. We may say this is the wrong way to buy time, but we do know she is trying to struggle through to peace. And not a peace at any price, for if it were at any price, India could not point at all to her voting record in the United Nations. During the eighth session of the General Assembly, India voted in support of the United States on 27 occasions and in support of the U. S. S. R. on 19 occasions. There would have been no such 27 occasions were India willing to try for time at any price. Keep in mind that at the same time the United States and the Soviet Union voted in support of each other on 14 occasions.

To say that India is not alert to the dangers of international communism is to deny the facts. It is perhaps the degress of alertness that may be open to question. Within India itself, quiet, quick, and effective measures are being constantly taken against subversives and Communists in government. Communism is a crime and the party is outlawed in numerous provinces. Many Communists have been jailed. India, unlike us gets after communism without fanfare, without any circus performances. During my visit to India, I talked with Nehru, President Persad, Govenor General Bagpai of Bombay, Governor General Roy of Bengal and many other leaders in Government. I found that by instinct, training, education, they are all oriented toward the West. And it is this orientation we must keep in mind when we act on aid to India. Do we encourage this orientation of India's leaders or do we push it away and with the pushing away make room for greater poverty in which the evils of communism flourish?

We cannot accuse India of bad faith. In her own way, she, too, seeks the road to peace, not in defiance or arrogance, but hopefully, probing here and there. This is of course her right, as it is ours, to seek varying directions to peace. If we deny her our aid, what do we save? Money. But if we grant it, we may in the end have saved a continent and millions of human souls. We cannot demand that other countries recreate themselves in our own image. If we can help in some measure India toward the fulfillment of her aims toward economic and social well-being, toward the expansions of democracy, then we shall in that measure have helped ourselves and all of the free world. I pray, gentleman, you consider well what you do.

I am not unaware of what may appear to be Nehru's skirting. Nehru has advocated the possibility of a peaceful coexistence with Red China. This is a policy advanced by Great Britain and France as well. Nobody at this moment can say whether that is possible or not, but, again, we do not turn aside from the most significant and largest democracy in Asia because while we do not differ in objectives we differ, perhaps, in method. India is a democracy, eager to preserve that democracy, eager to develop democratically. We face the long, hard pull at this turn of history. Irritation and impatience are the most ill-advised of all possible guides.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, why can he not permit Members to debate this item that carries $85 million? Do we have to hurry through with it on a basis of that kind?

Mr. VORYS. It is because of pressure on the House that the gentleman knows about. I have been hoping all day that we could move along. It seems to me that 15 minutes would be sufficient.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. In the last few years we have put this economic aid policy on a very fallacious foundation.

There is one thing I learned in the Far East 2 years ago from some people over there that I know knew what they were talking about. I was reliably informed that when Prime Minister Nehru came to the United States on his famous visit some years ago, which many of you will remember, he was taken up to Wall Street in New York. He was shown the vast financial setup of the United States. He was told that this corporation here represented billions of dollars, that this one represented hundreds of millions of dollars. He was taken over this country and shown vast projects that India could not possibly have in the next generation.

Then he went back to India and made this statement:

I do not like America. America is too dollar minded. They worship the dollar. They seem to think they can buy our friendship.

Those people resent that.

Mr. Chairman, what we should have done when Nehru was in America was take him out to Indiana or Nebraska or some of these great breadbasket areas of America. We should have shown him how to grow food for the people of India. Let him see the ordinary people of America. We have some poor people too. We should not have taken him up to Wall Street and shown him and impressed upon his mind the power of the almighty dollar. A real opportunity was missed to show Nehru the grassroots of the United States. The freedom and stamina of the common citizen—the real power of America.

It is time for us to wake up. We are in charge of the purse strings of America. Yes, I saw on the streets of Calcutta, along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and others, after we had voted millions of dollars in grain for India, the bodies being hauled off early in the morning, just as they have been for generations. And, listen, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was not taken on that tour around the streets of Calcutta at 6 o'clock in the morning by the cocktail diplomats who are supposed to be representing the people of the United States of America. I was taken there and shown the truth by the Standard Oil representative in Calcutta, by the representatives of American business, who told me about this fallacious policy, this ridiculous idea, of buying the friendship and love of people across the seas. They told me that every single bushel of wheat in the United States of America could have been piled on the wharves of Calcutta and the people of India would still be starving, as they have been for hundreds of years. Why? Because they do not have the railroad facilities in India. Why? Because 83 percent of the people of India are illiterate. They cannot read or possibly know where the aid comes from. The Government of that country would take the wheat and give it to their rich merchants, to those people friendly to Nehru, who in turn would give it to their friends, or sell it on the blackmarket. The people of that country continue to starve as they have been doing for many years.

What is the answer to this problem? Yes, send relief to those areas of the world where they need it, where people are starving, but send it through the Red Cross, send it through the Salvation Army, send it through the international relief organizations, people qualified to administer relief and meet the needs of the people of the world without any political strings tied to them by the party in power. Send aid in the Christian spirit of brotherly love. Not through some Government agent interested in padding figures to keep his job and maintain his luxurious standard of living.

I remember a colonel coming here from Bulgaria appearing before the Committee on Un-American Activities who made the flat statement, which has never been refuted, that UNRRA helped in the communization of his country; that when UNRRA came there, who was the crowd that administered it? The party in power, of course. And, they gave it to their friends on the promise that they would get more people into the Communist Party, and it was the taxpayer's money of this country that helped to communize Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and those nations of central Europe.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for this Congress, for this House, to realize that self-respect, honor, decency are still considered virtues by peoples in foreign lands. Their courage, determination and desire for freedom cannot be bought with American dollars. Their character and national pride is being weakened with handouts.

We should tell our foreign friends that there is no easy road to national glory. Tell them that the America of today is the product of privation, frugality, poverty, perservance, blood and sweat. They too can have freedom by their own efforts, by looking to and believing in themselves. Faith in their own destiny will win where American money alone cannot possibly buy national honor.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was unable to get the hearings on this bill in time to go through them as thoroughly as I would have liked before this bill came up. I have, since the committee report was available, studied this matter as closely as I could, and I have discovered one thing which was rather amazing to me; it is shown on page 9 of the committee report. The amount which is proposed in this bill for development assistance, for technical cooperation and other programs under title IV amounts to $481 million. Now, that is $45 million more than this House appropriated this year for all the rivers and harbors projects in the entire United States, which amount to $436,379,000. The rivers and harbors item for last year amounted to $423 million, and yet this bill carries $481 million for items which are not military assistance, not direct forces support, not defense support, but such items as 2,850 deep wells in the Ganges River delta to irrigate that farmland; for such items as building a fertilizer plant in India; for furnishing steel to India, and for items of that kind which are not a part at all of the technical assistance program.

Two years ago it was proposed to appropriate $77 million to India under the point 4 program for that year, although India was nearly $2 billion in the black, and we had a national debt then of $259 billion. I offered an amendment to cut $50 million off the Asia-Pacific so-called point 4 program; it passed overwhelmingly in the House and the reduction was approved in the Senate. So, we saved that $50 million that year. We ought to save the $85 million this year which is provided by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, in support of which I am now speaking.

That part of the hearings which I have been able to read and digest up to this time shows that—and I quote from page 540 of the hearings:

We have to date contracted for 2,850 production wells and are currently in the process of contracting for 350 exploratory wells in other parts of India. The United States investment in this program has been $24.5 million, to date, mostly from fiscal year 1952 and fiscal year 1953 funds.

It is also proposed in this program to spend our taxpayers' money for locomotives and freight cars and to rehabilitate the railroads of India.

In the financial stringency which we find our Government faces at this time, every dollar of this money which we appropriate for India and in this program must be borrowed money and we must pay interest on it. It is that kind of a burden on the taxpayers of this country. So I say that in the financial stringency which our Government now faces we should not, in addition to all these military items, be engaged in financing this kind of a program for India or any other foreign country. We have a hard enough time financing our water resources development projects here in this country. As I have already pointed out, the entire river and harbors appropriation in the House this year is $45 million less than the $481 million which is proposed to be appropriated here for these three items which go to make up the so-called point 4 or technical assistance and special economic assistance program.

This program started off in 1951 in the beginning to be a technical assistance program, with an appropriation for India of $5 million. It jumped the next year to $54 million; the following year $77 million was requested, and this year $85 million. Is there no help for the American taxpayer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor in support of the amendment and I would say in that connection that while India is entitled to lead her own life politically, economically, militarily; to pursue whatever course she may desire in world affairs including that of neutralism or close cordiality with the Soviet Union; and while Mr. Nehru may think what he wants, he may say what he desires to say in world councils, he may govern as he chooses, this country is certainly under no compulsion, under no obligation to underwrite constant, continuous and premeditated abuse from the leader of India nor from any other leader of any other nation in the world. Consistently across the past several years—in the world press, in the councils of the East, in the councils of the United Nations, our efforts and our objectives have been scorned and our projects worldwide have been derided. It appears that only our contributions in dollars and our contributions in wheat are acceptable in the Indian market place of ideas and of philosophies.

I think it should be said quite frankly that there is a tendency on the part of many to tiptoe around the true purposes of what we are trying to do in this all-out, tremendous effort which has been made across the years and is being made presently by this Congress. We are trying, to the best of our ability, to contribute in material support and in moral support, to the free nations of the world who can bring to this great effort against the greatest aggression since Genghis Kahn, spirit, determination, cooperation—those things without which certainly our efforts and the efforts of our allies are doomed to certain failure.

Today in the great worldwide bucket brigade in which this Nation is but one nation in the line there are those who are willingly passing along the bucket to help quench this great worldwide conflagration, but in that line as of today there is one nation which insists on trying to pass the bucket in the opposite direction and the confusion, the chaos and the dissension which grow out of India's present activities in this area cannot help but seriously handicap if not frustrate completely the decided effort being put forth.

Military aid is one thing, and there is important military aid contained in this bill. May I say here parenthetically that I intend to support the bill. I intend to vote for it. I think that to cease our effort at this point in what we are trying to do would certainly bring about a state of worldwide chaos. But I cannot subscribe to the idea that we are under a moral obligation to continue to do one single thing for those nations whose every effort appears to be directed to the frustration of our efforts in this regard.

I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman, and I hope it will be adopted by this body.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I make the observation that we like to have friends, but in this bill we are seeking allies. Also, that we, unlike the Communists, need no satellite states to enslave, but that we want to help peoples in the rolls of the free world. India is a vital counterfoil to Communist China and must be kept free.

Ambassador Allen, who is an extremely able man, and in whom so many Members of the House have confidence, reported this conversation—hearings, page 528—with Prime Minister Nehru:

He said he recognized that if any country becomes so dependent on foreign aid that it becomes addicted to the habit, then it never will be able to stand on its own feet. He said India needed foreign aid but at the same time he did not want India to become an habitue of it. He wanted India to stand on its own feet as soon as it could and as well as it could. He referred to this as a limitation on India's desire to have foreign assistance.

I might say that I respect that point of view. It is a great deal more dignified, it seems to me, and self-reliant than just to put your hand out for as much as you can get.

That, I think, is the attitude we all want taken, with respect to countries we work with in the mutual-security program. What we want them to do is to stand on their own feet in the lists of the free. That I know is the gentleman's view, and it is mine. India, building up economically, has a development plan involving $4 billion in investment, and our aid is estimated not to exceed 10 percent in any case overall. This plan is the redeeming assurance of freedom and of the support of the free world for the people of India. This is our direct channel, from the American people to the people of India, of self-help and mutual cooperation. It is invaluable. The worst thing we could do is to shut off from us India's people. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the gentleman and thank him.

Mr. Chairman, to oppose this amendment is not an easy position to take for reasons that everybody knows. It would be popular to denounce India for some of the provocative things some of her leaders have done or have said about us. But the more difficult the situation is, the more we have to sit down and take a good look at what we are trying to do in this bill, what this whole program is about.

It was never designed as a means of getting people to like us. Nobody has ever induced people to like him by giving them things. They may have to take his aid because of straitened circumstances, but they resent it just the same.

The idea behind this program is not that we can bribe people to join our side. You cannot bribe anybody to join you who is worth having, anywhere in the world.

The purpose of this bill is not to discharge a moral obligation. Not a cent of this Government aid, in my opinion, can be justified as charity or humanitarianism or on the basis of moral obligation.

The idea is not even that it will make friends for us.

The purpose of this bill is to safeguard the security of the United States. There are two main means or methods by which nations have won security. One is to prevent by all legitimate means any increase or expansion of the power of the forces that are against us, that are dedicated to our destruction. The other is to keep ourselves strong and have as much as possible of the rest of the world free and strong and on our side.

We are not trying to make other countries satellites of the United States. That is the Kremlin's objective and method; it is not ours.

We want other countries to be free and proud, willing and able to defend their national independence. If they are able to defend their own country and keep its manpower and resources and strategic bases out of the control of the enemy, that serves their interests and ours.

We are not trying to get Mr. Nehru or anyone else to bow before us to say, "Thank you so much for saving us." I would despise that attitude on our part, if anybody had it, as much as I would on his part if he were to come cravenly either to beg as a suppliant or to express gratitude as a cringing inferior.

What we are trying to do is to help free peoples stand on their own feet so that they can keep their countries free and out of the hands of our enemy. It is just as hard-headed a proposition as that. I wonder why we cannot keep our eye on the ball. This is not to make people like us; nobody is going to like us for something we do for them. It is not to make ourselves feel good because of aid we are giving to somebody. This program is to keep our enemy from getting any bigger and stronger and to keep the free world from being chiseled away and becoming steadily smaller and weaker.

Do we think we are doing so well in the world today that we can just cavalierly toss aside the several hundred million people of India who occupy exceedingly strategic territory and who may hold in their hands more of the fate of our own country than we even begin to realize?

Now how can we help keep their countries free? We can help give them the capacity to stand on their own feet and defend their national independence. That is what this bill is about. It cannot create the will, but it can give people who have the will, the capacity to defend their own institutions.

The people of Asia want economic uplift, yes, but that is not their first concern, it is a poor second. They want democracy—yes, but they can go a while longer without that, as they have gone centuries without it. The thing they do want, the desire that burns in their hearts, their first concern is the determination to be free from alien control. For decades, and in some cases for hundreds of years, they have fought to become independent. They have so recently achieved their independence. They have just tasted freedom—and they like it. More than anything else they are determined to keep it. And the first person they look on with suspicion is the white man of the west, from whom they won their freedom.

They have been independent for only about 6 years, it will be 7 years in August for India. Yet we expect them to be more mature and sure of themselves and judicious than we ourselves are after 175 years of independence and self-government.

Now, Mr. Nehru is a difficult person. Who is not under such circumstances? George Washington was pretty difficult, too. So is Syngman Rhee. So, for that matter, is Mr. Churchill. Almost every man is stubborn and proud and difficult who has the will to fight for 40 years to win independence for himself and his people.

Some of the leaders of India have what doctors would call in a child

adolescent revolt. I have a daughter who is going through the same thing. She does not know what some other imperialism may be like, but she knows what the one is like she has been under for the last 15 years; she is against it.

The British had Mr. Nehru, for example, in jail for 12 or 14 years. His inner soul has sustained wounds that inevitably make him have a strong subconscious resentment against everything connected with white people and with the Anglo Saxon tradition—of which we are a part. In his English-trained mind, he probably knows better. But down in his heart are scars that one can hardly expect to change much after what he has been through in 40 years of struggle against the West.

He hopes against hope that maybe communism, which he has never been under, will be less oppressive than the British rule which he has been under. It will not be, but it is not surprising that he does not see that yet. He is trying to get along with it.

Mr. Chairman, it took us 20 years or more to wake up to the nature of Communist imperialism. Some have not waked up yet. We have to give him a few more months. We cannot expect him to arrive at the same conclusion as we at the very same minute that we do.

Mr. Churchill has not discovered it yet. He advised us yesterday to have "a real good try for peaceful coexistence." If he still thinks that is possible, how can we ask a young nation that is just getting on its feet to be wiser and more intelligent and more resolute and more penetrating in its judgments than we in the West are, despite all our disillusioning experiences.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Indians see the Communists steadily winning in the struggle for Asia. Do we have a right to expect them to stand up against the Reds better than the West is doing?

Mr. Chairman, I hope everyone will take a good look at this amendment before deciding to vote for it. I hope we will take a good look before we take any action that might help a country of such strategic importance to drift into the hands of the Kremlin. These newly independent peoples are striving to find their way. I am convinced that if they are given a chance to become strong and to survive, they will be on our side when the showdown comes, because it is the side of freedom, and they will find there no freedom, there is no concern for human values on the other side.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be given to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think and would not the committee think that since this question has been raised and since it has been considered in the committee in hearings, both public and in executive session, and after it has been put in the bill, and furthermore, since we are dealing with a proud people, and a highly sensitive people, does not the gentleman think it would be a terrible mistake now for the House of Representatives to strike this language from the bill?

Mr. JUDD. I certainly do. That is the whole burden of my remarks. It would be like serving notice on these people that they might just as well go over to the other side first as last. That is why I believe we are playing with something as dangerous as atomic bombs here today—a sort of fission of the nucleus of freedom, if you will. When our country was just getting started, its leaders, including George Washington, wanted to be neutral, to keep out of other people's quarrels. They could do it because of physical isolation at that time. Nehru wants the same thing. He cannot have it; but does not see that yet. Events will force him to see it if we do not drive him to the other side by giving him no hope from our side. Let us not cut off all aid to India and thereby endanger our own security.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to express the hope that the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 61, noes 99.

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

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. VORYS and Mr. ADAIR to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 74, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, open to amendment at any point beyond that which we have already reached.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader as to how long he intends to continue tonight?

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because it gives me an opportunity to explain the situation as I see it.

There is no desire here to press on the matter of time for debate; certainly we have gone on here with everyone speaking who wanted to speak. There has been no motion to shut off debate; any limitation was by unanimous consent.

I understand there are two amendments at the desk, one by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], and one by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], which I understand may take a little time for debate. There are a couple of other amendments one of which will be withdrawn after a short statement. In other words, it seems we are down to the point where two amendments might take some time and the others not much time. If that is the situation and we can get the bill considered as read, then it would be my idea for the Chairman to recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], to dispose of their amendments. There could be a fair limitation of time for the consideration of those amendments and it seems to me if that were undertaken we could conclude the bill this evening without running too late.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell me what page of the bill we are on, and how many billion dollars we have already spent so far today, and how many billions we still have to go?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi—of course we have a great number of measures to be disposed of this week. There will be some conference reports in the morning. It is my desire that we meet at 10 o'clock in the morning to go on with the work that is before us and I hope that these measures that should be disposed of will be disposed of by Friday night so that we can have a long recess over the weekend. As many of you know, I had hoped for something a little better than that, but it is obvious now that that cannot be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. With all due regard to the good, honest intentions of our distinguished majority leader, I recognize this as merely an attempt to expedite and rush through this legislation and I object.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If anyone should ask for the reading of the engrossed copy, would that put it over until tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. We have not reached that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to ask if we could do that.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be a matter for the Speaker to rule on in the House.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: Page 22, strike out lines 20 to 24 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The total amount of assistance furnished under each paragraph of this subsection shall be furnished on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, as Members can see in the committee print,

the total amount of long-range economic assistance, otherwise known as development assistance, is $224 million. We have just voted on an amendment to eliminate $85 million. Fifty percent of the total amount of economic assistance is required under the committee print to be furnished on a loan basis under the terms of section 505. The amendment I have offered would put the entire amount of long-range economic assistance on a loan basis and would terminate any grant program, any give-away program, insofar as economic assistance is concerned.

In offering this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am mindful of the recommendations of the Randall Commission which recommended that economic aid on a grant basis be terminated as soon as possible. I am also mindful of the message the President sent to the Congress on March 30 of this year on the foreign economic policy of the United States in which he said:

> I subscribe, therefore, to the principle that economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible.

I also feel compelled to quote from a committee print containing the statement of the distinguished floor leader of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], in which he commented on these two statements of policy and said that apparently they have been completely ignored by the officials of the executive branch who brought up the fiscal year 1955 program to us.

I would like to quote two sentences from that statement by the gentleman from Ohio:

> Experience has shown us that when a country can have a grant or a loan, it always chooses a grant, and when a foreign aid administrator has both grant and loan authority, he always chooses grants.

The second statement which I think is very important is this:

> In any case, we have found since World War II that loans do not make enemies, and grants do not necessarily make friends.

Mr. Chairman, we have just debated an amendment to take out $85 million for India and South Asia. I remember, while the debate was going on a few minutes ago, someone stating that the Indians were a proud people and they would resent such action which would be deliberately pointed at them. That is true. The people of India are a proud people. The people of the Near East, Africa, and the other American Republics in the Western Hemisphere, all of whom come in under this development assistance, are also proud people. I also think they would resent the fact we would take any of this money out of our bill. So, all right; so, they are proud people. But let us give them a chance to be proud people. Who do you think is a prouder person, the person who is on charity or does business on a loan basis? That is what I am advocating. If we have to have this economic-assistance program for another year, I do advocate that it be placed on a loan basis so that we can conclude some business arrangements with these countries and maybe have some prospects some day of getting some money back and at the same time terminating grants and giveaways in this economic assistance which only, as somebody said yesterday, results in people thinking they are poor relations. For goodness' sake, let us give them a chance to show the pride that they are always talking about and saying they have. Let us give them pride. Let us not make them feel they are getting something for nothing. That is why I advocate the passage of the amendment which would put all long-term arrangements on a loan basis.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is there not evidence to the effect that that is exactly what the Indians would like to do?

Mr. BENTLEY. I have here a letter from the president of the Indian League of America in which he says he does not want to see any government-to-government economic assistance of any type, and I do think that the Indian people would prefer to have a loan.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, what I want to say is that while I originally started out on this basis myself on this section, after a great deal of discussion and giving and taking in the committee, the committee has provided in section 505 that 10 percent of title II money is to be by way of loans. Any of the rest of it could be by way of loans, and therefore I am constrained to feel that this represents a committee compromise, a 50–50 proposition in title II, that had best be followed.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio. I think every member of the committee will agree with me when I say that there is no man in the House or the other body who knows more about and has made a greater contribution to foreign aid legislation, or who has written more language, much of it restrictive, into foreign aid bills than has he. Further, I want to say this: He has fought for a long time for this loan provision. He won because he is brim-full of tenacity, sagacity, but most important of all, integrity. The loan provision as it is in the bill now will make $340 million available only for loans. That in itself is a massive innovation in foreign-aid legislation. It will have to be in the nature of an experiment, and I think it will be a successful experiment. I am glad to hear that the gentleman from Ohio is willing to go along with the committee, though he was originally for 100 percent loans on this section. I think his position is eminently correct, and I hope the House will keep the provision in the bill as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENTLEY) there were—ayes 68, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee 2 or 3 questions about a section which we have not reached yet. It is on page 28, title IV, Other Programs, section 401, subtitle "Special Fund."

It was under authority similar to the authority in this provision that Mr. Stassen of the Foreign Operations Administration embarked upon his now famous Operation Reindeer which ended up by his giving 5 million Christmas presents away to people around the world. I merely ask the question for the purpose of having a little legislative history here which might guide the Administration in the use of this fund.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee if it is contemplated by this proposed appropriation that any such Santa Claus, giveaway program will be looked upon with favor by the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that when this matter was first brought to the attention of the House it developed that actually 5 million presents were given away, paid for by the American taxpayers. I do not see how you could possibly read into the language of the MSA bill of last year any idea that we were then and there dealing with individuals on a holiday basis, or Santa Claus basis, or anything like Operation Reindeer. The language said that the President might make available to any nation not to exceed $20 million of the $100 million made available. Now the committee makes $150 million available. I am not objecting to the amount involved, but I am objecting to becoming part of a Santa Claus scheme like that which we witnessed last year.

A similar provision was in the surplus disposal bill which we had here the other day calling for $100 million. The conference report on that bill was filed today. When we came to conference on it, notwithstanding the actions of the House, the Senate conferees unanimously favored striking out that provision.

I should like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to explain just what will be done with this $150 million.

Mr. VORYS. Operation Reindeer came out of the similar fund, the President's discretionary fund, on the recommendation of the Operations Coordination Board, which was the successor to the Psychological Strategy Board last year. There was no such program recommended or referred to in any way this year, but if the Psychological Strategy Board and the President himself thought, as they did, that this would be psychological strategy, such a thing could be done. There has been no indication or hint that Operation Reindeer would be repeated. There has been con-

siderable discussion about it. But I want to be perfectly clear to the gentleman that this discretionary fund is intended to grant the authority of discretion to the President.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand that the gentleman as a member of the committee looks with favor upon such a project as Operation Reindeer?

One other thing I desire to call attention to is the fact that in the surplus disposal bill, which was before the House last week and upon which the conference report will probably be presented tomorrow, we provided $300 million worth of surplus commodities to be given away by the President, and in addition thereto authorized the sale of another $1 billion worth of commodities to be sold for local currencies. The amount of $1 billion was reduced in conference to $700 million. The $700 million when added to the $300 million to be given away makes a total of $1 billion worth of surplus commodities which will be sold for foreign currencies or actually given away. In addition to that billion in the surplus disposal bill, our committee will present to the House tomorrow general farm legislation containing a section known as the "set aside." This, too, was a proposal of the administration and under it $2,500,000,000 in value of surplus commodities will be "set aside." In that bill it is provided that the President under certain circumstances, may give away or dispose of any part or all of the "set aside" commodities. If all this authority is exercised and all these valuable commodities are given away our so-called surplus will certainly disappear.

I hope that you gentlemen will agree not to become a part of Mr. Stassen's Santa Claus projects in 1954.

Mr. VORYS. No, there was no approval I know of in the committee on that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am just wondering why the committee did not make some inquiries and reach some conclusions after all the talk we had about Operation Reindeer.

Mr. VORYS. Inquiries were made and a full investigation was made, but I want to point out that the only Santa Claus money that has gone through which is a pure give-away of agricutural surpluses went through in a bill from the gentleman's committee, and I voted for it, for $300 million of relief agriculture that could be given away around the world.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman and the House should know that there is wide discretionary authority in this legislation. Under the so-called illustrative program the Administrator can do almost anything he wants to do in the way of Santa Claus operations or Operation Choo Choo or anything else. The House should fully understand that.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that we are giving the $150 million to operate such programs as were operated by Stassen last Christmas, although there is not one word in the bill or in the report that would indicate that?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; indeed so. I do not think that would be denied.

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

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

Mr. WIER. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about on this Santa Claus proposition, but I took a look myself in the report to find if there was any item in there that allowed the Administrator, Mr. Stassen, to provide a worldwide tour for all of his political henchmen.

Mr. COOLEY. That was part of Operation Reindeer. I had the General Accounting Office investigate the matter, and I was advised that because no definite limitations were imposed and because language in the bill was broad and all embracing it could not be held that the use of Federal funds for Operation Reindeer was illegal.

Certainly the committee should be willing to place restrictions and limitations upon the use of this particular fund to the end that neither the President, Mr. Stassen, nor anyone else could again play Santa Clause to people around the world. Apparently when the administration decided to play Santa Claus in 21 nations and to deliver individual Christmas gifts, at the same time it was decided to keep the matter entirely secret. Even the letter written by the President to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was marked secret and classified. Such reports should not be secret or classified. Members of Congress should be advised fully concerning the use of all funds but under no circumstances should the great man from Minnesota be permitted to play Santa Claus and to finance his projects with Federal tax funds, and under no circumstances should he be permitted to send his political pals around the world at Government expense to check on the delivery of his Christmas gifts.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202. Administration: Except as necessary to accomplish the purposes of section 201, programs of assistance authorized by that section shall be administered in accordance with sections 301, 302, and 307.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL COOPERATION

SEC. 301. General authority and definition: It is the purpose of this title to assist the efforts of the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to achieve economic progress by authorizing measures designed to increase technical knowledge and skills and the flow of investment capital. The President is authorized to furnish assistance in accordance with the provisions of this title through bilateral technical cooperation programs. As used in this title, the term "technical cooperation programs" means programs for the international interchange of technical knowledge and skills designed to contribute primarily to the balanced and integrated development of the economic resources and productive capacities of economically underdeveloped areas. Such activities shall be limited to economic, engineering, medical, educational, agricultural, forestry, fishery, mineral, and fiscal surveys, demonstration, training, and similar projects that serve the purpose of promoting the development of economic resources, productive capacities, and trade of economically underdeveloped areas, and training in public administration. The term "technical cooperation programs" does not include such activities authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 6) as are not primarily related to economic development, nor activities undertaken now or hereafter pursuant to the International Aviation Facilities Act (62 Stat. 450), nor activities undertaken now or hereafter in the administration of areas occupied by the United States Armed Forces.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable thought to developing methods which will make the technical cooperation program more effective.

One of the underlying characteristics of these programs is the limited number of technicians available and the unlimited number of individuals who need or want technical skills. The problem is how a few people can impart knowledge to a large group in underdeveloped countries.

The countries in which FOA operates technical assistance programs also have military establishments which, for the most part, are composed of conscripts serving for a limited time, usually 1 to 2 years. They constitute a captive audience whose military training can be supplemented by technical training. The content of the training will undoubtedly vary widely from country to country and even within a country. It may include reading and writing, elementary hygiene, simple agricultural techniques, basic mechanics and a variety of other basic skills adaptable to the needs of the country and its people.

No American military personnel would be involved in this program. American civilian personnel would only be indirectly involved. Their role would be confined to (a) assistance in laying out a series of courses and (b) training groups of local peoples to do the actual teaching.

Following are some of the more obvious advantages of this method:

First. The training would reach more people than the present method of operation which is limited to relatively few centers.

Second. The programs would be geared to the needs and capacity of the country instead of stimulating needs that cannot readily be satisfied.

Third. Conscripts returning to their villages would be able to put their training to immediate use.

Fourth. By offering constructive skills capable of application after military service it would create a greater sense of satisfaction with military service and should develop a larger measure of loyalty to the government.

Fifth. The economy of the country would move forward at a more uniform, even though slower, rate.

Sixth. The training would build upon the existing economic structure and provide the basic skills that a country must have for its progressive development.

Seventh. The limited role of American personnel, located generally in a few of the larger cities, should make possible the recruitment of individuals who may

presently not choose such work because it involves living in isolated villages.

Eighth. No costly supply and equipment component would be necessary.

Ninth. By careful preparation of materials it would be possible to impart values and ideas that the United States would want to impart to peoples but presently cannot do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed by the increasing trend which seems to be evident to make the point 4 program—the program of technical cooperation and assistance for backward or underdeveloped areas—so directly a part of our military planning that we lose sight of what President Truman had in mind when he first broached this idea in his 1949 inaugural address.

As he enunciated it that cold and gray January day out here in front of the rotunda of the Capitol, it was to be a bold new program for leading a worldwide fight against the seedbeds in which communism develops and grows. It caught the imagination of the whole free world, and led to the establishment of similar programs on a small scale by the United Nations and by the Organization of American States.

The point about point 4—and the point which is often lost sight of when we get into a discussion in the Congress of authorizations and appropriations and budgets and deficits—is that point 4 is most effective in keeping communism from gaining a foothold in the underdeveloped areas the further it is removed from straight-out military considerations.

In other words, point 4 was based in its original concept not on military considerations but on humane considerations, on rightness and decency, not strength of arms or the exigencies of military strategy.

We have this whole vast complex of other programs available to us for carrying out military objectives, and many of them are important parts of this now before us, the Mutual Security Act of 1954. They have as their purpose the defense of specific geographical areas from a potential or actual Communist attack. Hard-headed military considerations should properly dominate our decisions on these programs. They are intended to build armed strength.

But point 4 should never be relegated to a subordinate role in that strategy. To do so would be to throw away one of its strongest qualities—the appeal it makes to people who are directly helped by point 4, not as pawns in a military chess game but as human beings with very definite human needs and with little opportunity to enjoy a full and rewarding life.

True, point 4 must be limited in scope by what we can afford to do. We cannot, of course, appropriate the funds here in this or any other fiscal year which will enable the peoples of all the backward areas overnight to transform their lands into flourishing Edens. But we have made a start—a spectacular start—under this 4-year-old program of point 4, and we should have no hesitancy about continuing it and expanding it wherever possible. It is no handout program. It is not billions in economic aid, but only a few millions in a cooperative program which encourages these nations to develop their own resources largely with their own funds.

Much has been made in the Congress of the extensions of aid under this program to countries like India—neutralist countries. We are told we have no guaranty that India would take its stand with us in a showdown between the free and Communist world; no indication at all that she would fight on our side. And of course that is true. India is deliberately neutralist—to an extent which sometimes infuriates us and which also puzzles us.

But just taking India as an example: Here is a sprawling area of the world where democracy is brandnew and on trial for its life. Communism sees in India exactly the kind of economic and social conditions which it believes makes natural spawning waters for communism.

While we have every reason to be puzzled by Nehru's seeming inability to recognize the danger of Communist aggression against his country, we cannot for a moment doubt that all India recognizes the terrible danger of communism taking over India from inside.

But if we can help India to raise living standards, by use of better methods of tilling the soil and of producing the needs of the people, this danger will recede.

The same is true in other underdeveloped areas—particularly Latin America. The average lifespan in Latin America is only 43 years, compared to our average of 68. The rate of illiteracy is about 48 percent, as compared to 3 percent in the United States. The average diet is 2,304 calories a day as compared to our 3,130. There is vast land area there for a population just about the same size as ours. And yet, with all the riches of mineral and other wealth there, there is much human misery.

This is at our back door. We have seen how communism has gotten a very big foot in the door in Guatemala. We can perhaps ascribe some of that success to communism's cleverness, ruthlessness, skill at conspiratorial subversion, and so on. But the fact remains that with a large part of the population destitute, the Communists did not have to look too hard to find inviting avenues of approach.

I said a few minutes ago that I was disturbed by the increasing trend in the point 4 program as now constituted toward linking it up with military objectives. My own view is that if we go into the countries which are really underdeveloped and where human suffering is acute because of lack of skill and know-how and the need for special assistance, and do a good job there under point 4 without necessarily tying it to military objectives, our military position in the long run will improve considerably.

Freedom means so much to us here in the United States in concrete terms of human advancement, as well as in spiritual values, that we tend sometimes to think that all peoples equate freedom in much the same way we do. But in areas where large portions of the population verge on starvation, and go without even the most elementary comforts of life, the Communists can and do make much capital out of defining freedom as freedom to starve. That is what we must fight, and we must fight it every bit as hard as we fight against Communist military adventures.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I share the concern expressed by all of the Democrats and a majority of the Republicans on the Foreign Affairs Committee in their report on this bill when they stated that in the present administrative setup, technical cooperation "tends to be a stepchild."

As the committee points out:

> There is no one individual responsible solely for guiding and focusing attention upon technical cooperation. It is now part of an agency that has other responsibilities involving more costly operations.

After noting this stepchild relationship, the committee report adds:

> Of all the parts of the program encompassed in this bill, this is the one that has the longest-range possibilities. Nowhere in the present administrative organization is the technical cooperation program brought into focus as a program. It is handled only on an area basis. The committee believes that what is needed is a single individual to concern himself with the total program and who will give it the stature and emphasis it merits as part of our foreign policy. Such an individual should be directly under the officer to whom the President entrusts the administration of the nonmilitary functions authorized in this bill.

To that, Mr. Chairman, I subscribe wholeheartedly. I would further say in conclusion that what we need on the whole point 4 program is more of the boldness and imagination and all-out enthusiasm which characterized the original establishment of the program as one of President Truman's greatest contributions to world freedom.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 302. Prerequisites to assistance: Assistance shall be made available under section 301 of this act only where the President determines that the nation being assisted—
>
> (a) pays a fair share of the cost of the program.
>
> (b) provides all necessary information concerning such program and gives the program full publicity;
>
> (c) seeks to the maximum extent possible full coordination and integration of technical cooperation programs being carried on in that nation;
>
> (d) endeavors to make effective use of the results of the program; and
>
> (e) cooperates with other nations participating in the program in the mutual exchange of technical knowledge and skills.
>
> SEC. 303. Authorization: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 $112,070,000 for technical cooperation programs in the Near East, Africa, South Asia, Far East and Pacific, and Latin America. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 543 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are authorized to be continued available for the purposes of this section through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.
>
> SEC. 304. Limitation on use of funds: Funds made available under section 303 may be expended to furnish assistance in the

form of equipment or commodities only where necessary for instruction or demonstration purposes.

SEC. 305. Multilateral technical cooperation: As one means of accomplishing the purposes of this title, the United States is authorized to participate in multilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by the United Nations, the Organization of American States, their related organizations, and other international organizations, wherever practicable. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purpose of this section, in addition to the amounts authorized by section 303, not to exceed—

(a) $17,958,000 for making contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance;

(b) $1,500,000 for making contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 25, line 8, strike out "$112,070,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall not press for my amendment at this time. However, I do want to make the record clear as far as this technical assistance program is concerned. We have strayed far from it. I say that because the administrators of the program have wandered far afield from the original concepts. One page 47 of the committee report, there is this language:

The first Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration, the late Dr. Henry G. Bennett, viewed the program this way:

"The idea is to send in a minimum number of people, with tools and limited amounts of supplies, so they may show the people by doing, and guide and instruct their doing * * *. It is believed that the benefits of the pilot projects, and projects which the Governments themselves have been stimulated to undertake in the next year or two, will result in improved earnings of the Governments so that, to a maximum extent, the large-scale projects may be financed from loans, either public or private. * * *

"The truth is that the whole program is in the main a training program. The big need in every underdeveloped area is for a reliable, trained, local leadership, and consequently we are seeking as best we can to encourage this type of training."

Now I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the purchasing of $20 million worth of railroad equipment, the establishment of school systems, the development of power projects and the development of reclamation projects are far removed from this concept expressed by Dr. Bennett and believed in by members of this committee. I hope that in some way the administrator of this program will heed the wishes of Congress in this matter.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I associate myself entirely with the remarks of the gentleman. As he knows, we fought this for several years before we could get them back on the beam of tending to technical assistance and technical cooperation instead of a commodity program. However, I do not associate myself with the amendment offered by the gentleman. I think the full amount ought to be left. It would be too bad to have the only item in the bill that is cut substantially be the item for technical assistance. I think those who are operating this program ought to plan to keep this program for at least 4 years at just about this level and really make a go of it in terms of training and not to expand it into an empire supplying commodities.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to say that I agree with the remarks just made.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not think the provisions of section 304 would cure the objection the gentleman has just raised in regard to former programs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope so, but I have some doubt about it.

Mr. RICHARDS. It provides:

Funds made available under section 303 may be expended to furnish assistance in the form of equipment or commodities only where necesessary for instruction or demonstration purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It may do the trick, but I am not sure.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I certainly would like to associate myself with the statement made by the gentleman, not to the point of agreeing to his amendment, but to the general statement that has been made.

The gentleman perhaps knows that through September, October, and November of last year the Inter-American Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs made a prolonged investigation in Latin America for the purpose of looking into the economic-assistance program. There is a great deal of validity in what the gentleman has said, and I certainly think that in the field of capital expenditures there is an acute and a great necessity for tightening up the operation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 306. Advances and grants; contracts: The President may make advances and grants-in-aid of technical cooperation programs to any person, corporation, or other body of persons or to any foreign government agency. The President may make and perform contracts and agreements in respect of technical cooperation programs on behalf of the United States Government with any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States, or with any foreign government or foreign government agency. A contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to this title may, subject to any future action of the Congress, run for not to exceed 3 years.

SEC. 307. International Development Advisory Board: There shall be an advisory board, referred to in this section as the "Board", which shall advise and consult with the President, or such other officer as he may designate to administer this title, with respect to general or basic policy matters arising in connection with the operation of programs authorized by this title, title II, and section 414 (b). The Board shall consist of not more than 13 members appointed by the President, 1 of whom, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be appointed by him as Chairman. The members of the Board shall be broadly representative of voluntary agencies and other groups interested in the programs, including business, labor, agriculture, public health, and education. All members of the Board shall be citizens of the United States; none except the Chairman shall be an officer or an employees of the United States (including any United States Government agency) who as such regularly receives compensation for current services. Members of the Board, other than the Chairman if he is an officer of the United States Government, shall receive out of funds made available for the purpose of this title a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business for the purpose of attendance at meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Chairman, and in necessary travel, and while so engaged they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer a motion to strike out this section, 307, providing for the creation of another board. In 1952, when I campaigned for office, I told my people I was opposed to the creation of more boards, bureaus, and commissions in Washington.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. This section does not create a board. The board is already in existence. The whole piece of legislation repeals some 13 bills, and we got rid of one board that was to advise on the overall program. But we kept this board for the reason that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] just stated: The technical cooperation program is still going through a shakedown period and we need the advice of wise people to help find ways to do the job in the best ways possible.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want the gentleman to take all my time. I will say to the gentleman that if he has abolished 1 board but 1 board still remains, that that is 1 board too many.

Mr. JUDD. We think this board can be very useful.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect that the members of this board will not be operating here in Washington; I imagine they will be out of the country most of the time at the expense of the American taxpayers. But I am not going to offer the amendment, because there seems to be all too little concern for economy here

today. I do, however, want to get some information. What does the committee mean in section 308 where a joint commission on rural reconstruction in China is provided? It reads:

The President is authorized to continue to participate in the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China.

Is that to reconstruct agriculture in Red China?

Mr. JUDD. No; it is not operating in Red China. The section authorizes continuation of the JCRR organization that was set up in the ECA Act of 1948, and it has been the single most successful agency operating in this field that we have had around the world. It was set up on the basis of three ideas, all indicated in its title. First, it is a joint organization; the Commission has 3 Chinese and 2 Americans operating it together. We work with, not for or over or under, Chinese. The second idea is rural. The people in Asian countries are predominantly rural. Instead of trying at the outset to make them into an industrial society, like we have here, the Commission tries to help them where they are. Third, reconstruction. The objective is not to try to reform them or make them over in our image, but to help them reconstruct their own rural society. Once they have attained stability in a familiar pattern, they will go on to carry out their own reforms and improvements. That was the theory. I have a certain fondness for it because it was my own "baby," and I am proud of the fact that it has worked so successfully.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot sell it to me simply because he is fond of it. Where is this Commission?

Mr. JUDD. On the island of Formosa. It began on the China mainland, but it did not get started until the last few months before China fell. Even so, the areas where this organization had been operating only a short time were the areas where there was the strongest and most vigorous resistance against the Communists. We hope FOA will follow the same pattern more and more all through the point 4 program, because it has proven its worth.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman. It is another Commission I did not know was in existence.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to state that I shall vote for the pending measure. It is important, it seems to me, in saving life and limb, although I do not know how important it is in the prevention of the spread of communism. I hope it is very important. Last night I visited a service hospital with badly injured men. The hospital was full. The picture of the courage of our battle casualties is with me now.

In the last amendment there was something about the reconstruction of certain things. I deplore with all the strength in my being the fact that we have not secured passage of veterans' legislation for the reconstruction of our veterans—that is needed insofar as the United States is concerned more than any other legislation—as a matter of common justice and appreciation.

I do not know what I can say when I am asked what the Congress has passed in the way of veterans' legislation except the truth—I feel so profoundly grateful to them. I have to admit that some cuts were made in the amount of money appropriated for hospitalization; I have to say that there have been cuts in money appropriated for regional offices, so much so that 1,000 persons, practically all of them veterans, in the Veterans' Administration will lose their jobs.

I have heard vaguely and I have received some half promises, Mr. Chairman, that rules would be reported on some of our legislation passed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I earnestly hope so and I hope that legislation passes the House before it is too late to go to the Senate for final passage. I for one cannot possibly go back home or go about the country and talk to our veterans and say that we passed a great deal of social security legislation and pensions for civilians, public health, welfare and education; we have passed a great deal of foreign aid legislation; we have passed aid for the farmers, increases for the postal workers, and increases for other Government workers; yet we have done nothing but cut the appropriations for our veterans—the veterans, the people of America to whom we owe the greatest debt. Without our veterans—from our earliest—we would have had no free America. We must legislate on them before it is too late. Have we become so callous, so cruel, we do not care any more?

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 308. Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China: The President is authorized to continue to participate in the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China and to appoint citizens of the United States to the Commission.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and open to amendment at any point from this point on.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman agree, then, that the Committee do rise now? The gentleman from Mississippi is going to object to this request unless the Committee is going to rise now and take this bill up in the morning.

Mr. HALLECK. That was not my understanding about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is my understanding, because I just talked to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, I withdraw my request.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. Special fund: Of the funds made available under this act, not to exceed $150 million may be expended, without regard to the requirements of this act or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act, in furtherance of any of the purposes of such acts, when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States. Not to exceed $100 million of the funds available under this section may be expended 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 or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria, or any Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Asia and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union, either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area or to the security of the United States. Certification by the President of amounts expended under this section up to a total of $50 million, and that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of such expenditures, shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for such amounts. Not more than $20 million of the funds available under this section may be allocated to any one nation.

SEC. 402. Earmarking of funds: (a) Of the funds made available pursuant to this act, not less than $500 million shall be used to finance the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities or products thereof, produced in the United States, pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

(b) The authority for this section shall not be in addition to the authorization provided for title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD:

On page 29, line 15, strike out all on lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 402. Earmarking of funds: Of the funds made available pursuant to this act, not less than $500 million shall be used to finance the purchase and export of surplus agricultural commodities or products thereof produced in the United States and foreign currency proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of this act pursuant to section 104 of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is an appropriation on a bill that is not authorized by law.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment so that it will read "Of the funds authorized to be made available."

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD:

Page 29, line 15, strike out all on lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 402. Earmarking of funds: Of the funds authorized to be made available pursuant to this act, not less than $500 million shall be used to finance the purchase and export of surplus agricultural commodities or products thereof produced in the United States and foreign currency proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of this

act pursuant to section 104 of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order that it involves an appropriation of funds, and I call attention to the fact that the language says that these funds that are realized from the sale of these products can be used for a particular purpose. That makes an appropriation out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

This is not an appropriation. The total bill authorizes the appropriation of about $3.4 billion. This section is a limitation or earmarking of funds that may be appropriated under the authorization. It says that of the $3.4 billion, if and when it is appropriated, not less than $500 million shall be used for a given purpose. This is language that is almost word for word the same as section 550 of the act last year, except the act last year said not less than $100 million and not to exceed $250 million should be used for this purpose of purchasing surplus agricultural commodities to be used as aid instead of dollars.

This section amounts to a cut of $500 million in the appropriation to be made for foreign aid under the bill. We have these commodities on hand. They have already been paid for. Other countries need them but do not have dollars with which to buy them. Under this amendment instead of $500 million being sent abroad, it will go to the CCC or into the market place to buy agricultural commodities that we already have in surplus. We will use them for aid in lieu of money. Actually, it amounts to a saving of $500 million in new money under the bill because if we do not adopt this section, we will have to authorize and appropriate that amount to maintain the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital stock and purchasing power, while the commodities rot out in the granaries.

This is an allocation of funds authorized to be appropriated under this bill and it will allow Members to say truthfully that they have reduced the amount of new money for foreign aid by $500 million.

There was an understanding at the time the original agricultural trade and development bill was sent to the Committee on Agriculture that we would earmark $500 million of the money for foreign aid, so-called, to be used to buy surplus commodities in our country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard on the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to say this, that the gentleman's amendment and the section in the bill both refer to the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954. There is not any such act. The conference report will probably come before the House tomorrow, and I assume it will be approved, but it has not yet been adopted. I do not object to $500 million of this money being used to purchase agricultural commodities to be shipped abroad. But the gentleman goes a little further than that and undertakes to make use of the local currency which will be received by our Government in exchange for the commodities to be purchased with dollars. The amendment certainly should be perfected to authorize the sale of the commodities when once acquired for foreign currencies.

Mr. JUDD. We considered that objection and our lawyers all said that when we say, "to finance the purchase and export of surplus agricultural commodities—and foreign currency proceeds therefrom shall be used for the purposes of this act pursuant to section 104 of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954," that language authorizes their sale for foreign currencies.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree that it does authorize the sale. I still think we have to authorize the sale of the commodities for the local currencies. There is one other question. Does this add $500 million to the $700 million that we are authorizing in this Surplus Disposal Act of 1954?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. This $500 million is outside of the $700 million of the other Act.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is clearly in order, in that it deals with an earmarking of funds authorized to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

On a careful reading of the amendment as modified—and I wish to read the wording of it—"of the funds authorized to be made available pursuant to this act not less than," and so forth—it is the ruling of the Chair that this amendment should be interpreted to mean that unless the appropriation is first authorized, the amendment has no effect whatsoever and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 403. Special assistance in joint control areas: The President is hereby authorized to furnish commodities, services, and financial and other assistance to nations and areas for which the United States has responsibility as a result of participation in joint-control arrangements where found by the President to be in the interest of the security of the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $25 million to carry out this section.

SEC. 404. Responsibilities in Germany: Upon approval by the Secretary of State, a part of the German currency now or hereafter deposited under the bilateral agreement of December 15, 1949, between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany (or any supplementary or succeeding agreement) shall be deposited in the GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) Special Account under the terms of article V of that agreement, and currency which has been or may be deposited in said account, and any portion of funds made available for assistance to the Federal Republic of Germany pursuant to section 403 of this act, may be used for expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities or objectives of the United States in Germany, including responsibilities arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany. Expenditures may be made under authority of this section in amounts and under conditions determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the official primarily responsible for administration of programs under chapter 3 of title I, and without regard to any provision of law which the President determines must be disregarded in order to meet such responsibilities or objectives.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a suggestion as to what I think we might do, after consultation with committee members on our side and the minority members, and the Speaker and minority leader.

We have a number of Members who had a dinner engagement at 6:30. They are not completely out on that. However, we have other work to do, and, as I said, I would like to make this suggestion and follow it with a unanimous-consent request that if we could get the bill considered as read and then get unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, with that limitation we would have the Committee rise, and then tomorrow we will come in at 10 o'clock. We would have 20 minutes to conclude consideration of the bill and the amendments and have the voting. I understand there will be motion to recommit, on which probably there will be a record vote, which would take time, as would a vote on passage if such were had, which would run us very late tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that does not carry a limitation of time?

Mr. HALLECK. I expect to ask for that later.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 405. Movement of migrants and refugees: (a) For the purpose of assisting in the movement of migrants, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $11,700,000 for contributions during the calendar year 1955 to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and thereafter such amounts as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its contributions to the Committee and all necessary salaries and expenses incident to United States participation in the Committee. In addition, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 534 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this section through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized in this section.

(b) Of the funds made available under this act, not more than $800,000 may be used by the President to facilitate the migration to the other American Republics of persons resident in that portion of the Ryukyu Island Archipelago under United States control.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955 not to

exceed $500,000 for contributions to the United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund.

SEC. 406. Children's welfare: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $13,500,000 for contributions during the fiscal year 1955 to the United Nations Children's Fund.

SEC. 407. Palestine refugees in the Near East: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955, not to exceed $30 million, to be used to make contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. In addition, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for the Palestine refugee program in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1954, is hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this section through June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of Palestine refugees in the Near East, he may expend any part of such unexpended balance through any other agency he may designate.

SEC. 408. North Atlantic Treaty Organization: (a) In order to provide for United States participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $3,200,000 for payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization.

(b) The United States permanent representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall have the rank and status of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary and shall be a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801).

(c) Persons detailed to the international staff of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in accordance with section 529 of this act who are appointed as Foreign Service Reserve officers may serve for periods of more than 4 years notwithstanding the limitation in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 922).

SEC. 409. Ocean freight charges: (a) In order to further the efficient use of United States voluntary contributions for relief and rehabilitation in nations eligible for assistance under this act, the President may pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry of such nations on shipments by United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid and shipments by the American Red Cross.

(b) Where practicable the President shall make arrangements with the receiving nation for free entry of such shipments and for the making available by that nation of local currencies for the purpose of defraying the transportation cost of such shipments from the port of entry of the receiving nation to the designated shipping point of the consignee.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $4,400,000 to carry out the purposes of this section; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 535 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are authorized to be continued available for the purposes of this section through June 30, 1955, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized in this section.

(d) In addition, any funds made available under this act may be used, in amounts determined by the President, to pay ocean freight charges on shipments of surplus agricultural commodities, including commodities made available pursuant to any act for the disposal abroad of United States agricultural surpluses.

SEC. 410. Control act expenses: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $1,300,000 for carrying out the objectives of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U. S. C. 1611). In addition, in accordance with section 303 of that act, funds made available for carrying out chapter 1 of title I of this act shall be available for carrying out the purpose of this section in such amounts as the President may direct.

SEC. 411. Administrative expenses: (a) Whenever possible, the expenses of administration of this act shall be paid for in the currency of the nation where the expense is incurred.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1955 not to exceed $35,900,000 for all necessary administrative expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of this act other than chapter 1 of title I, including expenses for compensation, allowances and travel of personnel, including Foreign Service personnel whose services are utilized primarily for the purposes of this act, and, without regard to the provisions of any other law, for printing and binding, and for expenditures outside the continental limits of the United States for the procurement of supplies and services and for other administrative purposes (other than compensation of personnel) without regard to such laws and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of Government funds as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 412. Strategic materials: In order to reduce the drain on United States resources and to assure the production of adequate supplies of essential raw materials for the collective defense of the free world, the President is authorized to initiate projects for, and assist in procuring and stimulating increased production of, materials in which deficiencies or potential deficiencies in supply exist in the United States or among nations receiving United States assistance. The unexpended balance of funds made available pursuant to section 514 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby authorized to be continued available for the purpose of this section through June 30, 1955.

SEC. 413. Chinese and Korean students: Funds heretofore allocated to the Secretary of State pursuant to the last proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1547) shall continue to be available until expended, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, using private agencies to the maximum extent practicable for necessary expenses of tuition, subsistence, transportation, and emergency medical care for selected citizens of China and of Korea for studying or teaching in accredited colleges, universities, or other educational institutions in the United States approved by the Secretary of State for the purpose, or for research and related academic and technical activities in the United States, and such selected citizens of China who have been admitted for the purpose of study in the United States shall be granted permission to accept employment upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Attorney General.

SEC. 414. Encouragement of free enterprise and private participation: (a) It is declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage the efforts of other free nations to incease the flow of international trade, to foster private initiative and competition, to discourage monopolistic practices, to improve the technical efficiency of their industry, agriculture and commerce, and to strengthen free labor unions; and to encourage the contribution of United States enterprise toward the economic strength of other free nations, through private trade and investment abroad, private participation in the programs carried out under this act (including the use of private trade channels to the maximum extent practicable in carrying out such programs), and exchange of ideas and technical information on the matters covered by this section.

(b) In order to encourage and facilitate participation by private enterprise to the maximum extent practicable in achieving any of the purposes of this act, the President—

(1) shall make arrangements to find and draw the attention of private enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in other free nations;

(2) shall accelerate a program of negotiating treaties for commerce and trade, or other temporary arrangements where more suitable or expeditious, which shall include provisions to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to nations participating in programs under this act; and

(3) may make, until June 30, 1957, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, guaranties to any person of investments in connection with projects, including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises, in any nation with which the United States has agreed to institute the guaranty program: *Provided*, That—

(A) such projects shall be approved by the President as furthering any of the purposes of this act, and by the nation concerned;

(B) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring any or all of the following:

(i) the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies, received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved project, as repayment or return of the investment therein, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof;

(ii) the compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the investment in the approved project which shall be found to have been lost to such person by reason of expropriation or confiscation by action of the government of a foreign nation or by reason of war, revolution or insurrection;

(C) when any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, assets, or investment on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim or cause of action existing in connection therewith;

(D) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the President plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty, and shall be limited to a term not exceeding 20 years from the date of issuance;

(E) a fee shall be charged in an amount not exceeding 1 percent per annum of the amount of each guaranty under clause (i) of subparagraph (B), and not exceeding 4 percent per annum of the amount of each guaranty under clause (ii) of such subparagraph, and all fees collected hereunder shall be available for expenditure in discharge of liabilities under guaranties made under this section until such time as all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired, or until all such fees have been expended in accordance with the provisions of this section;

(F) the President is authorized to issue guaranties up to a total of $200 million: *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the

United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding. Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this subsection shall be paid out of fees collected under subparagraph (E) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds realized from the sale of notes which have been issued under authority of paragraph 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, when necessary to discharge liabilities under any such guaranty;

(G) the guaranty program authorized by this paragraph shall be used to the maximum practicable extent and shall be administered under broad criteria so as to facilitate and increase the participation of private enterprise in achieving any of the purposes of this Act;

(H) as used in this paragraph—

(i) the term "person" means a citizen of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association created under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory and substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, and

(ii) the term "investment" includes any contribution of capital goods, materials, equipment, services, patents, processes, or techniques by any person in the form of (1) a loan or loans to an approved project; (2) the purchase of a share of ownership in any such project; (3) participation in royalties, earnings, or profits of any such project; and (4) the furnishing of capital-goods items and related services pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after the end of the fiscal year in which the guaranty of such investment is made.

SEC. 415. Emigration to U. S. S. R.: Funds made available pursuant to this act may be used to pay the expenses of travel of any resident in the United States to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the purpose of establishing permanent residence there: *Provided*, That such resident shall not be readmitted to the United States.

SEC. 416. Munitions control: (a) The President is authorized to control, in furtherance of world peace and the security and foreign policy of the United States, the export and import of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, other than by a United States Government agency. The President is authorized to designate those articles which shall be considered as arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.

(b) As prescribed in regulations issued under this section, every person who engages in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing any arms, ammunition, or implements of war designated by the President under subsection (a) shall register with the United States Government agency charged with the administration of this section and, in addition, shall pay a registration fee which shall be prescribed by such regulations.

(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section or any rule or regulation issued under this section, or who willfully, in a registration or license application, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 417. Assistance to international organization: Whenever it will assist in achieving purposes declared in this act, the President is authorized to use funds available under sections 131 and 403 in order to furnish assistance, including by transfer of funds, directly to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for a strategic stockpile of foodstuffs and other supplies, or for other purposes.

SEC. 418. Facilitation and encouragement of travel: The President, through such officer or commission as he may designate, shall facilitate and encourage, without cost to the United States except for administrative expenses, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within countries receiving assistance under this act and travel by citizens of such countries to the United States.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. Transferability of funds: Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purposes of this act, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available pursuant to any provision of this act may be transferred to and consolidated with the funds made available pursuant to any other provision of this act, and may be used for any of the purposes for which such funds may be used, except that the total in the provision for the benefit of which the transfer is made shall not be increased by more than 10 percent of the amount made available for such provision pursuant to this act. Funds transferred under this section to furnish military assistance under chapter 1 of title I may be expended without regard to the area limits imposed by section 106 (c). Not less than 50 percent of any assistance furnished under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 201 (a) with funds transferred under this section shall be furnished on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505.

SEC. 502. Use of foreign currency: (a) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, proceeds of sales made under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, shall remain available and shall be used for any of the purposes of this act, giving particular regard to the following purposes—

(1) for providing military assistance to nations or mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under this act;

(2) for purchase of goods or services in friendly nations;

(3) for loans, under applicable provisions of this act, to increase production of goods or services, including strategic materials, needed in any nation with which an agreement was negotiated, or in other friendly nations, with the authority to use currencies received in repayment for the purposes stated in this section or for deposit to the general account of the Treasury of the United States;

(4) for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis;

(5) for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries;

(6) for purchasing materials for United States stockpiles; and

(7) for financing international educational exchange activities under the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)).

(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That any such committee of the Congress which uses local currency shall make a full accounting thereof to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee using such currency is a committee of the House of Representatives) or to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate (if the committee using such currency is a committee of the Senate), showing the total amount of such currency so used in each country and the purposes for which it was expended.

SEC. 503. Termination of assistance: (a) If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation under any provision of this act—

(1) is no longer consistent with the national interest or security or the foreign policy of the United States; or

(2) would no longer contribute effectively to the purposes for which such assistance is furnished; or

(3) is no longer consistent with the obligations and responsibilities of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations,

he shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this act. If the President determines that any nation which is receiving assistance under chapter 1 of title I of this act is not making its full contribution to its own defense or to the defense of the area of which it is a part, he shall terminate all or part of such assistance.

(b) Assistance to any nation under any provision of this act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution.

(c) Funds made available under this act shall remain available for 12 months from the date of termination under this section for the necessary expenses of liquidating assistance programs.

SEC. 504. Small business: (a) Insofar as practicable and to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, the President shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under titles II, III, and IV, and chapters 2 and 3 of title I, of this act—

(1) by causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with such funds,

(2) by causing to be made available to prospective purchasers in the nations receiving assistance under this act information as to commodities and services produced by small independent enterprises in the United States, and

(3) by providing for additional services to give small business better opportunities to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with such funds.

(b) There shall be an Office of Small Business, headed by a Special Assistant for Small Business, in such United States Government agency as the President may direct, to assist in carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall assure that there is made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information with respect to purchases made by the Department of Defense pursuant to chapter 1 of title I, such information to be furnished as far in advance as possible.

SEC. 505. Loan assistance: (a) Not less than 10 percent of the amounts obligated from funds appropriated pursuant to titles I and II (excluding funds previously appropriated and continued available pursuant to such titles) shall be obligated for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment (including repayment in foreign currencies or by transfer to the United States of materials required for stockpiling or other purposes).

(b) Funds for the purpose of furnishing assistance on terms of repayment shall be allocated to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on such terms. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it shall not be considered in determining

whether the Bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any loan made under this section shall be held by the Treasury to be used for such purposes, including further loans, as may be authorized from time to time by Congress. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made under paragraph 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, except that, to the extent required for such purpose, amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made out of funds realized from the sale of notes heretofore authorized to be issued for the purpose of financing assistance on a credit basis under paragraph 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be deposited into the Treasury for the purpose of the retirement of such notes.

SEC. 506. Patents and technical information: (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 any assistance in furtherance of the purposes 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 or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident 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 United States Government agency, which has furnished any assistance in furtherance of the purposes 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) The provisions of the last sentence of section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to inventions and information covered by this section.

(e) Except as otherwise 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. 507. Availability of funds: Except as otherwise provided in sections 104, 105, 405, and 413, funds shall be available to carry out the provisions of this act—other than sections 416 and 418—as authorized and appropriated to the President each fiscal year.

SEC. 508. Limitation on funds for propaganda: None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated nor any counterpart funds shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the mutual-security program, or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States.

SEC. 509. Purchase of commodities: No funds made available under title II or chapter 3 of title I of this act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment. A bulk purchase within the meaning of this section does not include the purchase of raw cotton in bales. Funds made available under title II or chapter 3 of title I of this act may be used for the procurement of commodities outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweigh the economic advantages to the United States of less costly procurement abroad. In providing for the procurement of any surplus agricultural commodity for transfer by grant under this act to any recipient nation in accordance with the requirements of such nation, the President shall, insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of this act, authorize the procurement of such surplus agricultural commodity only within the United States except to the extent that any such surplus agricultural commodity is not available in the United States in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of the nations receiving assistance under this act.

SEC. 510. Retention and return of equipment: (a) No equipment or materials may be transferred under title I out of military stocks if the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such transfer would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, or that such equipment or materials are needed by the reserve components of the Armed Forces to meet their training requirements.

(b) Any equipment, materials, or commodities procured to carry out this act shall be retained by, or, upon reimbursement, transferred to and for the use of, such United States Government agency as the President may determine in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign nation or international organization whenever in the judgment of the President the best interests of the United States will be served thereby, or whenever such retention is called for by concurrent resolution. Any commodities so retained may be disposed of without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of Government-owned property, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such commodities or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from any such disposal or transfer shall revert to the respective appropriation or appropriations out of which funds were expended for the procurement of such equipment, materials, or commodities or to appropriations currently available for such procurement.

(c) The President shall make appropriate arrangements with each nation receiving equipment or materials under chapter 1 of title I (other than equipment or materials sold under the provisions of sec. 107) for the return to the United States (1) for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of mutual security, of any such equipment or materials which are no longer required for the purposes for which originally made available.

SEC. 511. Penal provision: Whoever offers or gives to anyone who is or in the preceding 2 years has been an employee or officer of the United States any commission, payment, or gift, in connection with the procurement of equipment, materials, commodities, or services under this act in connection with which procurement said officer, employee, former officer, or former employee is or was employed or performed duty or took any action during such employment, and whoever, being or having been an employee or officer of the United States in the preceding 2 years, solicits, accepts, or offers to accept any commission, payment, or gift in connection with the procurement of equipment, materials, commodities, or services under this act in connection with which procurement said officer, employee, former officer, or former employee is or was employed or performed duty or took any action during such employment, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment for not to exceed 3 years, or both: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to persons appointed pursuant to sections 307 or 530 (a) of this act.

SEC. 512. Notice to legislative committees: When any transfer is made under section 106 (d) or section 501, or any other action is taken under this act which will result in furnishing assistance of a kind, for a purpose, or to an area, substantially different from that included in the presentation to the Congress during its consideration of this act, or which will result in expenditures greater by 50 percent or more than the proposed expenditures included in such presentation for the program or project concerned, the President or such officer as he may designate shall promptly notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, stating the justification for such change. Notice shall also be given to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of any determination under the first sentence of section 401 (except with respect to unvouchered funds), and copies of any certification as to loyalty under section 531 shall be filed with such committees.

CHAPTER 2. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 521. Delegation of authority by the President: The President may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act through such agency or officer of the United States as he shall direct, and the head of such agency or such officer may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out functions under this act and may delegate authority to perform any of such functions to his subordinates acting under his direction.

SEC. 522. Allocation and reimbursement among agencies: (a) The President may allocate or transfer to any United States Government agency any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this act, including any advance to the United States by any nation or international organization for the procurement of equipment or materials or services. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes for which authorized, in accordance with authority granted in this act or under authority governing the activities of the Government agencies to which such funds are allocated or transferred. Funds allocated to the Department of Defense shall be governed by the procedures of subsection (c) of this section.

(b) Any officer of the United States performing functions under this act may utilize the services and facilities of, or procure commodities from, any United States Govern-

ment agency as the President shall direct, or with the consent of the head of such agency, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

(c) Reimbursement shall be made to any United States Government agency, from funds available to carry out chapter 1 of title I of this act, for any assistance furnished under that chapter from, by, or through such agency. Such reimbursement shall be in an amount equal to the value (as defined in section 545) of the equipment and materials, services (other than salaries of members of the Armed Forces of the United States), or other assistance furnished, plus expenses arising from or incident to operations under that chapter. The amount of any such reimbursement shall be credited as reimbursable receipts to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts of such agency and shall be available for, and under the authority applicable to, the purposes for which such appropriations, funds, or accounts are authorized to be used, including the procurement of equipment and materials or services, required by such agency, in the same general category as those furnished by it or authorized to be procured by it and expenses arising from and incident to such procurement.

(d) In the case of any commodity, service, or facility procured from any United States Government agency under any provision of this act other than chapter 1 of title I, reimbursement or payment shall be made to such agency from funds available to carry out such provision. Such reimbursement or payment shall be at replacement cost, or, if required by law, at actual cost, or at any other price authorized by law and agreed to by the owning or disposal agency. The amount of any such reimbursement or payment shall be credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which there may be procured replacements of similar commodities, services, or facilities, except that where such appropriations, funds, or accounts are not reimbursable except by reason of this subsection, and when the owning agency determines that such replacement is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(e) In furnishing assistance under this act accounts may be established on the books of any United States Government agency or, on terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in banking institutions in the United States, against which (i) letters of commitment may be issued which shall constitute obligations of the United States, and moneys due or to become due under such letters of commitment shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, and (ii) withdrawals may be made by recipient nations or agencies, organizations or persons upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other appropriate documentation. Expenditure of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditure of Government funds: *Provided*, That such expenditures for commodities or services procured outside the continental limits of the United States may be accounted for exclusively on such certification as may be prescribed in regulations approved by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 523. Coordination with foreign policy: (a) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

SEC. 524. The Secretary of Defense: (a) In the case of aid under chapter 1 of title I of this act, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility for—

(1) the determination of military end-item requirements:

(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel;

(5) the movement and delivery of military end items; and

(6) within the Department of Defense, the performance of any other functions with respect to the furnishing of military assistance.

(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense. The determination of the value of the program for any country under chapter 1 of title I shall be made by the President.

SEC. 525. Foreign Operations Administration: Except as modified pursuant to this section or section 521, the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration (referred to in this chapter as the "Director") shall continue to perform the functions vested in him on the effective date of this act, except insofar as such functions relate to continuous supervision and general direction of programs of military assistance. The President may transfer to any agency or officer of the United States, and may modify or abolish, any function, office, or entity of the Foreign Operations Administration or any officer or employee thereof, and may transfer such personnel, property, records, and funds as may be necessary incident thereto.

SEC. 526. Missions and staffs abroad: The President may maintain special missions or staffs abroad in such nations and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out this act. Each such special mission or staff shall be under the direction of a chief. The chief and his deputy shall be appointed by the President and may, notwithstanding any other law, be removed by the President at his discretion. The chief shall be entitled to receive (1) in cases approved by the President, the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801), or (2) compensation and allowances in accordance with section 527 (c) of this act, as the President shall determine to be appropriate.

SEC. 527. Employment of personnel: (a) Any United States Government agency performing functions under this act is authorized to employ such personnel as the President deems necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

(b) Of the personnel employed in the United States on programs authorized by this act, not to exceed 60 may be compensated without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of whom not to exceed 35 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 15 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 positions shall be in addition to those authorized by law to be filled by Presidential appointment, and in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) For the purpose of performing functions under this act outside the continental limits of the United States, the Director may—

(1) employ or assign persons, or authorize the employment or assignment of officers or employees of other United States Government agencies, who shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801), together with allowances and benefits established thereunder including, in all cases, post differentials prescribed under section 443 of the Foreign Service Act; and persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of the Foreign Service Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve; and

(2) utilize such authority, including authority to appoint and assign personnel for the duration of operations under this act, contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801), as the President deems necessary to carry out functions under this act. Such provisions of the Foreign Service Act as the President deems appropriate shall apply to personnel appointed or assigned under this paragraph, including, in all cases, the provisions of sections 443 and 528 of that act.

(d) For the purpose of performing functions under this act outside the continental limits of the United States, the Secretary of State may, at the request of the Director, appoint for the duration of operations under this act alien clerks and employees in accordance with applicable provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801).

SEC. 528. Detail of personnel to foreign governments: (a) Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of this act, the head of any United States Government agency is authorized to 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.

(b) 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 available to that agency or made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this act.

SEC. 529. Detail of personnel to international organizations: (a) Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of this act, the head of any United States Government agency is authorized to detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organization, or to render any technical, scientific or professional advice or service to or in cooperation with such organization.

(b) Any such officer or employee, while so assigned or detailed, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds available to that agency or made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this act. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to

those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

(c) Details or assignments may be made under this section—

(1) without reimbursement to the United States by the international organization;

(2) upon agreement by the international organization to reimburse the United States for compensation, travel expenses, and allowances, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of assignment or detail in accordance with subsection (b) of this section; and such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, or allowances, or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for such purposes;

(3) upon an advance of funds, property, or services to the United States accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this act; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure subject to the provisions of this act, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the international organization; or

(4) subject to the receipt by the United States of a credit to be applied against the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the international organization to which the officer or employee is detailed, such credit to be based upon the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of assignment or detail in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.

SEC. 530. Experts and consultants or organizations thereof: (a) Experts and consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be employed by any United States Government agency for the performance of functions under this act, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular place of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at a rate not to exceed $10 while so employed within the continental limits of the United States and at the applicable rate prescribed in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations (Foreign areas) while so employed outside the continental limits of the United States.

(b) Persons of outstanding experience and ability may be employed without compensation by any United States Government agency for the performance of functions under this act in accordance with the provisions of section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 2160), and regulations issued thereunder.

SEC. 531. Security clearance: No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Director under this act for a period to exceed 3 months unless—

(a) such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Civil Service Commission, or by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the case of specific positions which have been certified by the Director as being of a high degree of importance or sensitivity or in case the Civil Service Commission investigation develops data reflecting that the individual is of questionable loyalty, and a report thereon has been made to the Director, and until the Director 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 knowingly been a member of any organization advocating contrary views; or

(b) 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 section 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 person already employed under programs covered by this act who has been previously investigated in connection with such employment.

SEC. 532. Evemption of personnel from certain Federal laws: (a) Service of an individual as a member of the Board established pursuant to section 307 of this act or as an expert or consultant under section 530 (a) shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of title 18, U. S. C., sections 281, 283 or 284, or of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), 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, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service; nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 715), section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), or any other Federal law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

(b) Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 62), which prohibits certain retired officers from holding certain office, any retired officer of any of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may hold any office or appointment under this act or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, but the compensation of any such retired officer shall be subject to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), which does not permit retired pay to be added to the compensation received as a civilian officer.

SEC. 533. Waivers of certain Federal laws: Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of purposes declared in this act, the functions authorized under this act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

SEC. 534. Reports: 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 reports covering each 6 months of operations, in furtherance of the purposes of this act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. 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. Such reports shall include detailed information on the implementation of sections 504 and 414 (b) of this act.

SEC. 535. Cooperation with international organizations: (a) The President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies, or other international organizations, in carrying out the purposes of this act, and may make payments by advancements or reimbursements, for such purposes, out of funds made available for the purposes of this act, as may be necessary therefor, to the extent that special compensation is usually required for such services and facilities: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the delegation to any international or foreign organization or agency of authority to decide the method of furnishing assistance under this act to any country or the amount thereof.

(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this act, United States Government agencies, on request of international organizations, are authorized to furnish supplies, materials, and services, on an advance of funds or reimbursement basis, to such organizations. Such advances or reimbursements may be credited to the current applicable appropriation or fund of the agency concerned and shall be available for the purposes for which such appropriations and funds are authorized to be used.

CHAPTER 3. REPEAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 541. Effective date: This act shall take effect on July 1, 1954.

SEC. 542. Statutes repealed: (a) There are hereby repealed—

(1) an act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, approved May 22, 1947, as amended;

(2) the joint resolution to provide for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, approved May 31, 1947, as amended;

(3) the Foreign Aid Act of 1947;

(4) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended; including the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, the International Children's Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948, as amended, the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948, and the China Aid Act of 1948, as amended;

(5) the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended;

(6) the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended; including the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, the China Area Aid Act of 1950, as amended, the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, and the Act for International Development, as amended;

(7) the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended;

(8) the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950;

(9) the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

(10) the Mutual Security Act of 1952;

(11) the Mutual Security Act of 1953;

(12) section 12 of the joint resolution of Congress approved November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 10; 22 U. S. C. 452);

(13) section 4 of the act of March 3, 1925 (50 Stat. 887; 50 U. S. C. 165); and

(14) section 968 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) References in other acts to the acts listed in subsection (a) shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of this act.

(c) The repeal of the acts listed in subsection (a) shall not be deemed to affect amendments contained in such acts to acts not named in subsection (a).

SEC. 543. Saving provisions:

(a) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this act, all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken or entered into under authority of any provision of law repealed by section 542 shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(b) Where provisions of this act establish conditions which must be complied with before use may be made of authority contained in or funds authorized by this act, compliance with substantially similar conditions under acts named in section 542 shall be deemed to constitute compliance with the conditions established by this act.

(c) No person in the service or employment of the United States or otherwise performing functions under an act repealed by section 542 or under section 408 shall be required to be reappointed or reemployed by reason of the entry into force of this act, except that appointments made pursuant to section 110 (a) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be converted to appointments under section 527 (c) of this act.

SEC. 544. Amendments to other laws: (a) Title X of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431), is amended by adding the following new section:

"Informational media guaranties

"SEC. 1011. The Director of the United States Information Agency may make guaranties, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media consistent with the national interests of the United States against funds heretofore made available by notes issued to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, for purposes of guaranties of investments: *Provided, however,* That the amount of such guaranties in any fiscal year shall be determined by the President but shall not exceed $10,000,000."

(b) Section 1 of Public Law 283, 81st Congress, is repealed. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs, created pursuant to Public Law 369, 80th Congress (22 U. S. C. 281), shall have succession until June 30, 1960, and may make contracts for periods not to exceed 5 years: *Provided,* That any contract extending beyond June 30, 1960, shall be made subject to termination by the said Institute upon notice: *And provided further,* That the said Institute shall, on and after July 1, 1954, be subject to the applicable provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U. S. C. 1), in lieu of the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841).

SEC. 545. Definitions: For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "commodity" includes any commodity, material, article, supply, or goods.

(b) The term "surplus agricultural commodity" means any agricultural commodity or product thereof, class, kind, type, or other specification thereof, produced in the United States either publicly or privately owned, which is in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) The terms "equipment" and "materials" shall mean any arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or any other type of material, article, raw material, facility, tool, machine, supply or item that would further the purpose of chapter 1 of title I, or any component or part thereof, used or required for use in connection therewith, or required in or for the manufacture, production, processing, storage, transportation, repair, or rehabilitation of any equipment or materials, but shall not include merchant vessels.

(d) The term "mobilization reserve," as used with respect to any equipment or materials, means the quantity of such equipment or materials determined by the Secretary of Defense under regulations prescribed by the President to be required to support mobilization of the Armed Forces of the United States in the event of war or national emergency until such time as adequate additional quantities of such equipment or materials can be procured.

(e) The term "excess," as used with respect to any equipment or materials, means the quantity of such equipment or materials, owned by the United States which is in excess of the mobilization reserve of such equipment or materials.

(f) The term "services" shall include any service, repair, training of personnel, or technical or other assistance or information necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(g) The term "Armed Forces of the United States" shall include any component of the Army of the United States, of the United States Navy, of the United States Marine Corps, of the Air Force of the United States, of the United States Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof.

(h) The term "value" means—

(1) with respect to any excess equipment or materials furnished under chapter 1 of title I, the gross cost of repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying such equipment or materials prior to being so furnished;

(2) with respect to any nonexcess equipment or materials furnished under chapter 1 of title I which are taken from the mobilization reserve (other than equipment or materials referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection), the actual or the projected (computed as accurately as practicable) cost of procuring for the mobilization reserve an equal quantity of such equipment or materials or an equivalent quantity of equipment or materials of the same general type but deemed to be more desirable for inclusion in the mobilization reserve than the equipment or materials furnished;

(3) with respect to any nonexcess equipment or materials furnished under chapter 1 of title I which are taken from the mobilization reserve but with respect to which the Secretary of Defense has certified that it is not necessary fully to replace such equipment or materials in the mobilization reserve, the gross cost to the United States of such equipment and materials or its replacement cost, whichever the Secretary of Defense may specify; and

(4) with respect to any equipment or materials furnished under chapter 1 of title I which are procured for the purpose of being so furnished, the gross cost to the United States of such equipment and materials.

In determining the gross cost incurred by any agency in repairing, rehabilitating, or modifying any excess equipment furnished under chapter 1 of title I all parts, accessories, or other materials used in the course of repair, rehabilitation, or modification shall be priced in accordance with the current standard pricing policies of such agency. For the purpose of this subsection, the gross cost of any equipment or materials taken from the mobilization reserve means either the actual gross cost to the United States of that particular equipment or materials or the estimated gross cost to the United States of that particular equipment or materials obtained by multiplying the number of units of such particular equipment or materials by the average gross cost of each unit of that equipment and materials owned by the furnishing agency.

(i) The term "United States Government agency" means any department, agency, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, or instrumentality, commission, or establishment of the United States Government.

SEC. 546. Construction: (a) If any provision of this act or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

(b) Nothing in this act shall alter, amend, revoke, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1801).

(c) Nothing in this act is intended nor shall it be construed as an expressed or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any nation or nations, or to any international organization.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committe do now arise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that this Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may meet tomorrow during general debate during the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9517) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 15 and 20 to the foregoing bill.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during general debate during the session of the House tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. HALLECK, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 604, Rept. No. 2002), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without interventing motion except one motion to recommit.

NBC COMMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following from the NBC television program Comment, broadcast on Monday, June 28, 1954:

Mr. ROMNEY WHEELER. Right off the bat, let me say that I'm going to be controversial.

You can't tell the truth about the way the British feel and pull punches. You can't explain the fears and misgivings and suspicions that have grown up in London recently, without being blunt. And bluntness—in times like these—is bound to be controversial.

I've just come from London, and I can tell you that when Prime Minister Churchill and Mr. Eden took off for Washington, they not only carried the full confidence of the British people; they actually left as heroes. Heroes because they were standing up to the Americans, and telling them the facts of life.

To an American correspondent, living and working in London, as I do, this is an alarming situation. Because it means that the differences between Britain and America are really deep; and that misgivings and anxiety on both sides are just about as great as it's possible to have without an actual, irrevocable break between the English-speaking powers.

This is not just anti-Americanism. I live and work in Britain, and I find very little of that.

On the other hand, there's a very real concern about what America intends to do; a real fear that Britain and the British Commonwealth may be the tail on a very erratically handled kite that suddenly may wind up in a tree. We, here at home, may think that's absurd, but, nevertheless, it exists.

Before he left London, Anthony Eden told the House of Commons there would be some plain speaking in Washington. He was cheered by both sides of the house, regardless of party politics. And this is why:

No matter what government rules Britain—whether it's Churchill and the Conservatives, or Attlee and the Laborites—British foreign policy is based equally on two foundations:

First, Britain's responsibilities to the Commonwealth and the British Empire. And, second, the Anglo-American alliance.

The British have made it clear—many, many times—that in their view, the peace and security of the world depend on the Anglo-American alliance. And Sir Winston has made it equally clear that, if the chips are down, Britain inevitably would back the United States.

But—and it's a very big but—Britain is not just a small group of islands off the northwest coast of Europe. Britain is the heart of a Commonwealth extending right around the world; and by far the greatest number of those people are Asiatics. So Britain is going to think a long time before doing anything that would hurt or alienate the Commonwealth; exactly as our Government would consider carefully before hurting or alienatng Texas or California or the State of Washington.

Well, now, there is the heart of the problem:

On one hand, Churchill is determined to cooperate with the United States; to do everything possible to see that Britain and America present a united front to communism. On the other hand, he and the others who speak for Britain are not all sure what we're aiming at. I have been asked repeatedly in London: Exactly what is American foreign policy? Does America have a foreign policy, in the true sense of the word? Or is it a combination of what Mr. Dulles may say at his news conference this morning; what Senator KNOWLAND may say to reporters at lunch; what Admiral Radford may tell the Armed Services Committee this afternoon; and what Senator MCCARTHY may say at a public dinner tonight?

To the British—and they will tell you this quite frankly—it all adds up to a howling uncertainty.

That's hardly a helpful situation, between allies. But it doesn't end there. Entirely apart from this general feeling of insecurity, there is a lamentable absence of British confidence in our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

This is not just a recent blowup. It goes back even before Mr. Dulles became Secretary of State.

I remember talking with Herbert Morrison, when he was British Foreign Secretary in the Attlee government. It was when we were negotiating the Japanese Peace Treaty. Morrison told me Dulles had given Britain a firm pledge that the United States would not influence Japan one way or the other about China; that it would be left to the Japanese, themselves, whether they recognized Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government or the Communist government at Peiping.

Yet, almost immediately afterward, the Japanese Prime Minister made public the famous Dulles letter, in which Mr. Dulles put pressure on Japan to recognize Chiang Kai-shek.

Now, maybe it was entirely right and desirable for Japan to line up with Nationalist China, and to ignore the Chinese Reds. But the point is: The British felt keenly that Mr. Dulles went back on a solid promise; a promise without which the British Parliament would not have ratified the Japanese treaty, in the first place.

The British also feel that Mr. Dulles has been regrettably short on diplomacy; that he used a bullwhip on the French in trying to force ratification of the European Defense Community; and that he jumped the gun on a southeast Asia defense alliance, without being sure either of French support or the support of the Asian countries concerned.

The British argue, perhaps with a fair degree of logic, that it's absurd to think that Indochina could be saved—and held indefinitely—by white soldiers alone, even if Britain and America had the men available, and were prepared to have them fight in Indochina.

They agree that the Indians, the Burmese, and some of the other Asiatic peoples may be unrealistic about the threat of communism. But they believe that communism will be defeated in Asia only if the Asiatics, themselves, will defend their liberties. And they hope that what's happening in Indochina may be the shock that will jar India and the other Asiatic nations into action.

Mr. Dulles undoubtedly had a good point when he told Mr. Eden that the West would be in a much stronger position at Geneva if it went ahead right now and organized a southeast Asia defense treaty. On the other hand, Mr. Eden argued—perhaps with equal logic—that a defense organization, formed while fighting was going on, almost certainly would be called on to fight, too. And if the United States was not prepared to send ground forces into Indochina, we had better try to stop the war first, by negotiation, before getting involved in defense commitments.

That's what Mr. Churchill meant—over the weekend—when he said it was better to jaw-jaw with the Communists than to war-war.

One thing we must keep in mind. Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden have political problems in Britain quite as difficult as we have in America. They have an election coming, probably next year. And British public opinion is strongly on the side of using the big stick only as a last resort.

You may say that the British, particularly the Socialists, are starry-eyed and naive to believe you can do business with the Communists. But a lot of Britons do believe in the possibility of negotiation and compromise.

Mr. MAX FREEDMAN, Washington correspondent for the Manchester Guardian. Mr. Dulles has never been popular with the British press and there's a tendency today to blame him for the present mischief in Asia. That's dangerous folly; as silly and sinister as the attempts by some Members of Congress to degrade Mr. Eden into a creature of appeasement. The issues which divide the two Governments touch some of the most urgent principles of national policy. The real differences concern Asia. So let's concentrate on that point.

Let's begin by clearing away some misconceptions about Indochina. The American Government never seriously considered an air strike at Dien Bien Phu. It rejected this policy on its own responsibility. Britain exercised no veto. In fact London was never consulted. Nor did Great Britain stop America's general military involvement in Indochina. There were strong military reasons raised in Washington against such involvement, and France refused to give the native peoples immediate and unconditional independence. London had nothing to do with Washington's decision.

The only issue on which Great Britain exercised decisive influence was in the discussion of a collective security pact based on Mr. Dulles' principle of united action in Asia. On April 20 Mr. Eden told Mr. Dulles that England, at this stage, could take no part in these negotiations. The British Government gave two main reasons for this decision. The pact should include the five Colombo powers—India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia. The pact should not be proclaimed before the conference at Geneva had fully tested Communist intentions. Otherwise China might send troops into Indochina and there would be danger of world war.

Even today the British position is misunderstood. Mr. Eden still thinks the collective security pact should wait until there is some settlement in Indochina. How else will you know what frontiers are to be guaranteed by united action? The British Government also is convinced that no pact can succeed without the support of Indian and the other free nations of Asia. That is why Mr. Eden has proposed two pacts. One would be a mutual pact of non-aggression signed by China and the western powers. The other would be the Pacific equivalent of NATO and would protect the free world against Communist aggression in Asia. If China refused to cooperate she would be made to suffer the coercive power of the free world. It is a flexible but strong policy. It wins us the greatest number of allies in Asia. It will give us the support of the Colombo powers. These countries will not support Mr. Dulles' plan because it is directed against China and treats her as a potential and perpetual aggressor.

Many Americans believe that India is a troublesome critic. We believe that India is a priceless asset. We also feel that American policy would be much wiser if it listened more frequently to Mr. Nehru's advice instead of getting entangled with the ambitions of Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, and Syngman Rhee. American policy in Asia has sometimes been on the wrong side; it has never been on the side of wrong.

In essence the British complaint about American policy is that the American people have dangerously misunderstood the meaning of the Chinese revolution. Many Americans accuse the State Department of having lost China—as if the State Department owned the title deeds to Chinese freedom and somehow misplaced them. With great respect British officials suggest to their American colleagues that what happened in China is due less to the attitudes of Washington than to the actions of the Chinese people. But this argument is obstinately resisted. China's destiny is treated in the United States not as the high concern of national policy but as the angry theme of political passion. It ceases to be a problem in creative diplomacy and becomes a problem in abnormal psychology. America believes China inevitably must resort to aggression. Britain thinks there is a chance China might like to concentrate on her internal problems. But China's cooperation is very hard to get while this country, as the leader of the free world, refuses to recognize Communist China, threatens to veto her membership in the United Nations, tries to strangle her trade, abuses her world opinion as a nation whose word cannot be trusted, refuses even to talk with China's leaders at the Geneva Conference, and parades the exiled inefficiencies of Chiang Kai-shek as the alternative to the Communist Government. The United States treats China as if she is an outlaw state. Is it really a matter for indignation and surprise if China sometimes behaves like an outlaw?

But we must not endanger the future by quarrelling over the past. Both London and Washington have made concessions. Otherwise the Churchill-Eden mission will prove a barren pilgrimage instead of an adventurous experiment for peace. The Foreign Office must pursue the right policy without being self-righteous; and the State Department must banish its old fear that it is making a bad bargain if it wins peace with China at the cost of war with Congress.

The partnership between England and America will endure. Despite present differences it will grow in freedom. It is the shield and sanctuary of all nations which cherish peace and seek to protect the threatened frontiers of human decency. It cannot fail.

This is Max Freedman.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1955 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BOW submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9203) making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUDGE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLEVENGER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING GENERAL DEBATE TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow legislative committees of the House may meet while the House is engaged in general debate.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be transferred to tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H. R. 9678.

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE JAPHET

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk, the bill (H. R. 2636) for the relief of George Japhet, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID HANAN

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of David Hanan, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. REED of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. VORYS) to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS and to include additional matter to appear in the body of the RECORD, following the debate today.

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. JENSEN).

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6465. An act to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to footwear;

H. R. 7709. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; and

H. R. 8680. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3318. An act to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1677. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1678. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $1,035,000 and a draft of a proposed provision for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1955 (H. Doc. No. 454); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1679. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $7,050,000 for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1955 (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the General Services Administration and the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1681. A letter from the chairman, Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the fifth and final report of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel on Federal pension and retirement plans, pursuant to Public Law 555, 82d Congress, July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. JACKSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists; without amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee of conference. S. 2475. An act to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1947). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1303. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7517. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7518. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9728. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Comestics"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9729. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MEADER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9730. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8498. A bill authorizing construction of works to reestablish for the Palo Verde Irrigation District, California, a means of diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOW: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9203. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1997). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUDGE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9447. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1998). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLEVENGER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 8067. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2000). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9709. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program; without amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 604. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9680, a bill to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 268. An act for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 381. An act for the relief of Donald Grant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 455. An act for the relief of Johan Gerhard Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 490. An act for the relief of Josephine Reigl; without amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Regine du Planty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Majzner (alias Stanley Maisner); with amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2654. A bill for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antonietta Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scarlato, Iolanda Gaglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Francescaina Conterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci; with amendment (Rept. No. 1956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2879. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Juan Onativia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahn and Suzanne Hahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3238. A bill for the relief of Danica Maria Vavrova; with amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3444. A bill for the relief of Toki Yaeko; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Di Donato; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3677. A bill for the relief of Sister Paolina (Angela Di Franco); without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Sister Agrippina (Agrippina Palermo), Sister Battistina (Franceschina Serpa), Sister Romana (Angela Iolanda Morelli), Sister Franceschina (Maria Caruso), and Sister Bruna (Giuseppina De Caro); without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4092. A bill for the relief of Mira Tellini Napoleone; with amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4371. A bill for the relief of June Ann Sakurai; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Carmen D'Ottavio, also known as Cameron D'Ottavio; with amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Sophia Nassopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5443. A bill for the relief of Eva Lowinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5944. A bill for the relief of Alberto Ugo Landry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cazzato; with amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marie Adelheid Herok; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7606. A bill for the relief of Michael Henry LaFleur; without amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7635. A bill for the relief of Martti Ilmari Timonen, Maj-Lis Timonen, and Marja Timonen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Bart Blaak (formerly Johannes J. M. Gijsbers); without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 579. An act for the relief of Wong You Henn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 676. An act for the relief of Eftychios Mourginakis, without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 747. An act for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 997. An act for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1050. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1382. An act for the relief of Elie Joseph Hakim and family; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1508. An act for the relief of Borivoje Vulich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1517. An act for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1689. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange; without amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1991. An act for the relief of Esperanza Jimenez Trejo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2198. An act for the relief of (Sister) Jane Stanislaus Riederer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2369. An act for the relief of Karl Ulistein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2465. An act for the relief of Lydia Wickenfeld Butz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3196. An act for the relief of Dr. Helen Maria Roberts (Helen Maria Rebalska); without amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8735. A bill authorizing the President to present a gold medal to Irving Berlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 9728. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9729. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 9730. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 9731. A bill to make the employment, and related practices, of any alien known by an employer to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof unlawful, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9732. A bill to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of any vessel or vehicle used in the transportation of any alien known by the owner thereof to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 9733. A bill relating to the inspection and certification of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 9734. A bill to permit the city of Philadelphia to further develop the Hog Island tract as an air, rail, and marine terminal by directing the Secretary of Commerce to release the city of Philadelphia from the fulfillment of certain conditions contained in the existing deed which restrict further development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9735. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 9736. A bill to establish uniform weight allowance governing the transportation at Government expense of property of Government officers and employees (including members of the uniformed services), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 9737. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 9738. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a full and complete investigation and study of the effect the education and training benefits furnished veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 have had; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 9739. A bill to relieve certain veterans who relied on an erroneous interpretation of the law from liability to repay a portion of the subsistence allowances which they received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 9740. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9741. A bill to provide for replacement of certain strategic metals inventories liquidated during Korean war without affecting excess-profits credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9742. A bill to amend section 3404 (relating to the imposition of excise tax on radio and television sets, phonographs and records) and related sections of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9743. A bill to amend section 3444 (relating to use by manufacturers or importers of articles subject to excise tax) and

related sections of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9744. A bill to amend section 3443 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9745. A bill to amend section 3443 (relating to credits and refunds of manufacturers' excise taxes) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9746. A bill to amend section 3441 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution condemning uncivilized practice of kidnaping by East German Communist regime and its Soviet masters across international borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution condemning uncivilized practice of kidnaping by East German Communist regime and its Soviet masters across international borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution condemning uncivilized practice of kidnaping by East German Communist regime and its Soviet masters across international borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution condemning uncivilized practice of kidnaping by East German Communist regime and its Soviet masters across international borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9747. A bill for the relief of John (Janos) Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 9748. A bill for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock nee Nikolajewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9749. A bill for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 9750. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Luther et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1068. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Mrs. Verna S. Haynes and 35 others of Medford, Mass., favoring passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1069. Also, petition of Rev. A. Alton Dodge and 22 others of Medford, Mass., favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1070. Also, petition of Florence M. Cook and 5 others of Medford, Mass., favoring passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1071. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. George J. C. Wilhelm and other citizens of Monett to Congress to pass laws prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages through interstate commerce and over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1072. Also, petition of Chauncey Hilty and other citizens of Cassville to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1073. Also, petition of R. C. Byers, and other citizens of Pierce City and community to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Like Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for too long on foreign policy, we have followed the thinking and the advice of New York and other eastern seaboard cities which depend for their existence upon the charges they make for the services they render the people of the Midwest. The larger part of these charges are for services for handling foreign trade—goods shipped in and out through their ports and financial transactions with other countries.

The thinking of the people of the East is naturally international. Apparently, they give little consideration to the thought and the activities of the people of the Midwest. We in return, perhaps do not see clearly their viewpoint nor the reasons for it. Being closer to mother earth, realizing almost daily, that we live, prosper, and are happy because of what we dig out of the dirt, or, if you prefer, the soil, and manufacture, we cannot see their viewpoint which seems to be that not only our happiness and our prosperity but our national existence depend upon pleasing, gaining the approval and support of the people of other nations. In my opinion, the more than $119,301,997,500 which we have sent abroad as of today, has failed to bring either sincere friendship or wholehearted support of our present foreign policy. France, which has received $4,945,000,000, will not follow Dulles' recommendations.

Britain's representatives are here today expressing their determination that she will not back the policy of Dulles and the internationalists with military support. Churchill and Eden insist that we can, and must in some way, get along with Russia. Or we can fight alone.

Each and every one of the nations we have so generously aided, in support of whom so many hundreds of thousands of our men have suffered and thousands died, will today, as in the past, follow the course which to it seems for its own best interests.

It behooves us to remember that today, as always in the past, self-interest guides the activities of all other nations.

Imposing our views, our thoughts, our way of living, by war upon the communistic world is an impossible task.

Let us disregard the urging of our seaboard friends, of the profiteers, of the internationalists, of the sincere but mistaken dreamers, discontinue bleeding ourselves white, turn to a policy of efficiently and economically building our own national defense; think and act first to make our own country strong, self-reliant, prosperous, and secure.

A Personal Legislative Report to the People of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following:

OTTO KRUEGER IN WASHINGTON—SEPARATING THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Last year I sent you a report on the activities of the 1st session of the 83d Congress. You were so kind to me in your praise of the report, I felt it advisable to report to you on the happenings as the 2d session nears a close.

Being a Member of Congress is not an easy job, but it is a very gratifying one if you enjoy helping people and I do. Many of the things I am about to discuss with you do not give you the help I think you are entitled to. It looks now that we can celebrate the Fourth of July with a package farm bill on its way that will handle some of the problems we are facing. Congressman HOPE tells me the bill will be out on the floor of the House this week. I have always followed the affairs of the Agriculture Committee, and, of course, have continued to do so very closely. The bill will definitely come out with a provision for the extension of 90 percent of parity for a year. You folks may also have a chance to consider the merits of a two-price system. Personally, I would like to see controls on the basis of bushels rather than acreage, with a minimum of redtape for the farmer to contend with, but I know the House Agriculture Committee has spent many months of long hours in the preparation of this bill. I have talked with many of the members of the committee personally, and I know they, in their hearts, are hoping the same thing I am, that the bill will pass. I think it will receive the approval of Congress. The one thing I can assure you is that the extension of high parity will receive the approval of OTTO KRUEGER.

Seriously, friends, can anyone justify huge imports in oats, barley, and rye and then ask the farmer not to plant any of these crops in his diverted acreage if he wants to qualify for price supports? I fought Canadian imports last year, and will continue to do so when it penalizes America's farmers. Nor do I feel justified in cutting millions at home to spend billions abroad. Some assistance to our allies is necessary to combat commu-