

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we yearn for a better understanding of spiritual things, that we may know surely what Thy will is for us and for our Nation. Give to us clear vision that we may know where to stand and what to stand for—because unless we stand for something, we shall fall for anything.

Remind us, O God, that Thou hast not resigned. Harassed and troubled by the difficulties and uncertainties of the hour, we rest our minds on Thee, who dost not change. May it ever be in our minds as upon our coins that in God we trust. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 18, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE NORMAN,
OF WASHINGTON

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, during the course of last night Hon. FRED NORMAN, Representative from the Third District of the State of Washington, quietly passed away in his sleep.

Representative NORMAN's sudden passing leaves the State of Washington and the southwest Washington district he represented without the services of a man

who was above the average in an age whose problems and potentialities also are tremendously above the average.

FRED NORMAN worked himself to death. Only yesterday he participated in the vigorous labor debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, standing up for his principles.

He was a folksy man, but no ordinary citizen. Few of his constituents knew that many a time, in order to save them and the Nation even the smallest amount of money, he rode the day coach to and from his State and the Nation's Capital. That was his way of trying to do his bit.

We of the Washington State congressional delegation are extremely distressed by Mr. NORMAN's passing. The people have lost a valuable Representative.

We who represent the State of Washington in the Nation's Capital want to show our respect for him in the best way possible, and this would be to do some work for him.

The other Members of Congress from our State with whom I have talked are anxious to help, and until the problem of Mr. NORMAN's successor is settled we will gladly take over the duties of Mr. NORMAN's district.

We wish for Mr. NORMAN a happy and eternal rest. He has earned nothing less.

Were my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] present, I know he would subscribe to this sincere declaration of sorrow and respect.

Mr. President, I shall submit the customary resolution in the next few days.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, together with a summary of operations of the Fund from its establishment to June 30, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN
STATIONS BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NON-
PROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROGRESS REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL
RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT
CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND
COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics that become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after interstate shipment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary and proper legislation to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and other countries in which the foot-and-mouth disease exists

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease now exists in livestock in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the disease has spread from the six original states involved in the vicinity of Mexico City as far west and north as the state of Zacatecas; and

"Whereas it is extremely doubtful if the Government of the Republic of Mexico can eradicate this disease from their livestock without additional assistance; and

"Whereas the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico presents a very definite threat to the prosperity of the livestock industry and the entire economic welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representative of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to strengthen the present sanitary requirements governing the importation of livestock and livestock products from Mexico and from other countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; be it further

"Resolved, That we earnestly petition Congress to appropriate additional funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, in order that border inspection may be strengthened and a system of patrol be established along the northern boundary of Mexico to guard against the importation of people, animals and materials carrying the infection of foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

"Resolved, That we petition and urge the Congress of the United States to offer to the Government of the Republic of Mexico such facilities and assistance as may be available from the Bureau of Animal Industry and the United States Department of Agriculture, in order that foot-and-mouth disease be eradicated from their livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the

President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the honorable Secretary of State, the honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Kansas, with the request that they bring this matter forcibly to the attention of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body February 20, 1947.

"House concurred in senate amendments February 28, 1947.

"FRANK B. MILLER,
"Speaker of the House.
"H. W. CRAMER,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

The petition of Hideo Mori, of Brigham City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to give immigration and naturalization privileges to the Japanese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of the members of the Coconut Grove (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 18

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the State of Oregon by extending public assistance on the basis of individual need bears more than 50 percent of the cost in many instances especially for recipients of blind assistance and aid to dependent children because of existing Federal maximums for purposes of matching funds; and

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act contains no provision for Federal matching funds for the aid of the parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children receiving aid to dependent children; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon, in order to extend assistance to all needy persons in accordance with their needs irrespective of cause, is providing general assistance and to the extent of 85 percent of such total expenditures, there being no Federal financial participation through grants-in-aid for general assistance; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon through general assistance is expending large sums of money for medical care for persons who are receiving old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children as well as medical care for other needy persons who are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children.

"Whereas foster-family home care is provided to a large number of dependent and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent by the State of Oregon at a considerable cost from general-assistance funds; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon carries sole financial responsibility for the administration of general assistance; and

"Whereas the present limitations in the Federal matching maximums particularly with respect to aid to the blind and aid to dependent children and the lack of Federal financial participation in the assistance of all other needy persons and dependent chil-

dren as well as in the administration and expenditures of general assistance place excessive demands upon general taxpayers of Oregon, and constitute an increasingly serious financial burden for the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully petition and request that the Congress of the United States, during the present session thereof, do enact appropriate amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act providing: (1) for the elimination of Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children, and the deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, (2) for Federal financial participation in assistance to a parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children who are recipients of aid to dependent children, (3) for Federal grants-in-aid to States for general assistance to any needy person as well as for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, (4) for Federal financial participation in the costs of medical services made available to needy persons under State public assistance programs and in assistance payments to needy sick persons who reside in public or private medical institutions other than mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanitariums, (5) for Federal grants-in-aid or other appropriate provision of Federal aid to States in providing foster family home care for children in accordance with their individual needs, (6) for Federal financial participation in the administration of general assistance, including such welfare services as the States provide through the staff of the public welfare agency to help persons become self-supporting or avoid becoming dependent, and to contribute to their general welfare.

"Adopted by house March 13, 1947.

"Adopted by senate March 28, 1947."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1128. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the streams and their tributaries flowing through the Coastal Plains soil conservation district, Texas, with a view to the control of floods, retardation of run-off and waterflow, and prevention of soil erosion; and

S. 1129. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the streams and their tributaries flowing through the Matagorda County soil conservation district, Texas, with a view to the control of floods, retardation of run-off and waterflow, and prevention of soil erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 1130. A bill to create a National Cancer Research Commission in order to provide for and coordinate research in a supreme endeavor to discover the cause or causes of cancer and means for its prevention; to develop a limited number of research centers; to mobilize in the United States a number

of the world's outstanding experts in scientific research in order to utilize their services; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. MURRAY and himself):

S. 1131. A bill to aid the States in establishing and maintaining scholarship and loan programs for the purpose of enabling individuals to obtain education in the eleventh year of school grade or above; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1132. A bill to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in United States in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY RATING SYSTEMS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BALDWIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the systems and methods of determining the efficiency, and providing ratings thereof, of Federal employees now in use by any executive department or agency of the Government, and with respect to any regulations pertaining to such systems or methods made by the Civil Service Commission. Such study and investigation shall be conducted for the purpose of determining the usefulness, practicability, and effectiveness of the present systems and methods, and of determining the desirability of retaining, revising, or abolishing such systems and methods or of establishing new systems and methods for determining the efficiency, and providing ratings thereof, of Federal employees.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of any study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be the alternate representative of the United States to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

LEFT-WING CONTROL OF CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD remarks I made before the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association. Among other things, I called attention to the fact that the left-wing element which had carried over from the New Deal days had misinformed the people of this country in relation to the activity of the present Congress. I specifically set up in my remarks the accomplishments of Congress.

Mr. President, after I dictated the ideas contained in my Milwaukee speech, I ran across a column by Frank R. Kent, which stated far better than I did how the left-wing elements had acquired the channels of communication. He states, among other things, that there are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before. The material contained in Mr. Kent's column is so revealing that I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—GOP CONGRESS LEADERS CHAGRINED BY MISCALCULATION ON PRESS SUPPORT

(By Frank R. Kent)

The thing that more than any other has surprised as well as chagrined Republican leaders since they took over control of Congress is the extremely bad press that has attended their efforts to formulate a program. They did expect something better, which shows that they made a basic miscalculation as to the general publicity situation.

For example, they had the not unnatural feeling that the voters, long restrained by the war, having in the last election, belatedly turned against the New Deal policies, the press (also the radio) generally would commend and support the Republican effort to go in the other direction—by correcting the lopsided labor situation; by slashing governmental expenses, reducing waste and taxes. They had every right to that expectation. When it turned out to be largely unfounded, it came with something of a shock to complacent Republicans who felt they had a "clear mandate" from the people.

So they had. They were entirely right about that. Their mistake was in totally underestimating the hold which, in 14 years of concentration, the left-wing elements, which constituted and attached themselves to the New Deal, had acquired on the channels of communication. This is one of the phenomena of the period. It is made more interesting, so far as the press is concerned, because it was obtained almost simultaneously with a campaign of denunciation. The New Deal CIO allies, for example, were enabled regu-

larly to get extraordinary newspaper space day after day for their repetitious, verbose and wholly synthetic statements in the very newspapers which they consistently accused of suppressing the news.

TURNED OUT ALL WRONG

Apparently, the Republican idea was that when the New Dealers were repudiated at the polls, automatically their propaganda facilities would disappear and their publicity effectiveness be curtailed. But that notion turned out all wrong. There are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before. The polls were hardly closed before there was a rush toward the press, the magazines, and the radio. Some of them have become publishers, some assistants to the publishers; some are editorial writers; quite a few have become columnists and several are radio commentators. The ease with which they have penetrated into those fields can be accounted for in several ways but it is nonetheless remarkable.

The net of all this is that the left-wing spokesmen today are more articulate than before the election. When they lined up and let go at the Republicans soon after Congress convened it was something of a shock to the latter and they have been under pretty hot attack ever since. This is not to say that the Republicans have not done things for which they should be criticized. It would be amazing if they had not. It is to say that they are nothing like as black as they are being painted and that a good deal of the criticism is the same old left-wing, labor New Deal misrepresentation and propaganda, largely by the same people.

At the moment their fire is concentrated on the Republican effort to reduce appropriations. It is normal, of course, to hear the bureaucrats squeal when their estimates are cut. But the present squealing goes far beyond the ordinary. It appears not only well organized but to have a professional touch. A really violent blast has accompanied the two appropriation bills thus far acted upon by the House—the Treasury and labor security bills. A similar blast is obviously planned for every such bill as it comes up.

BASIS OF CURRENT ATTACK

The current attack is based on stories which insist that because of Republican "meat-ax surgery" various dreadful things are about to happen. We are told that the Secret Service is being undermined so as to flood the country with counterfeiters; that the Wagner Act is being scuttled through reduction in appropriations; that the Republicans are going to return the children to sweatshop conditions by denying the children's department proper funds; that the customs service is being forced to lay off men, thus throwing our ports open to smugglers; that Republican stinginess is going to permit tax evaders to go free.

Investigation proves there is scarcely a trace of truth in any of these stories. Yet they continue to be circulated. Telegrams pour in to Senators protesting the dismissal of Customs employees, but the fact, as brought out by Representative WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, that Customs asked for \$6,500,000 more than it got last year; that it was given \$3,165,000 more and that its appropriation provides for 400 additional employees—those facts get little, if any, attention. Neither is the fact publicized that the 3,000 revenue agents costing \$30,000,000 a year, whose lopping off has been so vehemently denounced, were the not wholly occupied agents that ex-Secretary Henry Morgenthau excitedly added a couple of years ago in the 1944 agitation about tax dodgers.

These are the sort of things that induce Chairman TABER of the House Appropriations Committee to charge that "an insidious cam-

paign of deceit and falsehood is being conducted to the effect that we are scuttling essential public services." Apparently the Republicans, while shocked and sore, are not going to weaken. They take comfort in the obvious fact that their record will be judged after they have made it and not by what is said about it before they have had their chance.

AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE TO ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., AND JESSE P. WOLCOTT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in this week's Colliers' magazine. The article is entitled "For Distinguished Congressional Service." It tells the story behind the Colliers' 1946 awards for distinguished congressional service. On yesterday, at the White House, President Truman presented to the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Jr., a former distinguished and beloved Member of the Senate, and to the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, a Representative in Congress from the Seventh Michigan District, the Colliers' 1946 awards for distinguished congressional service. Each was presented a silver plaque, and \$10,000 cash gifts are to be presented to the public institutions designated by the two recipients of the awards. Senator La Follette designated the University of Wisconsin, and Representative WOLCOTT designated the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the informal remarks made by the President at the White House presentation ceremony.

There being no objection, the remarks and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT IN PRESENTING THE COLLIER'S CONGRESSIONAL AWARDS TO FORMER SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE AND REPRESENTATIVE JESSE P. WOLCOTT, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, APRIL 17, 1947

It is a very great pleasure to me, Mr. Davis, to be able to participate in this worthy enterprise. Nobody knows any more about what Congressmen and Senators go through than I do. I spent 10 of the best years of my life in office for the State of Missouri and I know what these gentlemen have to do and all the difficult times they have to go through with in order to accomplish anything.

I think this is a great thing that Collier's has inaugurated, and I am, as I say, indeed happy to be able to participate in it.

And it gives me particular pleasure to award these trophies to my good personal friend Bob La Follette, and to my good friend, JESSE WOLCOTT. I am not as well acquainted with him as I am with Bob, but that is because we did not serve in the same place. I know him by reputation and I think that Collier's has made a good selection in both cases.

[From Collier's magazine of April 26, 1947]
FOR DISTINGUISHED CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE
(By James C. Derieux)

(Collier's 1946 congressional awards committee: Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, chairman; Howard E. Babcock, chairman, board of trustees, Cornell University; Walter C. Coffey, former president, University of Minnesota;

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author; Douglas S. Freeman, editor, Richmond News Leader; George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion; Clinton S. Golden, former vice president, United Steelworkers of America; Albert Goss, master, National Grange; Alan Gregg, director, Rockefeller Foundation; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, committee on economic development, and president, Studebaker Corp.; Ernest M. Hopkins, president emeritus, Dartmouth; Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, Denver Post; Eric A. Johnston, president, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc.; Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, journalist and social worker; Miss Josephine Roche, president, Rocky Mountain Fuel Co.; John Stuart, chairman, board of directors, Quaker Oats Co.; Col. Jay Taylor, former chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Tex.; Channing H. Tobias, director, Phelps-Stokes Fund; Donald B. Tresidder, president, Stanford University; Walter Wanger, president, Walter Wanger Productions, Inc.; Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor; Owen D. Young, former chairman of the board, General Electric Co.)

WASHINGTON.—The year 1946 was rough on Members of the Congress. No one could be certain just what the American people wanted or needed, but it was plain they wanted some kind of change.

And the year 1946 was not too easy on members of Collier's congressional awards committee, either. At the outset of their studies it was not plain which Senator and Representative had best served our country in that first postwar year, in the course of which propaganda for and against everything reached new highs, and the few persons in Washington who thought calmly and with some degree of balance were suspect by both extremes.

But the committee members, under the chairmanship of Chester C. Davis, stuck to their studies of legislation voting records, speeches, and advisory comments, continued their screening of the 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, and came up with Senator Robert Marion La Follette and Representative JESSE PAINE WOLCOTT as the winners; the first an independent, the second a regular Republican.

La Follette, Wisconsin's famous Young Bob, was defeated in the Republican primary last summer, and retired from the Senate at the end of the year after 21 years of diligent, effective work.

WOLCOTT, of the Seventh Michigan District, won reelection easily for his ninth time, and when the Republicans took over the House, he became chairman of the important Banking and Currency Committee.

At a White House ceremony these men received silver plaques to commemorate their distinguished congressional services in 1946, and in addition Collier's made two \$10,000 gifts to public institutions chosen by the two. Senator La Follette designated the University of Wisconsin to receive one of these donations, and with it set up a graduate scholarship to study the reorganization of government, with the goal of making it more efficient and more responsive to the will of the people.

Representative WOLCOTT designated the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, at East Lansing, to receive the other \$10,000 donation, and specified that the money be used to set up scholarships to assist students who, without such assistance, could not continue their studies.

The purpose of these annual awards by Collier's is to direct thoughtful attention to the fundamental role of the Congress, to point up the fact that representative law-making bodies are the symbol and basic es-

sential for freedom, and to recognize publicly with appropriate honors the good work done by individual representatives.

La Follette is as notable an independent as the Senate has known since his fiery father, Wisconsin's famous Old Bob, struggled and slugged for 20 years for whatever cause seemed to him good for the common man. At times Young Bob has been the hero of the liberals, at other times conservatives have nodded approval as he went into action, and on occasions he has been a middle-of-the-road man. But always he has been free to do his stuff as he thought it should be done. Young Bob, now 52, is married and has two sons. His home is the old La Follette house outside of Madison, Wis. He has a residence in Washington, also.

He came to the Senate as a Republican in 1925, to succeed his father, whom he had served as secretary and campaign manager. The elder La Follette had died soon after making a last grim fight for his progressive principles in the Presidential race of 1924 when he ran as an independent against Calvin Coolidge, the conservative Republican, and John W. Davis, the conservative Democrat. He had deliberately overtaxed what was left of his stormy strength, despite the efforts of his son to take over speaking engagements and other campaign tasks. Young Bob was reelected three times on Republican or Progressive tickets. In 1946, he tried unsuccessfully to move back into the Republican Party and win its nomination.

But his defeat, in the opinion of Collier's congressional awards committee, subtracted nothing from the great service he rendered our country last year, when he became the key figure in efforts to modernize congressional rules and organization. The Congress had suffered in popular respect because it stumbled over its own feet as it attempted to operate in the 1940's with methods and organization developed in the 1890's.

It was the definite opinion of all those consulted by the congressional awards committee that La Follette is entitled to credit for passage of the congressional reorganization plan. "The executive branch of Government had been taking over," said a Washington news writer consulted by the committee, "and the Congress, rattled by criticism and confused by the rush of events, did not seem to realize fully where its legislation was leading. The Congressional Reorganization Act, which La Follette put through, is the first well-directed effort to enable the Congress to recapture and to exercise the powers reposed in it by our Constitution and our political system."

CHIEF FEATURES OF THE PLAN

The reorganization plan is too long to be presented in a few lines, but these are some of its features: It gives congressional committees their own fact finders so that lawmakers will not be dependent, as they have been, on interested testimony and guesswork; it sets up a compact committee structure along lines corresponding with the present activities of government; it increases the responsibility of committees to watch what is happening in Government; it brings the spending and the taxing committees into synchronized relationship; it requires that a congressional ceiling be set on appropriations, in place of the old system of adding up all the appropriations near the end of a session and only then discovering what the total was; it raises the pay of all Congressmen from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year, and sets up a contributory retirement plan; it opens the doors and records of many committee deliberations heretofore held secretly.

Singularly, the Reorganization Act, generally recognized as a great service to the Nation, is directly associated with La Follette's defeat. He and others working with

him last spring and early summer were convinced that the act must be driven through in 1946, if ever. Conditions were nearer right for its passage than they had been, or were again likely to be. But La Follette could not get the bill to the floor for debate until campaign time was at hand in Wisconsin. He knew he was in for a hard primary fight in that campaign. While the war had lasted he had been so busy in Washington he had not been able to spend much time in his home State, and meanwhile, groups opposed to him were assembling their strength.

What should he do? He recalled then, as he had many times before, a principle his father had told him to live by.

"The thing that counts most in life," said Old Bob to Young Bob, "is to go straight ahead to the end of the furrow."

Young Bob decided to go straight ahead to the end of the congressional reorganization furrow. The bill passed the Senate and he hurried home. But he had less than 2 weeks to catch up, and it was not enough.

Thus what may be the greatest service Young Bob La Follette has rendered his country contributed to his first political defeat—and won him a Collier's congressional award.

REGULAR BUT NOT EXTREMIST

JESSE PAINE WOLCOTT, the House winner, has been a regular Republican all of his political days, but not an extremist; not one of those "rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun" Republicans sometimes found in his native New England or his adopted Middle West. In the great OPA battles of 1946, he was shot at by both sides, a situation to which he has been accustomed since his first election to the House in 1930. He just is not an emotional political zealot who believes that all the right is on one side.

He won the admiration of Collier's congressional awards committee by his remarkable sanity in a year of poisonous political fighting. He appeared unaffected by the fiercest of propaganda bombardments, as he pushed efforts to adapt wartime controls to the changing conditions of peace. "If his counsel had prevailed last summer," an able observer told the awards committee, "the transition to a free economy might have been made more gradually and with fewer jolts. He deserves recognition for wisdom and moderation not generally appreciated at the time he was making his OPA fight."

While the war lasted, WOLCOTT supported the economic stabilization program, but when the wage line broke after the war he turned from strict price control toward greater production as the surer way to avoid inflation. Stimulation of production, while letting off controls gradually, was the heart of his domestic line in 1946. In the international field he was a powerful influence in passing the British loan agreement through the House.

Passionate advocates of OPA say he cut its throat. Equally passionate opponents of that agency say he saved it from sudden dismemberment. Some of the former sought to explain his attitude by putting out reports that he was a vastly rich man, therefore unacquainted with the difficulties of little people.

But investigation shows that WOLCOTT worked as a laborer in a chair factory in Gardner, Mass., his birthplace; that later he sent himself through high school by working as a trap drummer in a professional dance and concert orchestra—he says he was the hottest thing on drums in those days; that he almost owned one share of telephone stock when as a young man he worked by day for the Bell Telephone System and by night for the Detroit Edison Co., but that he had to cash his equity in the share before he got it paid for and since then has bought no other stock; that he is paying for a house he bought almost entirely on credit near Washington

at the rate of \$66.93 a month; that his home in Port Huron, Mich., is assessed at \$5,500; that he carries a \$10,000 life-insurance policy, and on the day he learned he was a Collier's awards winner he had \$612.13 in one bank account and \$365.03 in another.

Wolcott moved from Massachusetts to Michigan when he was 19 because he thought he might do better out there. He studied law when he could, was admitted to the bar. When the First World War came he served as a sergeant and finally as a second lieutenant in a machine-gun company of the famous First Division. He saw action in the Argonne. After the war he was an assistant police judge in Port Huron, later county prosecuting attorney, and in 1930 was elected to the House, where he has been ever since. He is 54 years old, is married, has a 17-year-old son.

In recent years he has abandoned his drums, except for one appearance in the Russian Cultural Institute of Moscow. He had gone there with a congressional group in 1945, and one evening when the Russians were entertaining the visitors at the institute, Wolcott said to a companion that he'd like a try at the Russian drums in the orchestra. An interpreter heard the remark, reported it, and immediately Wolcott was escorted to the drums, where to the amazement of his colleagues he cut loose with confidence.

When the awards committee settled to the task of bestowing the honors for 1946, its first decision was that the previous year's winners, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, were not eligible for consideration. It was the unanimous opinion that no Member of the Congress should win 2 years in a row unless under the most extraordinary conditions he had changed his activities from the field in which he had won the honor to another field in which also he excelled his colleagues.

Next, the awards committee decided that generally choices should be made from the rank and file of Senate and House memberships, rather than from among party leaders whose influence springs in considerable degree from the high party posts they hold. But this decision was not unanimous, and always the Members are free to do as they think best. This same spirit of freedom carries over into the committee's voting, which pays no attention to party or ideological lines.

At the request of the awards committee each of 52 respected Washington editors, news writers, columnists and commentators suggested three Senators and three Representatives whose work in 1946 seemed to him to be notable. These confidential advisers named 20 Senators and 43 Representatives.

A LARGE LIST TO SELECT FROM

Following this poll, several hundred editors and political scientists, some in every State, were asked by the awards committee for confidential suggestions and comments. Again, each participant was asked to name three Senators and three Representatives. More than 500 replies were received, with the end result that 56 Senators and 119 Representatives were presented for consideration.

Finally the awards committee began its own voting, with 9 Senators and 14 Representatives receiving support as first or second choices on the first ballot. Twenty-one members of the committee participated in the voting. One was ill, and one out of touch. The Senators receiving support were: Aiken and Austin of Vermont, Barkley of Kentucky, Byrd of Virginia, Connally of Texas, La Follette of Wisconsin, McMahon of Connecticut, Murray of Montana, and Taft of Ohio; 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The

House Members receiving votes were: Case of South Dakota, Cresser of Ohio, Dirksen of Illinois, Douglas of California, Halleck of Indiana, Hope of Kansas, Kefauver of Tennessee, Martin of Massachusetts, Rayburn of Texas, Howard Smith of Virginia, Sparkman of Alabama (now a Senator), Voorhis of California (he was defeated for reelection), Wadsworth of New York, and Wolcott of Michigan. Of these, Case, Dirksen, Halleck, Hope, Martin, Wadsworth and Wolcott are Republicans, the other 7 are Democrats.

On this first poll, La Follette and Wolcott were out front but did not have majorities. On the second, both had majorities of first choice votes, and on the third and final poll of the committee, both won with heavy majorities. The polls were taken several days apart to allow time for study between them.

And that's the story of Collier's congressional awards for 1946, the second year of this adventure in the interest of representative government.

JEFFERSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day dinner address delivered by Senator CONNALLY before the Democratic Club of New York City, N. Y., on April 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE KIWANIS CLUB OF KENOSHA, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Service Spirit in the Atomic Age, delivered by him before the Kiwanis Club of Kenosha, Wis., on April 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him to the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding the appropriation for the Labor Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM H. KING

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. T. Odon Mathews, president of the Utah State Society, enclosing a resolution adopted by the society as a tribute to Hon. William H. King on the occasion of his return to Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH MITCHELL

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jefferson Day address by Hon. Hugh Mitchell, at Wenatchee, Wash., April 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LABOR POLICY NEEDED—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRENTON EVENING TIMES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Labor Policy Needed," written by James Kerney, Jr., editor and publisher of the Trenton Times newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement entered into last night, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	Overton
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Ives	Reed
Bridges	Jenner	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Capehart	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworschak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Eaton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Connor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, during the closing days of this debate, which has now consumed some time of the Senate, I desire to address myself to the pending bill.

In our work here in the Congress, as representatives of the several States of our Union and all the citizens who dwell in them, we confront many problems and make many decisions which affect our Nation's course for future years, and we shape in a large measure the destiny of the American people.

Today, I say to the Senate in earnest judgment that no decision we have made during the time I have been a Member of this body will so deeply affect our people now and in the days and years ahead, as the decision we make upon the pending bill.

It is not merely a gift of money to Greece and Turkey that gives us greatest concern, however little we can afford such gifts at this time. It is the embarkation upon a policy of Government that will lead us to new obligations, new problems, and to possible distress—yes, even to endangering our existence as a nation of free people—that is the overall danger in this measure.

If we pass this bill, we will have taken upon ourselves the duty to sustain every government that calls for our help to sustain it.

I cannot, under the sense of my obligation to my own country and my own people, support such a course. I consider it to be the most mistaken and most tragic policy that men in this Government have ever devised.

This world-wide spending and military plan was first stated to the Congress on March 12, 1947, by the President. The bill before us comes from the State Department. There is its place of origin.

We are told that the real object of this bill is to stop the spread of communism from Russia to Greece and Turkey. That is a smart appeal. That appeal at once grasps the interest of our people. The insidious work of communistic thought and action in our own midst has created here an aversion to communism and a determination that it must be eradicated from our land.

No one in this country can have any doubt as to my stand upon communism. I have opposed it everywhere. I have never compromised with communism in America; I never shall. There is no higher duty upon Congress than to take every measure to drive it completely from our shores. I have time and time again spoken out upon this subject. Only recently I spoke here in Washington before a large meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon the subject of communism. I meant what I said then, and I mean now what I said at that meeting. I quote from the statement I made at that time:

The call now comes to you as veterans of your country to work in unified effort to eradicate from our own land those philosophies that are destructive of our established way of government and of living, and to stop the work of those, whose objective is to destroy this country.

Subversive activities have generally been referred to as communism, fascism, and nazism. Basically, the danger in them all is the same. The final objective of each is to seize the Government for group rule and to control all men and women in their lives and activities for the primary benefit of the

group in power. That of course means destruction of freedom for the public.

That communism is extant in this land of ours cannot be doubted by those who have had contact with any phase of public life. Not only is the objective of communism bad but the means of operation are subversive, hidden, and underhand.

I may say, Mr. President, that a few months ago the Communist Party in my State published a tract in which they attacked me as being their enemy. Communists seldom tell what is true in the presentation of their cause before the public, but I want to say that in that instance, when they branded me as their enemy, the enemy of communism, they were truthful indeed.

So when I take my stand upon this measure, it is not for a moment to palliate communism, but it is to act in the light of what I believe to be best for my country upon a proposed policy which can, and I believe will, injure her; which will in the end weaken her and involve her in strife and make her less strong to resist those very forces of wrong which it is said we resist.

The bill, as I stated, comes from the State Department; and when I hear the spokesmen for that Department and of the administration declaim against communism and Russia I am not much impressed with their statements, in view of the facts, and in view of their record on the subject in recent days and even at this time.

The confusion and inconsistency in the State Department, which initiated the bill, have been revealed in the course of this debate.

On Wednesday of this week it was clearly stated on the floor of the Senate, and stands uncontradicted, that during the present session of Congress representatives of the State Department appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate urging and insisting that this Government give to Russia under lend-lease—supposedly long ago terminated—equipment and supplies for the erection of a high-octane gasoline plant at a cost of \$25,000,000. We are being asked to give to Russia the factory and means to make gasoline for her airplanes and thus strengthen her hand to expand her communism. Now the State Department asks that we give to two other nations millions of dollars and send military personnel for the avowed purpose of stopping that expansion.

How can such contradictory courses be reconciled or understood? What is the meaning of this confusion? What in truth is the real purpose of this measure? It seems to me we should establish a settled policy as to Russia and with regard to her actions, before we appropriate one cent more for such purposes.

Moreover, it has been brought to light here this week that since the fall of Japan we have given Russia, under lend-lease, equipment and supplies in excess of \$233,000,000 to strengthen her, in addition to more than \$11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies given her during the time of war. Today there may be added to those sums millions of

dollars which are being poured out through UNRRA, of which money we contribute more than 70 percent. That is being done today, right now.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the proposed plan of advancements to Russia. It is contained in the RECORD of the Senate, and I use the words of the able Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) who said:

Eighty percent of our shipments, even today, are going to Russia and to Russian-controlled countries. The shipments are being loaded in New York now. That was verified yesterday—

Meaning Tuesday of this week—

by UNRRA.

To Austria, which is Russian controlled, we are shipping \$4,083,810 during the current month of April. To Bylorussia, which is merely a Russian Province, there has been allocated \$607,000; to Czechoslovakia, \$5,281,550. Poland—

Which we know is absolutely under the domination of Russia and votes with Russia in the United Nations—

Poland is scheduled to get \$14,437,800—

During this month of April—

The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic is getting \$1,880,500. Yugoslavia—

Which is under the rule of Tito, one of the leaders of communism— is given \$21,027,600.

Those shipments are being made in this month of April, and, Mr. President, the State Department now comes before the Congress and says that it wants to stop communism.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For a question I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Just for a question, and a short remark. I shall not take very long.

The Senator realizes, and that is the reason he is bringing this point out, I take it, that when we turn over millions of dollars' worth of products to countries which are dominated by Russia we are putting into the hands of the Communists the power to make more and more people admit that they believe in their communistic philosophy. In other words, that is the only way that those poor people can receive any help. Does the Senator agree with me on that point?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; but there is more than that to it. It shows a confusion in our own Government that is not explainable. It shows that with one hand we are handing out millions of dollars for the support of Russia and Russian theories, while we are asked by this bill to send millions of dollars and military personnel to stop the expansion of Russian communism.

Mr. HAWKES. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make one further statement concerning an actual situation which I know about. I have received letters from three of my personal friends who are in the countries the Senator is talking about, countries which are receiving this help, and which are dominated by Russian policy. Each letter states very definitely that the coun-

tries in question can get no help from their Russian-dominated government because they have not signed the communistic pledge.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course that is so; and the very help we are giving is to strengthen communism, while we are told that the purpose of the bill is to stop communism.

Mr. HAWKES. On the one hand, we are breeding communism, and, on the other hand we are talking about spending hundreds of millions of dollars to stop it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I heartily agree with the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Can the Senator tell us under what authority payments are made to the various countries?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The sums advanced, which I last mentioned, are under authority of UNRRA, which is supposed to expire on June 30 of this year. However, I will say to the Senator that more than UNRRA is involved in attempting to supply these materials. As I stated, the State Department has come before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate at this session of the Congress and has asked that committee to recommend to the Senate an appropriation to permit the sending to Russia of a high-octane gasoline plant, at a value of \$25,000,000, designed to make high-octane gasoline for the planes of Russia. How can we reconcile the action taken by the State Department, on one day insisting before the committee on sending these materials to Russia, and on the next day bringing forth this bill to stop the expansion of Russia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I heard the testimony on the point now being discussed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I ask him if he knows that the \$35,000,000 for which the State Department originally asked was for administrative costs only? The State Department wanted such an authorization because under the interpretation of the Comptroller General the authority under lend-lease had terminated. The Department wanted \$35,000,000 for administrative costs so that it could continue to finance the delivery, under long-term contracts, of equipment which was then in the pipe line and would still be in the pipe line long after lend-lease had terminated.

These materials are not paid for in cash. They are to be paid for under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years. The contracts cover equipment which can be used for military purposes. Such equipment is now in the pipe line, under contract. The State Department stated that with

the termination of lend-lease the equipment would be lost; that we could not sell it, and that we might as well send it to Russia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand the able Senator to say that \$35,000,000 would not be the total amount of money which would go to Russia?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The total amount runs into many million dollars. The equipment is not paid for in cash. The \$35,000,000 was to defray administrative costs, to pay for financing the program to which we were committed with respect to Russia. The program involves millions of dollars worth of lend-lease materials now in the pipe line, and which will be delivered long after the termination of lend-lease, under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much indebted to the able Senator from Nebraska, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, for injecting into this discussion an elaboration of the point which I have presented. He shows more clearly than I have shown that the State Department is insisting on furnishing to Russia materials which could be used in waging war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make one further observation. At least some of the equipment which is being furnished would be very useful in military operations. I refer to such equipment as trucks and other heavy equipment which would be very useful if it should become necessary for Russia to go to war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator from Nebraska is in error. My understanding was that in connection with the amount of \$35,000,000, Australia and other countries were paying 100 percent of the cost, and that there was an administrative cost of 2½ percent. Russia was to pay only 90 percent. The \$35,000,000 was not for administrative cost. There was an additional 2½ percent for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the \$35,000,000 was a cash advance, which included the administrative costs, but did not include the entire amount of money to be realized from the sale of surplus property. My understanding was that the State Department said that the \$35,000,000, which was a token payment, or perhaps administrative cost, would be lost if lend-lease were cut off, and the Department asked that it be reimbursed. If lend-lease were to be continued, the materials would be supplied under long-term contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. YOUNG. There were long-term contracts; but in the case of Russia she was to pay 90 percent of the cost. The

other countries were to pay 100 percent of the cost, plus 2½ percent administrative cost.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whatever the amount may be, the point still remains clear that the State Department is asking for the advance of funds for the shipment to Russia of materials to arm Russia. I think that point is particularly important when we are asked to appropriate money to stop the expansion of Russia. Under such circumstances there is only one course to take. Let us not appropriate one cent more for such a program. Let us not give away a pro-American dollar until a settled policy on this subject has been definitely established. We want no more policies like the one which we followed with respect to Japan, under which we shipped scrap iron to Japan and armed her and thus enabled her later to shoot down our own men. At that time we were in the very shadow of war.

Let us straighten out the whole situation before we move further. It seems to me that there is not much force in the appeal of the State Department, which is the source of this bill, when it says on one day, with one voice, "We want to send equipment to Russia to build plants for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline," and on another day, with another voice, says, "Give us money to stop the expansion of Russian communism."

In the course of this extended debate Senators have given their reasons for their positions. It is well that they have done so, because from those reasons we may judge, each from his own viewpoint, the soundness of the positions taken.

A principal reason advanced for this measure by some—and it has been argued strenuously upon the floor of the Senate—is that the plan must be carried through because the President has announced a policy, and that great injury would come to the country if that policy were not carried out to the letter.

We have the right and the duty to inquire into the reasons advanced for arriving at a decision. Search as I may, I cannot find any sound reason for such a position. The President came before the Congress, not with a declared policy, but with a proposal that a policy be established. He came to the Congress because under our law it is necessary that the people, through their representatives, concur in the making of any policy of government.

If the reasoning advanced by those who support this measure is to be sustained, then henceforth those who agree to that course must say that the policies of this Nation are fixed in completeness by the Chief Executive, and once announced by him, they represent a fait accompli, and nothing more can be done about it.

Under such a view the Congress need not exist. The power of national policy would be vested solely in the President. Such autocratic power was never intended to be given in this Government. Indeed, for what purpose does the Congress exist if it be not to declare the

policies of the Nation, both in the domestic and the foreign fields? We do so by the laws we enact, by the treaties we approve, and by our action upon bills such as the one before us.

To follow a course that the Chief Executive can by his ipsi dixit declare a policy and that the Congress must blindly follow it would lead to the most complete one-man domination of the Nation. It could lead us to war; and the declaration of war, expressly vested in the Congress, would be but an empty perfunctory act. It could deplete our treasury and the people could not raise their voice in protest through their representatives, or, if raising their voice, their protest would be futile.

The very fact that the President submitted this proposal to Congress is a proper recognition on his part that the plan does not become policy, in reality, until the Congress puts its approval upon it.

Congress is not a rubber-stamp; Congress must act within its own wisdom and judgment.

I want to support the President in his acts in behalf of our people. I served with the gentleman who today occupies the Presidential office. I have for him, as he knows, the highest personal regard. I shall support him so long as I believe his course is right, and I shall part company with him when, in my earnest and sincere judgment, I believe him to be wrong.

That is the course which must be taken in this case. That, in substance, is the whole heart and life of our Government. That is why we are here as the representatives of the people. We have an obligation to fulfill our part in the affairs of the Government and not to act as echoes to Executive order.

No, Mr. President, there is not any soundness in the reasoning or excuse for support of this measure to be found in the words that "though it be wrong we must approve the plan because the President has stated it or has announced it to the world."

Any such action now creates a precedent whereby the Chief Executive may, if he desires, announce his policies and then say to the representatives of the people, "This is done; this is accomplished; your judgment is not needed upon it."

I do not and will not recognize any such philosophy or concept of government in this free country.

What will be the position of Senators hereafter when the President proposes that \$600,000,000 be given Korea? Will we still say the President has announced his views and the Senate must support it? We have had ample warning that \$600,000,000 will be asked for Korea. What will we do when other gifts to other countries are called for? Will we blindly approve them at any cost to our country?

If we adopt such reasoning at the first consideration of this world-wide plan of giving this Nation's wealth to others we shall have set for ourselves a basis that deprives us of independent judgment upon like cases for the future.

This is not spoken in criticism of any of my colleagues; it is an appeal to them to consider the implications of what they are about to do.

Is not now, indeed, the time to abandon any reasoning which would cause us to surrender our judgment? I urge upon the Senate that this proposal be considered solely upon its merits and that we vote solely upon the wisdom of following the course outlined in the proposal.

Mr. President, we are confronted with the proposal of a gift of \$400,000,000 to the Governments of Greece and Turkey and provision for the sending to those countries of American military personnel.

Let me point out in the beginning that this is not limited to a loan, but may be, and probably will be, an advancement of money which, in plain terms, is a donation. The bill provides that the President of the United States may loan or grant or otherwise give financial aid. This leaves the discretion in the President and, as I understand, already the Chief Executive has indicated his preference for a gift.

This proposal has two phases which may better be considered separately because each has different purports and effects. The first phase has to do with the gift of this immense sum; second is that which contemplates the sending of military personnel. The limitation upon such personnel is placed solely within the discretion of the President. While the bill refers to a limited number of the military, the judgment upon the limitation is given to the Chief Executive and, of course, the term "limited" can be construed in the light of any situation as it may develop.

The Congress and the people of the United States first heard of this proposal from the President in his message to a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947. It came like the sudden burst of a bomb. We had no notice of it. The purport of it was shocking. It is readily admitted that herein lies the establishment of a new policy for us. In essence it means the extension of the Monroe Doctrine by this Nation from the Western Hemisphere to all the world.

President James Monroe, many years ago, announced the doctrine that this Nation would look with disfavor upon the act of any European government attempting to interfere with any governments in the Western Hemisphere.

Several incidents have arisen under that policy in the Western Hemisphere, the most outstanding being the one involving the British Government.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the fact that the so-called Monroe Doctrine is a two-way highway. It applies not only to South America, but to Europe as well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It applies to Europe in the sense that it says, "Keep out and do not disturb the status of any established and recognized government in

the Western Hemisphere." That is the essence of it.

The British incident to which I referred—and I think it is well to discuss and review these incidents to show how far the Monroe Doctrine will carry this government in action—was that the British Government threatened to seize the customs offices of Venezuela and this country opposed that step. President Theodore Roosevelt went so far as to say, after Lord Cecil, the British Foreign Secretary, had stated that the British Fleet would come and take control of the customs houses of Venezuela to collect a debt owed her, that the British Fleet would be met by the American Fleet at the mouth of the Caribbean Sea.

On another occasion the German Government threatened, as I recall, to seize some of the customs houses in one of the Central American countries, and again this country, under its Monroe Doctrine, advised Germany that the United States would enforce its policy against such interference in this hemisphere. Those are merely examples which show the nature and extent of action under the Monroe Doctrine and what it obligates this Nation to do. It obligates us to go to the extent of war. But so far the doctrine has been applied only to the neighboring countries. It has been recognized by Europe and the rest of the world as being a very fair doctrine. They have observed it, and they have known that it meant a great deal to this country. The Western Hemisphere was remote from them, and they did not desire to invade it.

Able men upon the floor of the Senate have disputed the statement that the pending measure is an extension, in effect, of the Monroe Doctrine. Let us first compare the language; let us see whether the pending bill is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine and obligates the United States to go to the aid of other established governments throughout the world. As I view it, that, in sum and substance, is the proposition. Let us see if that is not a correct view. I shall read the language of the Monroe Doctrine, which was enunciated by President Monroe in 1823:

But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it—

He was speaking of the governments of the Western Hemisphere—

and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a very brief statement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue for a moment until I finish my discussion of this particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am trying to bring out, Mr. President, the likeness be-

tween the original Monroe Doctrine, now more than 100 years old, applying to the Western Hemisphere, and the new doctrine now proclaimed which, in effect, extends the same principle to the rest of the world. As I have said, after reading the language and considering the actions taken under the Monroe Doctrine and then reading the President's statement with respect to the pending measure, it is inescapable, to my mind, that the presently proposed world-wide doctrine is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the rest of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from West Virginia is making such an important statement, and since I am sure he wishes to have it carried in the press and fairly reported there, let me say to him that what I wish to say will have an important bearing on what he is saying.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall yield in a moment. I hope this side of the question will be carried by the press, because I have never seen any public question of such importance so greatly ignored and given so little consideration by the press.

Mr. PEPPER. It is on that subject that I wish to speak.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a few moments I shall, indeed, be glad to yield to the Senator on that point.

Mr. President, I have read from the Monroe Doctrine with respect to any European power's interposing itself upon the government of any country in the Western Hemisphere, and I have read the portion of the Monroe Doctrine which states that such an act will be regarded as an unfriendly one toward the United States.

Now turning to the President's message before the Congress on March 12, 1947, when he presented this policy for the first time for our consideration and action, we find that he said this:

We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.

Mr. President, the word "we" used by the President in that statement refers to the people of the United States; and "free peoples" means people anywhere in the world. "Totalitarian regimes" are such as we ourselves call totalitarian. No one doubts that Russia is totalitarian, and there are many others, so I am told. For instance, I am informed that Yugoslavia has a totalitarian government. But the President's statement means that he proposes that we undertake to secure all people against having other governments interpose themselves upon them.

I read further from the President's address to the Congress:

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

I quote further from the President's message:

The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note at this point that in his message Presi-

dent Truman said that "the free peoples of the world look to us"—the United States—"for support in maintaining their freedoms"—in other words, that the whole world looks to us for that. The President did not say—and the point is accentuated by the absence of any statement on this point—that the free peoples of the world look to the United Nations for support in securing their freedom. All of us want to believe in that organization, and we have had hope in it. But in his message the President of the United States, the country which was most active in bringing the United Nations into being, says that the free peoples of the world look to this country alone for support in preserving their freedoms—in other words, not to the United Nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

As I have said, Mr. President, the President of the United States in his message said that the free peoples of the world look to the United States for support in preserving their freedoms—not to the United Nations, but to this country alone. I say that is an extension to all the world of the very principle of the Monroe Doctrine.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me say that by no stretch of the imagination could we call either Greece or Turkey a free people; could we?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have some doubt about their being free peoples. I have heard them called democracies. In the President's message to the joint session of Congress I heard Greece referred to as a democracy.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Greece is a monarchy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; we know Greece is a monarchy, ruled over by a King. Greece cannot be called a democracy.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Turkey is ruled by a dictator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to make a clarification of the RECORD relative to the observation I made a few moments ago to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My remarks can be placed either at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia or at the conclusion of my own remarks.

I wish to refer to the request for an appropriation of \$35,000,000 which came up before the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is a fact, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota mentioned, that that appropriation came before us for the reason that the Comptroller refused to approve any more administrative costs after December 31, 1946, because lend-lease terminated at that time. What Mr. Lane asked for as Administrator of Lend-Lease was congressional authority to grant the Comptroller the right to pay the necessary

administrative costs. I find that I am in error as to the amount. Instead of being \$35,000,000, it was reduced to \$25,000,000, and the amount for costs was \$2,500,000, or 10 percent of the amount of the appropriation or the amount of the funds necessary to purchase the lend-lease equipment which was in the pipe line, so to speak.

I wish to stress that it is not the amount involved that is of such great importance, but it is the fact that in the pipe line there were nearly \$35,000,000 worth of property at that time—which included such equipment as that which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been mentioning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD five pages of Mr. Lane's letter, which gives a breakdown of that equipment.

There being no objection, the portion of the letter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF ITEMS SALABLE AND NOT SALABLE IN UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, OFFICE,
FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1947.
The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In the course of the hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 7, 1947, Senator TYDINGS asked whether the State Department could review the material in the lend-lease pipe lines and divide it into two categories, those which could find a ready market in the United States and those which might not find a ready market. In response to this inquiry I have prepared the attached memorandum entitled "Marketability in the United States of Undelivered Lend-Lease Pipe-Line Material." I trust that this will provide the desired information.

In connection with this memorandum, it will be noted that the total amount of material in the pipe lines now is estimated at \$25,479,591, as contrasted with the estimate of approximately \$35,000,000 previously given to the committee. The discrepancy is explained by the fact that we have now learned that more material had been transferred to the foreign governments before December 31, 1946, than had been reported when our original estimate was made.

The clerk of the committee has called my attention to certain additional information requested in the course of the hearing on February 6, 1947. In response to this inquiry I am also enclosing herewith a copy of the statement, as of December 31, 1946, showing the general contents of the pipe lines for the various countries (see p. 8) and a copy of the twenty-first report to Congress on lend-lease operations, which contains, on page 48, the text of the pipe-line agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dated October 15, 1945 (see p. 38). The statement of the contents of the pipe lines is the same as was attached to my letter to you dated January 17, 1947.

Sincerely yours,
CHESTER T. LANE,
Lend-Lease Administrator.

[Enclosures.]

[Prepared by Lend-Lease Administrator, Department of State, from data supplied by Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department.]

MARKETABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES OF UNDELIVERED LEND-LEASE PIPE-LINE MATERIAL

The remaining items in the lend-lease pipe lines are divided into two main categories, namely, the material now in storage and the material not yet delivered by suppliers.

1. Material in storage (as of Feb. 1, 1947)

Country	Net tons	Value
Russian		
Oil-refinery equipment.....	19,919	\$6,971,650
Miscellaneous (as per inventory).....	1,677	838,500
British (as per inventory).....	14	7,000
French North Africa (as per inventory).....	58	29,000
Continental France (as per inventory).....	28	14,000
West Africa (as per inventory).....	16	8,000
Total.....	21,712	7,868,150

The material held in storage for the British, French North Africa, continental France, and West Africa consists of miscellaneous industrial equipment and parts for such equipment. Much of the equipment itself, as well as the parts, has been built to foreign specifications and would not realize any substantial return in a surplus sale. The material in storage for these countries, in any event, constitutes a very small proportion of the pipe-line material, aggregating only \$58,000 in all. A complete list of this material is labeled "schedule A" and has been filed with the committee.

The miscellaneous material held for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contains a very high proportion of material made to foreign specifications and is of no value, other than scrap, in the United States. A list of this material, showing the general categories, is contained in schedule B, which has been filed with the committee. The oil-refinery equipment held for the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics consists of miscellaneous component parts of oil refineries. Large portions of the refineries have already been delivered in Russia. The equipment still in storage consists of parts of machines, other parts of which have already been shipped. As a result, it is unlikely that the unshipped material has any value, other than scrap, unless it is combined with the delivered portions. Furthermore, the oil-refinery processes for which this equipment was built are of obsolete types from the point of view of the United States industry. Accordingly, it would be of little interest to United States purchasers for its original purpose.

The conclusion of those officials of the Bureau of Federal Supply (formerly the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department) who have been concerned with the procurement and shipment of the pipe-line material, is that the items now in storage would bring a very small return if they have to be disposed of as surplus.

2. Material on order as of February 1, 1947, but not delivered by suppliers

The grand total of items in this category is estimated at \$17,611,441.

Five million one hundred and forty-eight thousand five hundred and sixty-three dollars' worth of this material is covered by contracts on which no definite delivery dates have been scheduled. Most of this material consists of items fairly short in supply, and cancellation of the contracts with the suppliers would probably not result in loss to the United States Government.

Material valued at \$9,181,566 in the undelivered category is deemed by the Bureau of

Federal Supply to be "unsalable except as scrap." This means that any of such material already completed, although undelivered by the suppliers, could not be sold as surplus with any expectation of a substantial return. Furthermore, it is to be expected that the United States Government would be required to pay heavy cancellation charges in case of cancellation of such contracts.

Three million two hundred and eighty-one thousand three hundred and twelve dollars' worth of the undelivered material is considered "usable in domestic market," which means that, if sold as surplus, approximately 75 percent of the full value could be expected to be realized.

There is attached hereto, as schedule C, a list of the undelivered material, broken down in the three categories described above:

3. Summary

	Unsalable except as scrap	Usable in domestic market	Cancelable without loss
Material not delivered.....	\$9,181,566	\$3,281,312	\$5,148,563
Material in storage.....	7,868,150		
Total.....	17,049,716		

SCHEDULE C.—Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items as of Jan. 15, 1947

Considered usable in domestic market.....	\$3,281,312
Unsalable except as scrap.....	9,181,566
Not scheduled, indefinite.....	5,148,563

Estimated grand total..... 17,611,441

Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items, Jan. 15, 1947

Program	Number active contracts	Commodity classification, undelivered	Estimated value			Total
			Disposal, domestic sale	Unsalable, except scrap	Not scheduled, indefinite	
Continental France.....	17	Spares, trucks.....	\$84,917		\$196,205	
	3	Electric sheets.....			306,510	
	7	Steel bars.....	27,000		298,332	
	1	Cranes and spares.....	1,579,272	\$97,781		
	1	Locomotives and spares.....			29,700	
	1	Estrone.....			10,685	
	1	Magnesium wire.....			1,377	
	1	Copper wire.....				
	1	Hand saws.....	98,554	266,279	26,262	
	11	Machine tools.....			26,880	
	1	Air hose.....			72,450	
	3	Telegraph poles.....	50,000		72,450	
	7	Tractor and agricultural spares.....	379,077		7,500	
	3	Tractors, plows and spares.....	316,918			
	5	Industrial machines.....	7,076		182,042	
	1	Motors and parts.....		3,371		
	3	Air compressor parts.....	16,934			
	3	Tires, tubes, and flaps.....	5,969		8,216	
	2	Structural steel.....			1,285,000	
Total.....	72		2,565,717	307,431	2,451,159	
French North Africa.....	10	Tractor spare parts.....	\$28,069		\$6,982	
	18	Agricultural equipment and parts.....	23,111		51,870	
	1	Lumber.....			5,955	
	1	Sheet steel.....	16,000			
	1	Pillow blocks.....		\$5,526		
	1	Circular saws.....	11,408			
	1	Pumps and parts.....		404		
	1	Fruit pulper and parts.....		500		
	1	Rubber hose.....			13,402	
	1	Engine spare parts.....	15,035			
	2	Electric wiring devices.....		8,025	1,100	
	2	Refrigerator parts.....		14,517		
	18	Auto spares.....	20,429		18,540	
	4	Electrical equipment.....		3,764		
	1	Garage equipment.....	660			
	1	Electric station and spares.....		1,500		
	1	Electric material and substation.....		26,483		
	1	Auto equipment.....	4,670			
	1	Mine locomotive.....		9,800		
	1	Gaskets.....		760		
	1	Sulfur dioxide.....			28,860	
	11	Bearings.....	60	7,413	200	
	3	Electrical switches.....	389		5,469	
	1	Chain.....	4,166		3,656	
	1	Dyes.....			2,565	
	5	Tools.....		7,500	15,431	
	1	Brush cutters.....	2,822			
Total.....	91		126,819	86,192	154,030	\$867,041

Recapitulation of undelivered lend-lease items, Jan. 15, 1947—Continued

Program	Number active contracts	Commodity classification, undelivered	Estimated value			Total
			Disposal, domestic sale	Unsalable, except scrap	Not scheduled, indefinite	
China	2	Bearings	\$682	\$1,031		
	1	Petroleum products equipment	32			
	1	Electrical materials	14,407			
	1	Magnet wire			\$6,726	
	1	Microphones	5,400			
	1	Laboratory equipment	1,112			
	2	Steam power plant		22,963	48,300	
	9	Spares-truck	7,724			
	1	Switch gears		938		
	1	Petrol equipment		1,043		
	5	Electrical equipment	15,082			
	1	Wire cloth	1,360			
	13	Tires and tubes			1,150,821	
	2	Electrical equipment	9,847	1,676		
	1	Laboratory equipment	1,818			
	3	Testing machine	23,811	9,825		
	1	Engines		224		
	1	Watt-4 motors			110,588	
	1	Turbine generator		8,810		
Total	48		65,993	61,592	1,316,435	
Netherlands	1	Tires and tubes	42,502			
Total	1		42,502			
Russia	12	Spares for cranes	4,094		74,229	
	2	Telephone equipment	24,697			
	3	Laboratory equipment	16,174			
	5	Machine tools	30,283	144,249		
	1	Electrical instruments			288	
	1	3 roll machine			1,090	
	1	Sieves	5,800			
	1	Electric motors		344		
	1	Pipe fittings		13,842		
	1	Bearings		1,056		
	1	Copper cable		8,249		
	2	Locomotives		25,641		
	11	Power equipment and spares		1,272,417	5,545	
	22	Electrical equipment		945,137		
	7	Mine hoists and controls		3,057,988		
	1	Diesel spares	29,464			
	3	Pumps and spares	6,194	14,400		
	7	Electric motors and controls		349,855		
	1	Service condenser		40,000		
	2	Boilers and spares		6,347		
	1	Locomotive storage batteries		1,776,632		
	13	Industrial equipment	3,199	299,531	31,738	
	1	Tools	33,351			
	2	Mining equipment		674,081		
Total	102		153,256	8,619,769	112,890	
Peru	2	Auto spares	491			\$491
Saudi Arabia	1	Pumps and spares		515		
	6	Auto spares	2,031			
	2	Electric wiring and accessories		226	2,000	
	1	Truck and spares			47,401	
Total	10		2,031	741	49,401	\$2,173
West Africa	5	Locomotive parts		78,114		
	1	Motor pump		220		
	1	Rubber sheet			150	
	2	Welders		10,934		
	1	Bronze bars			1,024	
	4	Auto spares	3,900		658	
Total	14		3,900	89,268	1,832	\$5,000
Brazil	1	Auto spares	2,560			
	1	Battery charger	372			
	1	Industrial machinery	10,575			
Total	3		13,507			\$13,507
British	1	Medical X-ray		9,072		
	15	Tractor, agricultural and industrial spares	5,755	979	8,386	
Total	16		5,755	10,051	8,386	\$24,192
Belgium	1	Agricultural spares	25			
	2	Paper			7,551	
	2	Tires and tubes			19,358	
	1	Trucks and spares			230,444	
	5	Truck spare	31,283		46,485	
	1	Bicycle chains			17,791	
Total	15		31,308		321,829	\$352,937
Austria	1	Crosscut saws			62,617	
	1	Cardiograph		6,502		
	2	Truck spares	8,398			
	1	Laboratory equipment			230	
	7	Tractor, agricultural spares	37,770		16,236	
	7	Tractor and parts	19,445		653,518	
	2	Balers and spares	204,420			
Total	21		270,036	6,502	732,601	\$1,009,159

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the first item we find for Russia is oil-refinery equipment in the amount of \$6,971,000—new equipment going through the pipe line to Russia. The letter breaks down the equipment into different categories. There are automobile tires, tractors, and a variety of items which I think would be of interest to the Senate.

I wish to say further that the amount of money involved exceeds \$25,000,000 or \$35,000,000, because at that time there also was brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee the matter of the disposal of goods and supplies in continental Europe by other Government agencies, such as the War Assets Administration, the State Department, and also the Army, which continued to sell and is now selling to Russia millions of dollars' worth of property on long-term security. Some of it is just as vital in a military way as the oil-refinery equipment to which the distinguished Senator has referred.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving me the opportunity to continue my remarks to this extent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks, because they clarify the point which has been made; namely, that while we are, by the measure now before the Senate, asked to take steps to stop the expansion of communism from Russia, yet at the same time we find the departments of our Government, even the same department which has brought forth the pending bill, urging the Congress to permit the sending of military supplies, even a high-octane gasoline plant, into Russia. It is inconceivable that such a thing should be done, and it is unreasonable. Certainly we should not proceed until a definite policy is established.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Yesterday in Washington Mr. Arthur H. Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, addressed the Society of Newspaper Editors. The article in the New York Times reporting Mr. Sulzberger's address contains, among other things, the following, on page 19:

Responsibility to print unbiased, objective news is a part of the price which the public expects of the press in return for its basic guaranty of freedom, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, declared today in an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Later in the same article the following appears:

The public, Mr. Sulzberger said in his speech, had the right to demand a fair presentation of the news.

"It has a right to protection from unscrupulous advertising," he said. "It has the right to demand as accurate, full and impartial a news service as the public itself is prepared to support. It has this right because freedom of the press is one of its own fundamental freedoms which, in effect, vests with a relatively small number of its citizenry. The press and freedom suffer where a community fails to demand and receive its rights in this respect."

The New York publisher said that the chief external attack against the newspapers comes now from Communists and fellow

travelers. But, he had previously emphasized, "most important among the dangers to press freedom are the shortcomings of the press itself."

The article then proceeds:

The present administration, Mr. Sulzberger said, "unlike the last, has not sniped at newspapers." On the contrary, he went on, this administration "has advanced the theory of press freedom as an element of democracy to such an extent that those who are in conflict with our American way of life are those making the most propaganda against the newspapers on the ground that they are not free.

"But also," he stated, "we must not forget the honest critics who have no ulterior motive and who, quite the contrary, are fully aware of the importance of press freedom, and who wish to have the product improved in order that the threats to the institution can be removed or at least minimized."

Mr. President, I consider myself in the category there referred to by Mr. Sulzberger as an honest member of a group who criticizes the press because I want to preserve its essential freedom to be a free press. But I am also one of the public, who, as Mr. Sulzberger says, has the right to demand a fair presentation of the news, and one of those who have a right to demand fair and full reporting of the news.

My application is this, Mr. President. I commend to Mr. Sulzberger's consideration the article in the New York Times reporting the speech made in this body yesterday by the senior Senator from Florida. I say it was not fair, it was not full, it was not accurate, in the information and in the impressions it conveyed of the remarks made. In that whole report not one reference was made to the fact that the Senator from Florida, in two speeches made to his colleagues on this floor, has made the burden of his argument that the measure now pending should go through the United Nations organization, and that the vice of it lay in an attempt to achieve the objective enunciated by the President through unilateral action on the part of the Government of the United States.

No man on this floor has gone further than the Senator from Florida in those two speeches in saying that he would vote and do what he could to resist Russian aggression, and that if it took arms to do it through the United Nations, he would support that objective in every possible way. But in the New York Times report of the speech it took out of the context a little colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico, and played it up into a sensational journalistic report hardly better than would have been done by a part of the press of this country that does not claim to be in the category with the New York Times.

Mr. Sulzberger has a great responsibility, not only to keep his word, but to set an example to the American press. I understand his paper gets more newsprint than any other paper in the Nation, when many little papers in our country are having to curtail or to shut down because they are just little newspapers, and do not have Mr. Sulzberger's access to the great newsprint cartel of America or the world.

I say that Mr. Sulzberger would do better to practice what he preaches. I say he would do better to give in his paper a representation that comports with his principles as he has declared them to his fellow publishers, and I brand as unfair, as inaccurate, as giving a wrong impression, the report of the New York Times of the particular speech yesterday to which I have referred, of which I have knowledge, because I was the one who delivered it.

Mr. President, this is why I called attention a moment ago to the speech being made by the Senator from West Virginia. It is no function of the American press to censor public speeches, either. Whether they like them or do not like them, they owe a duty of fair representation of the facts. It is none of their business whether they like a Senator's speech or whether they do not like it, their duty is to report it, and let the people determine whether they like it or not, whether they give it their approval or whether they reject it. Yet we have seen in this debate that when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] made an address in the Senate on Tuesday, and spoke all afternoon, one paper stated, in a dignified report of the speech, that all Senator TAYLOR did was to spend an afternoon speaking, waiting for the Senator from Florida to return.

Would anyone call that freedom of the press being fairly exercised, responsibility being fully discharged? It was the duty of the press to report the substance of what the Senator said. He is one ninety-sixth of the senatorial power of the United States. The papers cannot carry all that all of us say, or all of what any of us say, when we make protracted speeches; but I denounce the kind of newspaper reporting that will castigate a Senator's remarks on this floor with that kind of an epithet and that kind of disregard.

The representatives of the American press are meeting here in Washington. They are fine, honorable, patriotic gentlemen, and I wish a test could be made of the report of this debate, not by all—and I am not criticizing the press services, either—but by some of the papers who have read into their news reporting their editorial policy. They are the enemies of a free press. Any paper that censors its news columns attempts to deny the fundamental civic right of a free press. It is its own worst enemy. It betrays a public duty. I say the pending issue is a matter of colossal import, and that the people are entitled to know the facts; they are entitled, as best they can, to get the arguments made and to weigh those arguments according to the information they have. A press that denies them the fullest possible information betrays its duty; it does not deserve the freedom it enjoys if in that manner it discharges its obligation.

I conclude by saying that I come squarely within the principle enunciated by Mr. Sulzberger. I have tried to be an honest critic in order to preserve the freedom of the press, which we cherish. Let the newspapers write any kind of an editorial they desire to write. But they do owe a duty to us all that they report

the facts to the people. When they have done that, they are entitled to give any interpretation in their editorial columns they care to give. But as an honest critic, and as one who cherishes the fullest freedom of the press as a part of our great democracy, I wanted to call attention to what I believe has been a failure on the part of the press adequately, at this important moment in American history, to discharge its commanding obligation.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very glad to have heard the statement of the able Senator from Florida. I think it is entirely timely. I know that he advocated—I heard him do so upon the floor of the Senate—that the question involved in the bill before us should go to the United Nations. In that suggestion I certainly concur, and I advocate here today that such a course be followed. It is not a burden which the United States should carry alone. It is wrong for this Government to saddle it upon the backs of the American people alone. It is a matter which should go to the organization which was established for the purpose of meeting these problems—the United Nations.

Mr. President, before I yielded I was discussing the message of the President and certain statements therein which dealt with the subject of the scope of this problem and whether or not it was an extension of the principles that we know, and that are known to all the world, as the Monroe Doctrine. I quote further from the President's message:

But we cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion, or by such subterfuges as political infiltration. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

This means nothing less than that the United States is taking upon itself alone the obligation to see that existing governments of all nations in the world are to be held in status quo. It further means that we are adopting a policy of taking upon the United States alone the duty to carry out the objective of the United Nations because the President says if we will do this the United States would be effecting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

To me, it is inescapable that, through the President's language when he presented this new plan for Greece and Turkey, he desires to extend to every country in the world a policy to sustain their governments, to protect them against disturbances within or invasion from without.

That goes further than the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. President. It is to protect the status quo of the governments of the world. That is definitely in true essence an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. It is even broader than the Monroe Doctrine, in that it applies to internal insurrections. Furthermore, the President, by the language which I have quoted, states that by following this policy we, the United States, alone will be carry-

ing out the purposes of all those who have joined together in the United Nations. We divest the United Nations, if you please, of its duties and purposes, and take them upon ourselves.

I remember that when the question of the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations was pending before the Senate, a strong appeal was made that there would be taken from the shoulders of the American people and of the Government of the United States the duty, alone, to settle difficulties and troubles in parts of the world remote from us and that such responsibilities would be placed in the hands of a united group of nations for the purpose of maintaining peace and stopping wars that might burst forth. When, in the Senate, we voted for the United Nations organization, we did so in the belief that it would carry the burden of such problems as might arise in the Middle East. "But, oh," it is said, "the United Nations cannot act." Has it been tried? No. Has this question been submitted to the United Nations? Not once. It was presented first to the Congress of this Government, not to the Council of the United Nations. Why is it said that the United Nations cannot act? The able Senator from Florida on yesterday pointed out the instance of the United Nations, upon complaint of Iran, compelling the Russians to withdraw their troops from that country. There have been other instances in which the United Nations have intervened to bring about settlements.

(At this point, Mr. REVERCOMB yielded to Mr. COOPER, whose remarks, by request of Mr. REVERCOMB, appear at the conclusion of Mr. REVERCOMB's speech.)

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I have said, Mr. President, those who continue to argue before the Senate that this question cannot be taken to the United Nations are themselves taking a course which it seems to me is a belittlement of and the beginning of the end of that organization. It stands as a great and beautiful structure of uselessness, if we permit any country that is a member of it to take upon itself the duties and work of the United Nations. It is regrettable indeed that the United States of America, where it had its birth and its organization, should be the first to avoid the use of that great instrumentality in an attempt at least to meet the problem that exists in the southern part of Europe.

The President, further in his remarks, made it clear that this was the beginning of a new policy. He said in his address to the Congress:

This is a serious course upon which we embark.

He, himself, recognized the true seriousness of it. He was fair to the Congress in saying that it is serious.

It is so serious because it is fraught with the danger of early involvement of this country in war without an ally to aid in the cause. Our country would be acting alone and creating situations or incidents which could plunge us into a devastating war at any time. When the President says it is a serious course upon which we embark, I agree with him; it is not only a serious course but, if adopted, would be a tragic course.

If the Monroe Doctrine is applied to all the world and to every country in it, it means that the Government of this Nation has assumed, on behalf of our people, an obligation to protect every country in the world against invasion or aggression from another.

The best example of such a policy is summed up in the language of those who have said that wherever there may be trouble in the world it is the trouble of the United States of America. We become the police force of the world. We shoulder as one nation the burden that was to be that of the United Nations.

Perhaps wherever trouble may be in the world it may indeed be of interest to us, but we now confront the question of carrying that policy to the extent of using the wealth and the armed forces of the United States to enforce such a doctrine in lands far remote from us.

The bill now before the Senate of the United States marks the first definite step on the part of those who seek to place an obligation upon this country to protect every established government, wherever it may exist, and to underwrite and guarantee the security and safety of every government in the world. If we consider the proposal thoughtfully we can but wonder where such a course will carry us.

First, Mr. President, let me discuss the matter solely from a financial and monetary viewpoint. This is, in fact, not a completely new monetary policy. Our Government has heretofore used the wealth of our people for others. We have loaned billions of dollars to other countries. Such a step was taken after the First World War. Much of the money we advanced was not repaid, and a Second World War was not averted. Mr. President, I say that the action we are now asked to take, if taken, will not avert a third world war.

We were cursed for our beneficence, but failed to learn a lesson therefrom. Already we have again set out upon the same course. We have loaned approximately \$4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, a country which still owed us \$6,000,000,000 on a debt it had refused time and again to honor. When the subject of the loan to Britain was before the Senate I said that it was not so much the matter of a particular loan to Great Britain wherein the danger lay for us as it was the renewed establishment of a policy of loaning the wealth of America to other countries. The charge that we were beginning such a policy was denied on the floor of the Senate. Now we see that not only the loaning of money to other countries was established as a policy, loaning money whether there was any hope of it ever being repaid or not, but we see established as a policy the giving away of money to other nations. That, in candor, is the plan which is now before us. How long can this Nation survive such a course without impoverishment?

Even today we are advised that these donations will not stop with the four hundred millions proposed to be sent to Greece and Turkey, but we are told that we must give six hundred millions to Korea, a country which has today no

settled government and is divided into spheres of government between Russia and the attempted influence of America.

This new billion dollars to be given away is but an inkling of what it will mean if we are to set ourselves up as the guardians and supporters of every remote country in the world, whatever our motive may be, whether to aid them to have what they want or to insist that our ideas of government shall prevail for them.

We are at once confronted with the very practical question of how long the wealth of America and her people, who even today struggle under a crushing debt, can long endure a constant drain upon our resources for the benefit of crumbling governments abroad. Can we dare take the chance of throwing our own country into economic turmoil and impoverish our own people through any such policy?

It seems to me that such a plan whereby America must shoulder the financial burdens of the world and pour out what she may have here can mean only the end of a wealthy America and the end of a strong America. When her strength is gone this country will be begging alms and who will there be to help?

Such a plan as that proposed is bound to carry us to that end if we follow it with consistency.

Mr. President, history is replete with examples of nations which have fallen. I doubt if anyone who lived in the days when the Roman Empire was rich and powerful dreamt for a moment that that great power could crumble. But we who read her history know how she extended her borders farther and farther throughout the world, and we know how she eventually fell. The power that was Rome has long since ceased to exist.

If we cannot follow the proposed plan with consistency, we should not begin it, because unless we follow it through to its end certainly that which we pour out will be of only temporary aid, and will be lost both in purpose and in repayment. Abandonment of the plan will bring hate from those we promised more than we can give.

We are confronted now with the question, plainly, clearly, are we to undertake a course whereby the people of America are to finance the governments of the world? The proposed plan is the first step on such a course.

It is but the beginning of the spending. We should not ignore the practical effect of what is sought here to be done. It is \$250,000,000 to Greece this year and one hundred and fifty millions to Turkey this year. Having started this undertaking, I warn Senators that the budgets of next year and the appropriations of next year will carry additional millions and millions to meet the cost of the plan that we have set up for those countries. No man can foretell when it will end, whether in 5 years or in 20 years. This Nation's wealth can be exhausted in such a venture. Once embarked upon there can be no turning back without the charge of failure, and those we would make the beneficiaries of our bounty will rise to hate us for not carrying through to the end the plan we declared upon.

Great Britain undertook this scheme, and it had to stop.

There was reason for the British people to undertake such a plan. Their very life on their rugged islands depended on it. Great, strong people that they were, they had the plan of empire. They had to protect the ways of commerce through the Middle East. But, Mr. President, we have in Great Britain the example—with her great wealth—of having failed, and today we are told, and it has been told here upon the floor of the Senate in the course of this debate, that the British people now face ruin economically.

To quote the President's own language, the Government of Great Britain today had to "liquidate its commitments."

Great Britain has liquidated its commitments in Greece and in the Middle East. It made certain commitments, certain promises. It undertook to sustain its former course and carry out its commitments. It failed and it has withdrawn, and we are asked to take up the burden in the face of the failure of another powerful nation.

Liquidating a commitment simply means repudiating a policy because of inability to fulfill it. Is America to place herself in the position not only of liquidating her commitments abroad, but also failing in her first obligation to her own people? If we pass this bill she will have to do so or go down the road to virtual economic ruin and bankruptcy. She will have to abandon this plan. She will have to suffer the dishonor of repudiating promises, or else pour out the wealth of the people of this country to support all other governments in the world. That is the reason why I oppose starting upon such a program. I can see no other end if we follow this program to its logical conclusion. We shall be helpless to prevent the spread of communism in our own land. Cannot men see what lies ahead? Why embark upon a course which may bring us to such an end?

The President himself frankly stated to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress that if the sums of money which he requested did not meet the needs of his policy he would again come to us. Senators recall that statement. He said that if the sum of \$400,000,000 did not meet the requirements in carrying out the world-wide policy, he would come back to us and ask for more. He will be back if this policy is adopted. It will become a regular part of the yearly expenditures of this Government. He will come to us again and again if we ever embark upon so fateful and tragic a course. Can Senators ignore those facts? Shall we, in our zeal to carry out a plan which now seems beneficent, blind ourselves to reality?

There is a publication known as the Kiplinger Letter, which is issued at intervals. It deals with government activities. In this week's issue the statement is made that this plan will cost between \$10,000,000,000 and \$15,000,000,000.

The people of this country are crying out to their Government to relieve them from the taxes they now bear. This must be done if we are to progress and if

our people are to have the use of their own money. Senators have urged the retirement of the great public debt which hangs around our necks like a millstone. The people, by their votes and voices, have asked that expenditures be curtailed so that less expense of government will be placed upon them. If we pass this bill and embark upon this policy, we cannot hope either to reduce the debt or to reduce taxes. Yet in the face of this call of the people we embark upon a policy which means increased debt and increased taxes for no good end.

Mr. President, let me say as earnestly as I know how that this measure will not stop the spread of communism. The expenditure of \$400,000,000 will not stop the spread of communism. We plunge into a policy of giving away our wealth and sustaining governments which totter, with no assurance whatever of success, and with the certain result in the end of our own country being weakened. Only in the preservation of our own strength lies our security and the security of the world.

Figures have already been placed before us in the course of this debate, but a recapitulation of them will, I hope, impress them upon us and bring them more definitely into the consideration of the decision we are about to make.

We are told that since July 1, 1945, this country has obligated itself and its people to the extent of almost \$16,000,000,000 to assist those in foreign lands. That has already been done, before any move is taken upon the course we are now asked to undertake. We are told that that figure does not include our military costs abroad or most of our aid to Latin-American countries and countries of the Orient. These expenditures include commitments and loans to Great Britain; the support and feeding of people in the invaded countries of Europe; loans from the Export-Import Bank to help the Allied countries rebuild their commerce; and money given through UNRRA.

What has happened to the Bretton Woods project? America committed herself to the extent of \$6,000,000,000, with a contingent liability for even more. We were told that that fund was created so that countries which found their economies depressed through war could borrow money to reestablish themselves. All of this is apparently forgotten. We now embark upon a new scheme which, in effect, is a commitment to support with money all the governments of the world if they will but call upon us and say that their regimes are threatened by an uprising from within or attack from without.

Are we ready to sacrifice America, to weaken her, to destroy her, under a plan which has no end in sight, a plan which can carry us to impoverishment and weakness? I am not willing to go along with such a plan.

No one deplors more than I do the spread of communism anywhere, and particularly in my own country. It seems to me that our first duty is to meet the threat of communism at home. But I am not willing to sacrifice the strength and power of America and destroy the

freedom of our own people and our right to enjoy the fruits of our labor in order to protect tottering governments in other lands. I am not willing to weaken America to the point where communism can take a strangle hold upon us.

To what extent do we expect these gifts to save Greece and Turkey? Doubtless when Russia is ready she can move with speed into those countries. Yesterday I heard the statement made upon the floor of the Senate that some high military authority had stated that Russia's armed forces could move into the countries of Europe within 8 days if she so desired. Under those circumstances what good would it do to spend this money in Greece and establish a force in Europe for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism, if that is the real intent?

It was well pointed out yesterday from the map on the wall that Russia borders on other countries to the east, through which she could move. Are we going to pour out money there too? It has not yet been suggested, but if this plan is followed through it is reasonable to expect that we shall be asked to make such expenditures. What about Yugoslavia? Are we to pour money into Yugoslavia, which is now under Communist domination, to stop the further spread of communism? Where will this program end? The very fact that we, under the shadow of the borders of Russia, take such a step at this time, in my judgment, is but a reason for her to act more promptly in moving into those nations if she has the intention of doing so. She has a reason, in the eyes of the world, to say that the United States of America is attempting to set up a foreign sovereignty on her borders and for that reason she must move into those countries to protect her own border lines.

That is the hue and cry which she can make to the world. We cannot give one reason for ourselves and another reason for some other country.

This is a tragic course. It means the ruin of our internal economy. It means hastened involvement in war. Surely the future could hold no greater tragedies—tragedies that are hastened and precipitated by our own actions.

So today, as I stand here, a Member of the Senate, I earnestly plead with my colleagues to stop and consider and not to take an action which, in my judgment, can lead us only upon a path of dark regret.

The loan to Greece and to Turkey is not great in itself. But, as the President has said, this is a serious policy. Oh, how serious it is when we think of the end to which it can carry us. It can carry us to internal economic destruction. Every country shown on the map which is on that wall of the Senate Chamber wants protection against communism. This action will not stop the spread of communism. Only one thing will stop it for us and that is a strong, internal economy in America.

Mr. President, there is another feature of this policy of sending money and the military into other countries, and it is a feature which must cause other nations to shudder in apprehension of what

America is up to, and that is the subject of American imperialism—of America attempting to dominate the world and the governments of other countries. We will not admit such a purpose, and, in truth, we do not have such a purpose, but, indeed, how quickly may that purpose change if we find ourselves dominating the governments of other countries or find ourselves in a position where it is necessary to dominate others in order to have them repay to us that which we have advanced them. Is America to start upon an imperialistic policy in the Mediterranean and in Asia? Can we in fairness fail to see the fear in other countries even when we start with declared good intentions? I can understand that such apprehension on their part is well founded, for the day may come when for our own economic stability it may be necessary to demand that they return to us that which we have advanced in the form of financial aid.

However, were this but an advance of money, with all the dangers fraught to our economy in such a policy, it would be less dangerous to our welfare if it were not connected plainly and outspokenly with the sending into those countries of military personnel. There is the interesting feature, and I want my country to be earnest and frank about what is intended.

There is no limit upon the number of such personnel. The Congress gives the President authority to send limited personnel. Under the language of the resolution he can send 20 or 20,000 or 200,000, depending upon what, in his judgment, is a necessary limitation under the exigencies that may arise out of this whole undertaking. Military commissions are the forerunners of war.

We are told that this combination of money and military might is necessary to stop the spread of communism from Russia into Greece. If that be the real reason, it is to stop Russia over and near her own borders from advancing her power and infiltrating her ideologies of government into a neighboring country.

To sum it up, we are undertaking to say to other nations of the world that ours is the only true way for you, whether you like it or not. That is imperialism in its strongest essence.

There is no one more opposed to communism than am I. Time and time again I have spoken openly upon the floor of the Senate and before the people of my country in the condemnation of communism. I want it eradicated completely from every phase of American life.

At the same time, I have recognized the right of the Russian people that if they desire communism that is their own choice. I recognize the right of every country within its own borders to have any desired form of government, so long as they themselves can sustain it.

Suppose Russia, or Great Britain, with her form of government by a limited monarchy, were to send military personnel into Mexico to see to it that the principles of American democracy were not to be considered in that country, what would be the reaction of America

to such a step. Undoubtedly, we would consider it an overt act of hostility, and, in truth, a declaration of war.

Let us get down to facts and realities and see whether we are moving toward war. I cannot accept the statement that it is not a hostile act. We have been outspoken and we should be outspoken with reference to it.

Can we expect Russia to consider such a step on our part in any other light? In fact, is it any other step?

This is a far move toward World War III, a definite step taken by America in that direction.

If, in truth, we have found it necessary to make war upon Russia, why not tell the American people and the world that we are doing just that so that they may know where we are going and prepare for it.

This talk about this being a step to avert war is to ignore realities. It has the same sound as the words that came out of the Congress when the Harrison Neutrality Act was repealed, and we began to send arms abroad. We were told then that was a step to assure our protection against involvement in a war already raging. At first it was said that we would sell arms to combatants on the barrel head, for those who wanted to come and get them at our shores, and shortly thereafter we were shipping arms to the Allies in American boats. Why did not our Government then tell the people of America that it was to the best interest of this country to join the Allies and go to war with them. Why must the people be fooled?

We confront the very same situation here today. If we must resort to arms, why not tell the people of this country and tell them why we must go to war.

If the spread of communism into Europe is the reason for this action, and if the spread of communism over into Asia is the reason for the proposed advance to Korea, tell the people of this country and tell them why we must go to war.

It seems to me, in the light of any principle that may be laid down, that we cannot hope to avert eventual war by such a course of action.

We could hope to do so if we would take the matter to the United Nations, start with it there, and go as far as we could with it. We cannot expect to apply one principle to the government of another country and another principle to ourselves. If such action were directed at us, you and I know that war would be inevitable and immediate. Can you expect anything other than that from Russia?

There may be some lapse of time for preparation, but certainly this act on our part can never be forgotten and can be used as a cause of war against us. How practical, I wonder, is the sending of military personnel into Greece and Turkey. How long would such military personnel block the way for Russia if that country desired to make an advance or invasion?

Indeed, it seems to me that instead of preserving peace we are precipitating certain war. This is a time for men to speak frankly, and I am speaking

frankly. I do not want to take a step that will needlessly plunge us into war or hasten war. If war be inevitable, if we know that Russia is to advance upon us, then let us say so openly to the people, and go ahead. No one has yet said that, however.

The step now proposed is but a dallying step, a taunting act that cannot help but inflame the hearts and feelings of those at whom it is directed.

I do not have any defense, from my own viewpoint, for what is going on in Russia. When I went into Europe after the fall of Germany and saw that torn land, when I went into France and saw its 16 largest cities elect Communists to head up their government, and when I went into Italy and saw the red banner of communism over the graves of their Italian dead, I made the statement that we had helped to destroy a bad thing in Europe but we had paved the way for something equally bad, and that was communism. I was criticized for that remark, but I still believe I was right.

Now the question comes as to whether this country must invite another war to block the communism that is sweeping Europe, sweeping it through the people of their own lands, through the force of Russia. Communism is strongly entrenched in many countries of Europe. Are we to carry this now proposed policy into all other countries? Certainly to be effective and to be consistent in any degree would require it. Such a course, I believe, would wreck this Nation before it could defend its own shores and its own people against the spread of that threat.

If, in soundness, it could be believed that \$400,000,000 taken from our own Treasury and our own people and given to Greece and Turkey would strengthen those countries so that they would be a happy people and secure against communism, even at that cost to us this particular gift would have a strong appeal.

However, I submit to you, Mr. President, that such an act will not stop communism, if communism through force is to be brought into those countries. I submit to you that if the people of Greece are going to fall for communism, this loan of money and a military commission will not stop it. It will not stop it any more than the three and three-fourths billion dollars would have saved the economy of the British Empire. We know that it has not and we know that will not. It means that much loss to this country without substantial and lasting aid to the donees.

The United Nations organization has been brought into this picture. I have referred, as several other Members of the Senate have referred, to the suggestion that this problem should be submitted to the United Nations, which is where it should have originated, certainly. The trial should be made there.

It is proposed that we give this aid and money to Greece and Turkey and that we send military missions—ours, no one else's—into those countries.

It is said that if we take this matter before the United Nations, the United Nations might veto our proposal. I believe a provision now in the bill would have us take this step subject to the

approval of the United Nations, so that if the United Nations did not see fit to approve of our action, the United Nations could veto what we were doing in those countries.

In the first place, I think that is utterly unsound. If we are to permit the United Nations to veto what we are doing, why do not we go to the United Nations in the first place and ask their approval of this action before it is taken, and then take it through the channels that organization offers? Why must America suffer the cost of this enterprise and take unto herself the whole burden of the world, when such a problem was supposed to be handled by the nations acting in concert? It has been pointed out that we cannot act through the United Nations because of Russia. Naturally, Russia would veto such action of the United Nations, and reasonably so because the very step is taken against her.

Then it has been proposed by an able Member of the Senate that if Russia acts in that way, she should be faced squarely with the proposition, and should be dropped from the United Nations in such case, or that action should be taken regardless of her opposition. Mr. President, that proposal is a realistic one, to me, and I believe it deserves sound consideration. If we are to move to block communism, why not act in a practical way by getting other nations to move with us? How can we say in one breath that the proposed move is to block Russia and to block communism, and then say in the next breath that it would not be proper to ignore Russia? We are setting out not only to ignore Russia, but to block Russia.

The view of leaving Russia out of the United Nations has been criticized upon the ground that it will be the means of creating a power bloc of the other countries against Russia. Is not that just what we want if we are proceeding against Russia? Is not it better to have a power bloc of nations against Russia than to have the United States undertake the project alone. I cannot understand the reasoning of those who, having espoused and fought for an undertaking that has as its prime objective blocking the influence of Russia, would then oppose forming a power bloc against her. There is too much contradiction in that position.

The time has come here on the floor of the Senate of the United States for this Government to decide whether it wants to adopt a policy that, stripped of all decorative verbiage, means that this country is to undertake to sustain, through military force and through financing, the government of every country in the world that fears the uprising of a minority within it or an attack from without.

The alternative to such a plan—and it seems to me there is but one alternative—is to avail ourselves of the one agency and the one power and the one group that exists in the world, the United Nations, that is established for such a purpose, and go there and try to use it first, and see whether it will be successful. We should at least be fair enough with it not to ignore it, not to bypass it, or to have this country, the

scene of its birth, be the first to pursue such a course.

If the United States is to follow the policy which is now proposed, then America should get ready for continuous and recurrent war, and get ready to sacrifice the lives of her young men, and get ready to exhaust her wealth, because that will be the ultimate end, and the only end, to which such a course can take us.

I am opposed to the philosophies and the brutalities of Russia. But what controls my course more than my dislike of communism or any other dislike is the security and strength of my own country and the protection and well-being of my own people. When I see my Government embarking upon a plan which in my own honest thought can but lead to another war, can but lead to a weakening of our Nation, I shall oppose that course so long as to oppose it does not mean to oppose the defense of my own country; and I do not believe that is involved in the present case. If it can be shown that the adoption of such a course is necessary for the defense of the United States, that it is necessary for the defense of the United States that we go to war with Russia at this time, let that be shown. But let us not adopt a plan under some covert step to look after all the other countries of the world and sustain their governments and, through following such a course, thus fool our people into taking a step that can only lead to war.

This subject is the gravest one which has confronted our Government in many years. Not only is it grave in respect to being a step toward war, but it is also grave in that we shall be undertaking a policy which may mean recurrent and continuous warfare for America. Furthermore, it is the making of a policy which would place upon the backs of the American people the costs of sustaining every failing government in the world.

Mr. President, I have spoken frankly today. I have spoken at great length. I have listened to the debates upon this subject. I waited some time before arriving at my own decision in regard to the pending measure and this issue. But I say to you that I have come to the sincere conclusion—a conclusion contrary to that held by many Members of this body whom I respect greatly—that the only course for the United States to take and the only way for the United States to go is through the United Nations, and that not until failure is met with there should this country attempt to act alone. This bill is the way to war and economic injury for our country; the United Nations may offer a way to peace and continued strength for us.

During the delivery of Mr. REVERCOMB'S speech,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator at this time and interrupt the train of his thought. I am a little late in my remarks, but a few moments ago when the Senator from Florida was speaking, I was moved to make a statement, and I should like to do that now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator wish to speak at length?

Mr. COOPER. No. I should like to refer to the statement just made by the Senator from Florida, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At length?

Mr. COOPER. No, for only two or three minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well; I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I can say that I was sitting on the other side near the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] yesterday when he was speaking, and I heard practically all of his speech. A few minutes before that time the Senator from Florida and I had engaged in a colloquy consisting of some questions and answers. While I can say that I do not agree with the Senator from Florida in many of the conclusions he reached in his argument, and I am not in accord with his attitude upon this bill—I am supporting the bill—yet in reading this morning the article, to which he referred, I myself felt that I had interpreted his remarks in a much different way than they were reported in the article.

As I understood the sense of what the Senator said and the context of his speech, he was speaking about fundamental governmental positions, and what one country could argue as against the position of another. It was my opinion in listening to him that he was expressing it as a matter of argument and not as his own conclusion.

I am moved to make this statement because after listening to his speech yesterday, with many of the conclusions of which I did not agree—and I am not with him in his position upon this bill—I wanted to say that I did not arrive at the conclusion that was reported in the newspaper this morning.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his characteristically kind and generous words?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the remarks by the Senator from Kentucky, and the last remark by the able Senator from Florida, appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. REVERCOMB'S speech,

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a suggestion I am making, first, that the Senate obtain immediately the recommendation of General Marshall on the Greek loan; and second, that when he returns, he be requested to furnish the Senate a full report on world affairs.

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

SUGGESTIONS ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. President, I submit two suggestions with regard to our foreign policy. Rather than put them in the form of resolutions, I offer them at this point for purposes of speed and simplicity, merely in this form:

RECOMMENDATION OF GENERAL MARSHALL ON GREEK LOAN

The first is that Secretary of State Marshall, in Moscow, advise the Senate and the House, by cable, of his personal position with

regard to the proposed Greek and Turkish loan program, based upon his latest experiences in the Foreign Ministers Conference. There is no single citizen in the United States of America who possesses a greater and more up-to-the-minute insight of United States-Russian relations than our distinguished Secretary of State. If my suggestion that he advise us at this time on the Greek and Turkish loan meets with favor here, and with the State Department, and the President, then I believe that General Marshall could, with that keen mind and great brain of his, within a few hours or less cable word to the Senate and to the House of Representatives on this matter. In so doing he could help resolve many of the questions and doubts in the minds of my colleagues here and in the minds of all Americans.

It has been imputed here in the Senate that Secretary Marshall is not wholly in favor of the proposed Greek and Turkish loan program. Such rumor could be spiked immediately, certainly before the Senate takes action on this measure next Tuesday. America stands at the crossroad of international policy. She deserves the benefit of the first-hand judgment of her Secretary of State. Too long have we received only the judgment of the second-level State Department officials, however able they may be.

Some might say that such a report from General Marshall at this time might embarrass him in his role at the Conference. I say, on the contrary, it would strengthen his role. It would indicate the ideal, indivisible unity of United States foreign policy for a United States diplomat working out the problems of Germany to report simultaneously on the problems of the eastern Mediterranean.

POST-MOSCOW REPORT ON WORLD AFFAIRS

My second suggestion is that immediately upon the conclusion or suspension of the Foreign Ministers Conference in Moscow, that Secretary of State Marshall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session on the status of United States foreign relations. Here again we should have the direct benefit of his able judgment on the greatest single problem in the world today—the problem of the relationship between the United States and Soviet Russia, which expresses itself in the problem of the west versus the east.

I recall that some 6 years ago in February 1941 I urged that Secretary of State Hull report to the Senate in similar executive session on the crisis in the Far East. This was 10 months before Pearl Harbor. Such a session was not held, and America was not informed of the gathering war clouds over the Pacific; the result was tragic, as we know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, returning from a trip to attend the Inter-parliamentary Union meeting at Cairo, where, during the course of our aerial voyage, we saw the remnants and the relics of the civilizations which have waxed and waned in the Mediterranean Basin, we are compelled to ponder the implications of the action now proposed. It is a matter of regret that we missed the discussions which have proceeded on the Senate floor during our absence. On the other hand, it seems possible that from the first-hand impressions gained, there might be something of value contributed to the understanding of the situation as it now exists.

Some of the things we observed might not seem to lend great support to the position of the President. Yet, on balance, it is my considered conclusion at this time that the course the President

recommends is the one we may well pursue.

The brevity of our visit necessarily left us qualified as experts, as it has always been my theory that unless one stayed in a country more than 24 hours, he could qualify as an expert. If he stayed any longer, he was disqualified. So we may in some instances be in the happy state of being experts.

We returned with an overwhelming impression, which was fortified by the recurrent stories about the economic problems of Europe resting upon the lack of coal. That was the story in Italy, the story in France, the story we read in Germany. So it became obvious that the conversion of European economy to a petroleum base is apparently the only possible solution of Europe's economic ills.

Whether or not this is one world, there is certainly no doubt that there is one Middle East, and we cannot divorce Greece and Turkey from the picture of the Middle East as a whole. I think it would be utterly unrealistic for us to approach the problem without the far broader view that the petroleum sources of the Middle East are a vital stake in the economic situation, a matter to which we must give increasing attention as the days go by, not only from the standpoint of our own national security, and supplies and reserves, but from the standpoint of the reconstruction of the European economy, which must be a matter to engage and invite the interest of everyone concerned with the progress of the world.

With the timing of events I find myself somewhat concerned. The fact that the Greek commission was about to report, within a month, regarding the conditions on the Greek border, and that we were precipitated into this situation by the action of the President, seems to me to be extremely unfortunate. It is useless to indulge in speculation, but whether or not there is anyone in the world who desires that, instead of a united solution of the problem we are now considering, there should be a world in which Russia and the United States shall be opposed, and somebody else shall be in between, necessarily invites speculation.

It had been my thought for some time, for many months, that as it became more obvious that we were having difficulty in doing business with the Soviet, we must shortly begin to consider whether in the United Nations we could live with Russia, or must consider whether in the United Nations we could live without Russia, and that the other nations of the world should proceed, holding the door open for Russia to collaborate if she desired. But Russia proceeded, by the exercise of the veto, to indicate her lack of that co-operative spirit which is essential to the successful functioning of the United Nations, and it seems necessary to decide if the nations of the world must go forward, either within the framework of the United Nations or in a supplemental organization along similar lines, awaiting patiently the day when Russia will recognize the desirability of cooperation.

It is for this reason that I think all of us share profound regret that this

issue was precipitated before a finding of the commission surveying conditions in Greece had at least furnished a solid foundation on which America, well within the terms of the United Nations Charter, could have proceeded to extend the economic or military aid that was necessary. But it is a condition and not a theory which confronts us, as was said some 50 years ago by Grover Cleveland when leaving office at that time. So we face a situation in which we must resolve our action in the light of what exists, rather than of what we may desire.

There has been controversy as to how long this situation has been developing. It was my understanding that it was indicated last fall that something of this sort might develop. The pressure under which the question necessarily has been considered is, of course, unfortunate. To the extent that it represents any departure from the bipartisan cooperation to which so many of us have been devoted, it is even more unfortunate. If there is any likelihood, in connection with the present development, of there being a lack of the confidence and cooperation which prevailed so happily in the development of the United Nations Charter, which will stand as a monument to the labors of Cordell Hull, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], then indeed it is a sorry day. It is my earnest hope that if there has been any deviation from that procedure we shall soon see a resumption of that cooperation between the executive and the legislative departments, which is well within the scope of our constitutional process, which unfortunately has been ignored or disregarded many times in the century and a half of our history, but which developed so happily in the United Nations, in contrast to the tragic experiences in the League of Nations, and which seemed to augur the day when the Senate of the United States might really occupy such a position, in advice and consent in connection with our foreign affairs, as to develop a stability in the conduct of our foreign relations that is absolutely vital if America is to occupy the position in the world to which she is entitled by her preeminence in power and responsibility.

No man, as President, whoever he may be, necessarily limited in term, can possibly give to our foreign policy the continuity that could be achieved by a Senate united in the sense of its responsibility and able, if it has opportunity, by bipartisan collaboration, to carry America forward and to occupy in the world a position which, in the past century, gave us a century of peace under the Pax Britannica, and may give us a century of peace under a new concept of a Pax Americana, if we can only rise to our self-evident responsibilities in the challenge of this new world. So much for the broad outlines.

Our trip took us first to Palestine, where we landed on Easter Sunday morning. We spent the day there, visiting the holy shrines, and observing also at first hand some of the conditions in that beleaguered land. At one of the churches which we visited, we witnessed a controversy between Christian sects that in-

cluded police intervention. Neither Arabs nor Jews were involved; which indicates that arguments are not confined to the Jews and the Arabs in that land.

It was my privilege to visit a Jewish community farm on a Sunday afternoon, and to observe the miracle that had been wrought on those devastated acres by the Jewish rehabilitation of the land. There I saw 50 refugee children from Dachau and Buchenwald, who were blooming there in what had formerly been a desert and who were a token of what it is possible to do. Fifty or a hundred cows give them milk from the hills of Palestine. And yet, as I rode away from there, between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, there were thousands of idle acres, deserted by the Arabs and denied to the Jews. Meanwhile, America goes on spending millions of dollars to support thousands of refugees in the detention camps of Germany. How long this must continue, as a result of the denial of immigration by the mandatory power, is still of course in doubt. It is my earnest hope that, pending the discussions in the United Nations and the operations of the committee, the mandatory power may see fit to observe what is the undoubted international obligation of permitting the continued migration of the Jewish refugees of Europe; not primarily to relieve the American taxpayers of the millions of dollars of expense in which we are now involved in supporting these unfortunates but primarily in order that these poor unfortunates, persecuted, the remnant of 6,000,000 who have been destroyed, may establish themselves as self-respecting and self-supporting citizens in the land that has so clearly been promised to them. It is my hope that the mandatory power may, in the not too distant future, see the wisdom of that course.

Going on to Cairo, we attended the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, which has been holding sessions for many years, and which consists of members of the parliaments of various nations. In Cairo 24 or 25 were represented in an entirely informal parliament of the world, which discussed and adopted certain resolutions. The pre-eminence and supremacy of the United Nations was entirely recognized and only certain resolutions of recommendation addressed to the United Nations were adopted. I have copies of them here. The meeting brought home the difficulties of developing world government, which has been a fond dream. Meeting there with the members of 24 other parliaments, it became obvious that not in the very distant future could we even attempt a form of world government, that the United Nations, with its Assembly and the Council, and the very carefully worked out limitations upon its functionings, obviously represents about as far as it has been practicable and possible to go. The session of the Interparliamentary Union is rather a forum of acquaintance, of interchange of views, of the meeting of various people, and of developing gradually an understanding of various problems, without the pressure of official responsibility, which results often in acerbities which are unfortunate. There the utmost of good fel-

lowship prevailed, although, as the American delegation walked into the scene, 5 or 10 minutes late as the result of an apparent error in time, there flooded over me a sensation that the ancient civilizations which were represented there, viewing us, must well have pondered somewhat as did the Romans in the forum when the barbarians marched in. We, who were probably the only group that did not understand the language of anybody else participating there, outside our English friends, represented America, great in her power and might and resources, which are so much desired, and while they viewed us as a people they did not understand, yet they still wanted to be friends.

The British delegation was a most representative one, with the deputy speaker of the house as the head of the delegation, who is also chairman of the ways and means committee, Lord Stangate, who had formerly been Minister of Air and is now president of the Interparliamentary Union. This delegation was also most carefully and comprehensively briefed, as I had occasion to learn when I came to the discussion of reparations. Our delegation had practically no collaboration or assistance so far as our State Department was concerned. I hasten to say this was not the fault of the State Department, but of the very casual way in which the delegations were developed, not knowing what our plans were or what our problems were, and not having any advance agenda of the meeting or of the resolutions which were to be proposed; so that we were operating more or less in the dark. The British arrived there with every resolution having been carefully considered by their foreign office and most exhaustive briefs prepared as to British policy and procedure—indicating the importance which they attach to any gathering of this kind.

The sharpest issue there developed arose in connection with the subject of reparations. There was presented to the union, a resolution which had been formulated by a committee which adopted the Russian viewpoint regarding reparations, namely, that they should be maintained at the maximum level out of current production. This was obviously squarely in conflict with the policy of the United States and of Great Britain, that we cannot feed the cow at one end while the unfortunate countries of Europe milk the cow at the other. We did that after the last war. There were paid out in reparations by Germany somewhat more than what the United States advanced to Germany. So a sharp issue was presented on this score. The resolution had no binding or legal effect, but it seemed to us that it would be most unfortunate if a resolution of that character were adopted. So we presented as strong a case as we could. It was argued on the floor. An amendment was offered, representing the American point of view as advanced by our Secretary of State at Moscow, and after considerable discussion and some approaches to the various delegations, the amendment was adopted by a vote of 119 to 74, with 73 abstentions; which is apparently a rather prevalent European system of sitting on the

fence. They did not care to offend either side in the controversy. So the resolution which was finally adopted represented the American point of view, which is that if we are to put up money for the rehabilitation of Europe that money shall first be repaid before reparations are provided out of current production as distinct from capital.

There was also considerable discussion of the question of migratory populations, and rather unanimous agreement against forceful removals of either populations or refugees. A resolution dealing with that subject, addressed to the United Nations, was referred to a committee for further study as to form.

This represented approximately the discussion and the committee work during the week we were in Cairo. We had opportunity to see the relics of the civilizations which during thousands of years had developed in the Nile Valley and had left their impress upon the history of mankind.

Then we moved on to Turkey and to Greece, making a brief visit in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, selected by Ataturk after the revolution following the First World War—a city which has been developed there in 25 years. It was formerly a little country town and now is a city of 150,000, of most modern type construction. They are building a magnificent capital there. They have acres and acres of government buildings, not equal to our own Capital City, but comparable with it when one considers that Turkey is a nation of 18,000,000 people.

What we thought was a rather significant thing—and here I seek to give only impressions as to the character of the country, and I gather that perhaps this may be helpful in considering the result of our trip—was that the residence of the President, high on a hill, is the most modest structure we saw. That is rather unusual in view of the stories we hear about dictatorships and police governments, and so on.

It is a rather modest little house, pink, not white, erected on the hill but smaller than the British Embassy or the German Embassy which had been built there, indicating that Ataturk, and his successor, Inonu, were men of rather modest inclinations. Inonu, the present President, showed himself very little. He has very little contact, at any rate, with the foreigners who are there. We met the Prime Minister and the foreign officers, and also the Minister for Air.

What impressed me about Turkey was that it is a land of ample resources to support its people; that it was under very adequate cultivation, and that democracy was making progress. We had no illusions as to how far they could have gone in 25 years, but one sensed in the conversations a sincere devotion to progress of a democratic kind.

Turkey has suppressed certain Communist newspapers, in contrast to what is being done in Greece. Perhaps anything can be proved by it, Turkey suppressed Communist newspapers which went too far, as they felt, in attacks on the government. There was what was called a free press. I talked with Americans resident there, not only in the embassy, but with those who lived in

Istanbul for 30 years and who lived at Robert College, who talked freely about the suppression of the Communist press.

Whether the Turkish policy of suppressing the Communist press or the Greek policy of allowing it is the wiser is a matter of opinion, but when I hear a suggestion that Greece is a police state I find myself utterly unable to reconcile such a statement with what I hold in my hand, which is a Communist newspaper published in Athens on the day we were there, bitterly attacking President Truman and the United States of America, and praising Stalin. Here is a picture of Stalin on the front page giving his answer to a correspondent who had communicated with him about the theories of Clausewitz, and whether or not the criticism of those theories was a criticism of Lenin. Mr. Stalin had replied that that was all right; that Lenin was only speaking of Clausewitz as a statesman, not a military man, and that it was all right therefore to differ with him.

That article is not so interesting or so illuminating as the back page, which carries the caricatures and cartoons of the American position, of the American loan, and again putting Stalin in a most favorable light.

It might be said that the fact that they would not suppress a newspaper such as that indicates the weakness of the Greek Government. I have here 10 other newspapers of varying points of view all the way from the extreme left, red, and pink organs through to the conservative and right wings. But whatever one may think as to Greek policy, it certainly does not indicate that the Greek Government is suppressing free speech. Certainly we have no freer speech in this country than is exemplified there. But what it seems to me it does conclusively show is that this is obviously of Soviet origin. Certainly no Greek Communist or group would be capable of producing day by day cartoons and caricatures of this character secured from Soviet sources and presented to a simple little publication there in Athens for daily issuance to the Greek people. That was to me far more significant evidence than the finding on the Greek border of a Russian machine gun with the date of 1946. One was found. What conclusion should be drawn from that? Certainly that the gun was made in Russia in 1946, that it was given to Bulgaria, Albania, or one of the other countries, and then it found its way to the Grecian border. That is material evidence that something is going on, but to me not by any means as clear in its persuasiveness as is the publication of a newspaper of this kind carried on day by day in Athens by Soviet sympathy and support in an attempt to subvert the form of government of Greece.

The Prime Minister with whom we talked in Athens was a very mild and benignant character, a man 73 years old. He had been a banker much of his life, a diminutive little banker who weighed 84 kilos, whatever that is, when the war started, and lost 40 kilos during it, as he said, not as the result of inadequate food, because he said, "I was able to get food," "but," he said, "because of the catastro-

phe under which my country was living." And one believed him as he said it. He talked with us very simply and directly for half an hour. He was called back from retirement. He had retired from his business, his banking, and from politics. Many years ago he was Prime Minister, and he was again trying to carry on. The curious situation is that in spite of the criticism of the Greek elections, whether or not they were right or wrong, the leader of the majority of the House of Commons there was not permitted to be Prime Minister, apparently through disapproval of the British, who were at that time furnishing the support. After a great deal of discussion a compromise was finally worked out by which the present Prime Minister took over. He certainly did not impress any of us as a belligerent or dictatorial type of man. I can say that for him. We sat and talked with him for perhaps half an hour, and he told us of the problems of the future. If one were to criticize him for anything it would be for a certain lack of force, but I am not sure that such a criticism is justified.

We later met the Foreign Minister who is the leader of the majority in the House of Parliament and who was not allowed to be Prime Minister. He was a considerably more aggressive character. It might be suggested that he was the power behind the throne.

We talked at some length with one who was in the minority in the Parliament, one of the followers of Venizelos, whose son is also a Republican, meaning by that that he had been opposed to the monarchy. The one with whom we talked was a most intelligent young man who had finally gone into the Government because he felt, although the liberal party had been opposed to it, that the crisis facing the country demanded that they should cooperate. We were very much impressed with this young man. He was a professor in the college. He was now Minister for Air. He said to us frankly that there was much of which he did not approve; that he thought there were many reforms to be carried out. We discussed the question of taxation and the fact that many wealthy Greeks were avoiding taxation. He said, "It is undoubtedly so, but we do not have the power at this time to enforce such taxation, much as I should like to do it. I should like to see the Government do it, but I recognize at the same time the very great difficulties under which the Government must carry on with the Soviet sword suspended over their heads."

He said, "A little group of us, the liberal party, decided to cooperate with our Government in this hour of crisis, although we still adhere to our ideals and ideas." He stated that they had separated from some of their colleagues.

We went from the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister to be received by the new King Paul and his queen, Fredericka. It has been a matter of discussion that Greece is still a monarchy. Our visit with the King and Queen was most interesting. We are not very familiar with kings and queens. It has been my fortune to meet a few in my travels around the world.

We were received by them about 8:30 in the evening. They had a few sandwiches for us and we stood around talking with them alone for half an hour. It was an interesting experience and afforded an opportunity to appraise what kind of people they were, which I think is a matter of some importance to America. I had seen King George, the predecessor of King Paul, when he was here. Everyone recognized that he was a rather austere, reserved character. He was a diminutive figure who had the concept that being king was a job, and that one had to carry it with him. So he rather repelled popular acclaim. When he appeared in public he did not attract the people. Whatever other good qualities he possessed, there is no doubt that he did not possess the quality of popular appeal.

King Paul, his successor, is a very different type, as I think the newspapers have indicated. One would think that he was an all-American fullback from a college football team. He is 6 feet or more tall, and splendidly built. Apparently he is in perfect physical condition. Although he is 45 years of age, he has a long record and a reputation as an athlete. That has been one of his occupations. He is a very fine looking gentleman. The only difficulty I found with him was that he still wore a monocle. I thought that if he ever came to America his public relations adviser had better get rid of the monocle. But he wore it with a skill which did him credit. He did not have a ribbon on it. It stuck all right. I suppose he was demonstrating his ingenuity.

But he had very tough competition. Personally I took pity on him and remained to talk with him, because all the rest of our delegation had clustered around the Queen, who is one of the most intriguing and interesting young ladies it has ever been my privilege to see. I do not think it was because she was decorated with a queenly crown. I have never met a more charming young lady, even among American girls—and I do not wish to compare them to their disadvantage, because I am sure they can measure up.

The Queen is a slip of a creature who appears to be about 21 years of age, although, I believe, she is really 27, and has three children. She has a very pleasing personality. The entire delegation was charmed. However, one of our comrades who is somewhat to the left, and who had evidently read something about her German background, perhaps in order to put her on the spot, proceeded, to my consternation and that of the others, suddenly to say—I do not think he even said Your Royal Highness—"I would like to know about your ancestry and education." The Queen looked a trifle aghast, as did the rest of us. In the pause which followed he repeated, with even more firmness, "I would like to know about your ancestry and education." At that point the Queen, with perfect composure, said with great simplicity and directness, "I was born a pure-blooded barbarian, and I came to Greece to be civilized."

I thought that that was not bad for any young lady under those circum-

stances. She said not a word about her great-grandmother, Queen Victoria, whom she might, at least, have brought into the picture to alleviate her German background. She "took it on the chin."

In my discussions with both the King and Queen I thought that perhaps some divine dispensation was moving me to have considerable confidence in what they outlined to us that they had in mind to do. This was apparently not known to our embassy. We were questioned very closely about it in subsequent discussions when we returned. We were asked, "What did the King and Queen have to say?"

The Queen indicated that she had a rather comprehensive program of child welfare, which included legislation which she hoped to have submitted to the Parliament, and which she hoped would be approved, looking to the welfare of the children of Greece.

It may be added that long before she had ascended to her present place she had given herself wholeheartedly to this work. We were told that by others, including the officials of our embassy. She had gone about laboring without limit in hospitals and welfare institutions. She had gone to Salonika among the Communists and had been received by them, although she was warned against going there. She said, "Those people are in trouble, and that is where I belong." So it seemed that the King and Queen were both sincerely devoted to their people.

The King indicated that he intended to try to organize the young men of Greece over 16 years of age—taking up, apparently, where the Queen left off—into something comparable to our civilian labor corps, to restore Greek roads and Greek utilities. He proposed to lead those boys himself, which he was evidently perfectly capable of doing. He told us with a smile that he had asked the members of the cabinet whether they would participate, and whether the 73-year-old Prime Minister would come out the first day to start digging in the road.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator know that King Paul has considerable background and experience in the business of leading young men? He was the head of the Fascist Youth group under the dictator Metaxis. I have a picture in my office of King Paul with his Youth Group giving the Fascist salute.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad that he has had experience.

Mr. TAYLOR. It helps.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am simply giving the impressions which I formed. As I shall subsequently say, I hold no brief for the King and Queen on the basis of this brief interview. My whole attitude in supporting this measure is to buy time. It has come upon us suddenly. I wish we had much more time to consider it. I am not sure that it was not forced upon us for certain reasons. But I am certainly giving the President the benefit of the doubt. I feel that at the end of 12 or 15 months we shall know much more than we now know.

So far as I am concerned, the King, the Queen, the Prime Minister, and the

Foreign Minister are all on probation. By their fruits we shall know them. If 10 months from today the fears which many feel prove to be justified, it certainly will have great weight with me. I am simply trying to give my impressions. If they were selling us a bill of goods, they did a good job.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been listening with great interest to the Senator's description. When he referred to the young men the statement struck me quite forcefully, because I have just finished reading an article on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would appreciate the Senator's comment on this evidence. I have heard a great many statements to the effect that Greece is a police state. Can the Senator reconcile the document which I hold in my hand with a police state? How does the Senator figure it out?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a newspaper article written by a reporter for a reputable newspaper. The dispatch, which comes from Greece, states that newspapers of all shades of opinion are published in Athens, but that after leaving the environs of the city if one is caught with such publications, it is as much as his life is worth.

Mr. BREWSTER. They are certainly circulated freely in Athens, which has a population of approximately a million. That seems to me to be a rather curious way to suppress them. We did not get out into the country, so I do not know what was going on out there; but I do not believe that anything like this attacking the administration, could be published in Russia or in Bulgaria.

Mr. TAYLOR. Probably not. The impression I obtained from the news article—and I shall have it placed in the RECORD, inasmuch as it has been mentioned—was that the publication of such newspapers was permitted in Athens in order to impress people with how fair they were.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is a pretty labored explanation. Does the Senator take it seriously? I have half a dozen such newspapers before me. They certainly contain considerable internal evidence. I had them translated over here.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am simply repeating what the newspaper article stated. I shall get it and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. This article is on the front page, together with a picture of Stalin:

THE THEORIES OF CLAUSEWITZ OUTMODDED

This article contains a letter written to Stalin by Colonel Razin, a professor of military history, and Stalin's reply.

Razin asks Stalin if articles such as one published by Colonel Baz in a military journal which say that Clausewitz's theories have been outmoded are not anti-Leninistic and, therefore, bad for the morale of the Red Army.

Stalin replies that Lenin approved of the theories of Clausewitz only as a statesman and not as a military expert. He approved the general theories of Clausewitz, some of which were Marxist, but he did not claim to be an expert on military tactics and, therefore, did not pass judgment on the military aspect of Clausewitz's book. It is, therefore, not being untrue to Lenin to criticize these theories which, according to Stalin, are outmoded in this day of mechanized warfare.

That is interesting and illuminating. I thought the cartoons were more illuminating as revealing both the origin and the character of the thing, but I thought the explanation that this is published for the benefit of American visitors was a trifle strained.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I say, I shall get the clipping to which I referred. I am not saying that that is my estimate of it.

Mr. TAYLOR subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, during the exchange which I had with the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on the question of Communist newspapers published in Athens, I stated that I had read a newspaper article saying that newspapers were published but not permitted to circulate outside Athens. I should like to read a clipping at this time and, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Maine, I should like to have it inserted in the RECORD. It is a dispatch by Raymond Daniel, dated at Athens, April 4, and appearing in the New York Times under date of April 5. It is as follows:

The Government boasts that there is no censorship in Greece. That is true. Communist and other left-wing papers are sold freely in Athens. But right-wing bands see to it that they are not distributed outside the capital. It is worth a man's life to be seen reading a liberal daily in most communities in the provinces.

Right-wing bands recently turned machine guns on the office of the Communist newspaper in Salonika, killing several employees, at least two of whom were anti-Communists. No one has been punished for this, nor has there been punitive action against the rightists who raided the jail in Laconia, killing more than 30 persons in cold blood.

Greece is beginning to take on some aspects of a police state, although that is not surprising in view of the circumstances. There is a security law that enables the police to deport without trial persons suspected of subversive action. Recently in Athens 560 persons were routed from bed by security police at night and whisked to the Aegean Islands in gestapo style.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, let me say that I am sorry, but I did not hear the Senator say from what newspaper the clipping was taken.

Mr. TAYLOR. The New York Times.

Mr. BALDWIN. Was it a clipping in the New York Times from a Greek paper?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; it is an article by Raymond Daniel, one of the New York Times' correspondents in Greece.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. What does the Senator mean when he says he is in favor of this \$400,000,000 loan to buy time.

Mr. BREWSTER. I mean that I frankly am not ready to take the alternative responsibility of denying it. I do not know whether the Senator heard me when I began my remarks, but I stated that I very much regretted that this matter had been precipitated so suddenly. If it could have come some months later, after we had received a report, it would have helped very much. But we are faced with a condition and not a theory, and I personally do not feel justified in taking the responsibility, under our con-

stitutional system, of denying this course. I am giving the President the benefit of the doubt, but serving notice upon him that if there is any diminution of bipartisan collaboration—I shall go further and say that if there is any failure to develop further a bipartisan attitude, which we know has not existed except with respect to the United Nations and certain matters in Europe—unless we develop further along that line, it seems to me that it will be extremely unfortunate while we are buying time if we cannot find out more about it.

I have considerable confidence in Turkey. I saw many soldiers there who looked to me as if they were ready to fight. They were stocky, rugged men. Economically Turkey looked progressive and developing. I have high hope that Turkey will justify our confidence.

Greece has a terribly tragic problem. Many years ago when President Monroe declared the Monroe Doctrine he stated that he would consider a loan to Greece. Apparently the same problem has continued for a century.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course, conditions were different a hundred years ago. We now have a definite set of conditions. Does not the Senator think that we could buy the time he is talking about just as well by not accepting the military implications and becoming involved in a very serious situation the answer to which no one seems to be able to give at the present moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not as much disturbed over that aspect as some others may be. Personally I am not burning any bridges in connection with this matter; I am not embarking on any world program of extending our culture or democracy to all the world. I do not think we can make democracies by outside force. I think they come from within and not from without.

Mr. HAWKES. That is what I said yesterday in my speech. I do not know whether the Senator was here or not. I said we could do a thousand times more by setting an example to show that democracy will work, and make the people of the world want it, than we could do with all the bullets, bayonets, and bombs in the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is no comparison. I take the teaching of the Bible, that "I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me." I think that is the only way we can make democracy in the world, as we demonstrate the virility and power of our own democracy and our own system. We are doing a job, but we have a greater job ahead. I am not in favor of abandoning Greece to what would undoubtedly result in a Communist infiltration.

Mr. HAWKES. I would not abandon Greece at this point. I think the only difference between the Senator's position and mine is that I would not embark upon this world-wide situation without letting the people of the United States have a say about it. I want to say to the distinguished Senator, for whom I have a very high regard, that I have talked with thousands of American citizens, and I want to make this prediction: It will be found as we go along that hundreds and thousands and millions of American citi-

zens do not want again to go into war. They want to make the United Nations work. That is their one and only hope.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I hold the Senator in equally high regard, but it would certainly be begging the question, it seems to me, to say that those who advocate this measure are advocating leading the United States into war. I am sure the Senator did not mean to intimate that.

Mr. HAWKES. Oh, no.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are taking a method which we think is best calculated to keep us out of war. We are fallible and human. I am sure the Senator will admit that others are also.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that everything which has been put before Congress in the last few years has had to be solved immediately before Congress had time fully to understand it, because of an emergency.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; and that is what I do not like.

Mr. HAWKES. And I say that the emergency method of reaching decisions without knowing the facts and the implications will ultimately destroy the United States. I do not mean that the distinguished Senator thinks that it is leading this Nation into war. I know he wants peace as much as I do, or as anyone else does, but the point I am making is that the whole history of the world shows that nation after nation has taken steps which it expected to retrace if they were found to be wrong. But the world is not built that way. Sometimes in a bad place there is many a man who would not have gone to pieces if he had been able to get out of the place he had gotten into and had been able to protect and save himself.

Mr. BREWSTER. In 1921 I was very hopeful that this Nation would be a member of the League of Nations. I formed the League To Enforce Peace in the State of Maine, as a young man out of the last war. I think the Senator and others will agree that we took the other course. We picked up our marbles and came home and thought we had taught the world a lesson. It did not seem to work. We landed in a worse mess than we had been in before.

For the past 15 years, as a Member of the House and Senate, I have supported all measures calculated to strengthen our hand in our international dealings, over the bitter opposition of most of my friends, as well as those on the other side of the aisle. A few years ago very few of us felt the danger which inhered in our being inadequately prepared, and we took a course certainly calculated not to intervene or to be active in foreign affairs, and yet there occurred the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say that what disturbs me is the very thing the Senator is discussing. I think we did contribute, perhaps indirectly, to the

destruction of the League of Nations. I thought that this time we had determined to be a part of the United Nations and to try to make it work.

Of course, the Senator from Maine and I have a right to have a difference of opinion on this matter, just as all men have a right to have differences of opinion, so long as they keep faith with their consciences and believe they are all right. But I make the prediction that once we circumvent the United Nations, and play a lone hand in the world, we shall find that all the countries that are in distress will, one after another, come to our front door and ask for assistance. I have not yet seen any exchequer in the United Nations which can be used to solve their problems. When we refuse to help one nation, after we have done something for another nation, the result will be what I predicted yesterday, namely, that we shall incur the enmity and the hatred of nation after nation in the world; and after having been the greatest philanthropist and the greatest humanitarian nation on earth, we shall end up in disrepute and shall have lost our friends.

I make that prediction. The Senator from Maine can wait to see whether it comes true; he is young enough to do that, whereas I may not live to see it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey heard me say this, but I predicated my remarks today by stating my profound regret over the failure of the United Nations and I said that for many months I have felt that since it has seemed impossible for the other nations to get along with Russia, the world must show whether it can get along without her; that if there is a party that seems to think it is indispensable, it is time for it to go. That was a principle which guided me when I was Governor of Maine—that if any man serving under me thought I could not get along without him, it was certainly time for me to do so. I take a similar position in regard to Russia, namely, that she has been using the veto in a manner incompatible with the successful functioning of the United Nations, and that therefore we should move in the direction of getting along without her. I expressed my profound regret that this problem was precipitated on our doorstep by the sudden action of Britain in withdrawing aid, and I said I hoped we could have the aid of the report of the United Nations' commission to Greece before we took action.

As the Senator knows, I have just returned from abroad. In Cairo we saw the whole European group trying to obtain reparations. The fact that in the end the cost of the reparations would come out of the pocket of the United States did not trouble them at all. But they discovered that they had taken the wrong course, that they could not get reparations through the Secretary of State, George Marshall, or through our Government, because our representatives said, "No; we will not do that."

However, I have sufficient respect for their intellectual processes to believe that they will quickly emulate the step that has been taken by Greece and Tur-

key, and will put themselves in a similar position.

I have no doubt that the pending proposal is not the only one we shall face, but that in the course of the next few years we shall face many similar ones; and I have no magic formula for answering all the problems we shall inevitably confront.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more, briefly?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further, because I am sure I know his attitude and his purposes, and they appeal to me strongly.

Let me say that the abandonment by the British of their Empire must have appealed to the Senator from Maine as presenting a very complicated problem. Now we find that it is proposed that we step into it. If we do take that step, I think we shall regret it as long as we live. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Maine knows that except for their sheer inability to carry on, the representatives of Britain would not be saying in meeting after meeting that their Empire is practically through. The other noon, 30 or 40 Senators heard a member of the House of Commons admit that the British cannot hold their Empire together, that Britain is through. That was an amazing statement. I think the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was present; and, in all, 30 or 40 Senators were there.

Now we are stepping into something about which we know nothing.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Jersey does not quite mean that. We know a little something about it, but there is a great deal that we do not know.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course. I was in Greece in 1945, after the war; I spent several days there. We have sent Paul Porter over there, and he has found out all about Greece.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Greeks do not want him back.

Mr. HAWKES. The Greeks do not want him back?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. HAWKES. Well, he has made a report that is having the result of carrying this Nation to a place where I do not think it should go.

I simply say to the Senator from Maine that the fact is that the British have let go in this situation, and we are about to step into it. I think we all have great respect for those in Britain who wish to preserve individual liberty and freedom; but the fact is that Britain is now stepping out of that situation, and we are stepping into it—stepping into something for which we are not trained in any way, and we do not know the implications at all. With all due regard to all the brilliant men in the Senate of the United States, I say that not one Member of the Senate has the slightest idea of what is going on in Europe. Our knowledge of European affairs is merely a little skim along the surface. I myself have some knowledge of European conditions; I have been in business in Europe, as perhaps the Senator from Maine knows. I have gone there twice

every year for 19 years. But even so, I do not know much about Europe. I am sure the same thing is true of people who take a trip there and shake hands with several persons, and then return to the United States—like my dear friend Eric Johnston, who went to Russia for a week, and then returned to the United States and wrote a wonderful book about Russia. He did not understand a word of Russian. He had to use an interpreter, and he never knew whether the interpreter was correctly interpreting a word he said or a word that was said to him in response to the questions he asked.

Mr. President, I have said to the Senator from Maine about all I wish to. I have a very firm conviction that we are about to take a step which we shall regret the rest of our lives.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the force of what the Senator from New Jersey has said, and I also appreciate the background for his remarks.

If one may be pardoned for learning a lesson from the ancient civilizations, which we have visited—the Acropolis and the Roman Forum—let me remind the Senator that Socrates once was asked by a young man whether he should get married. Socrates replied, "Whatever you do, you will regret it."

There, Mr. President, is some of the cynicism of the ages. I am sure that 1, 2, or 5 years from today it may easily be possible for anyone to stand up in the Senate and demonstrate conclusively how wrong almost everyone else was. No one knows what may happen in this situation. Twenty-five years ago we took one course which we thought was the proper one, but we finally arrived at Pearl Harbor.

Since the war I have rather felt that the American people have been dedicated to a different course. The Senator from New Jersey says, and I agree with him, that by following the course now proposed we would seem to be bypassing the United Nations. I profoundly regret that, and I hope it is only a temporary matter.

Mr. President, why are we bypassing the United Nations? We do so partly, perhaps, because we were precipitated into the situation. I regret that that is so; I think the administration should have waited until the United Nations Commission's report on Greece was available. I believe that should have been done, and I have said so many times.

The other reason for bypassing the United Nations is that Russia has consistently refused to cooperate with the United Nations or to permit the United Nations to form any military security organization or group or to permit the United Nations to have any means of handling such situations. Certainly we know what the Russian attitude would be in the present situation; the Russians have indicated it already.

So, Mr. President, although I say it is unfortunate, and although we think that if we could have pursued the other course it would have been more fruitful, meanwhile the situation in Greece has certainly been deteriorating, and Greece is the last outpost.

I have said before that Europe is converting from coal to oil. Oil is in the Middle East, and we might as well be realistic about the situation and realize that that is a stake in this affair. That does not mean the establishment of an oil empire. It means that oil alone can enable Europe to get back on a self-sustaining basis. If it becomes possible for oil to be laid down in Europe at 75 cents or \$1 a barrel, perhaps we shall not have to support European countries for the next 25 years, and perhaps we shall not have to fight another war.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield at this point?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am pleased to hear the Senator say what he has said, because I think he and I hold very similar views, even though we shall vote differently. I wish to say that I would not let a charter, something written on a piece of paper, keep 49 nations from having peace in the world, just because one nation wished to resist that effort and was determined to do things that the other 49 nations did not wish to do. In that event, I would change that charter, and would still keep faith with that great organization. If we do precisely that we shall save time by losing time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have said earlier in my remarks; and, as I have already said, I predicated my remarks upon that.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes. As I have said, Mr. President, I am glad to know that the Senator from Maine agrees with me, even though I know that he and I will vote differently.

I might say to the Senator that I have lived long enough to know that the only thing that makes it safe to make mistakes is that nobody can prove you make a mistake, because nobody can prove what would have happened if the other thing had been inaugurated instead of what was done.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a comfortable position in which the Senator from New Jersey is going to find himself.

Mr. HAWKES. It is comfortable for the Senator and his associates, because we can never prove that if they had not done what they are about to do, the country would have been better off.

Mr. BREWSTER. The converse is true, that we who vote for the course that is taken must take the responsibility. We can never prove that those in the minority are wrong, because the course we advocate is adopted, for better or for worse.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to make a further statement to the distinguished Senator from Maine. The people of the United States are just beginning to understand what this is all about, and I wish to reemphasize what I said last night, that the first 2 weeks after the President made his address my mail was 4 or 5 to 1 in favor of the Greek-Turkish loan. Today my mail is running 4 or 5 to 1 just the other way. I have talked to audiences on this subject, and everyone who begins to understand the implications of the proposal says "No; we should not circumvent the United Na-

tions, and we do not want to get into war."

The Senator has been away. I have been looking around the United States, while the Senator has been looking at Egypt and Greece, and I have stated what I have found in the United States. I can show the Senator some very interesting mail in my office asking, "Why do you not wait until we understand this?"

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly entertain no ideas of omniscience, either from previous experience or from this latest exploration. I said also, in beginning my remarks, in order to show appropriate humility, that anyone who spends more than 24 hours in a country is no longer an expert on it.

I should like to conclude on this note, that we are in very troublous times, and I think we must move toward mobilizing world opinion within the forum of the United Nations. I think we are here setting a precedent of unilateral action which undoubtedly will rise up to plague us. I think we can justify it in the interim, but if it were to afford the pattern, if this were to furnish the precedent, for America going all over the world and mixing into the internal affairs of every country, I would agree with anyone here that it would be a catastrophe without precedent in our history, or that of any nation in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says it would be a precedent?

Mr. BREWSTER. A precedent.

Mr. WHERRY. A precedent and a pattern?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what he would have us do when the next move was made, when we begin to unveil this pattern. Certainly the State Department must have a pattern of what they are going to do in Italy. Italy now wants \$100,000,000. I understand she needs it to make the first payment on the reparations to Russia.

What would the Senator have us do when France comes and asks for another loan? What would he have us do when England comes and asks for another loan? We are told we are going to give them a billion dollars by next July.

What would the Senator have us do when we try to reestablish the economy in Germany? I have been told the peace of Europe depends on what we do in Germany, and that it is going to take \$6,000,000,000.

When we get through with continental Europe, what are we to do when Korea comes in and asks for from six hundred million to a billion dollars? What are we going to do when China comes in and asks for from six hundred million to a billion dollars?

If we do in Greece and in Turkey what is proposed, under the theory that we want to preserve the independence of those countries, are we not establishing a precedent whereby we will have to

grant the loans if these other countries come and ask for them?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what troubles me. It seems to me we have just as much obligation in Germany, where we have permitted the Potsdam agreement to undermine absolutely the economy of that country, fastening a starvation living upon its people. The Senator knows as much about that as I do, or more. I ask him, What are we to do when they come forward and ask to be rehabilitated? Certainly, if we are ever to establish peace in Europe, we have to start in now and terminate or cancel every secret agreement that works in direct contradiction to the freedom of those people. They are asking for freedom, just as the people in Greece are asking for it.

Certainly, if there is a people on earth we have to take care of, it is the people of Korea, because we are occupying that country. I do not see how we can get away from that.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania brought out the first suggestion that opened my eyes, that this is only the beginning. If we are to stop communistic aggression, directly or indirectly, in all these countries—and that is the statement in the President's message—then we must be prepared quickly to grant these loans; we must fit in not merely two pieces of this great jigsaw puzzle, but we must finish the complete puzzle, and we must give aid to those other countries, if we are to keep faith with their people, and insure their independence and peace.

How can we say we will give aid to Greece and then deny it to all the others? If we do, how are we going to stop communism? How are we going to stop communism in Italy if we do not grant Italy a loan? How are we going to stop communism in France if we do not grant France a loan? How are we going to stop it anywhere, where there is aggression?

There is the same occasion to grant aid to France as to Greece. Of course, Greece is almost obliterated. I am sorry for the Greeks. They are devastated. Their transportation is gone. They are probably at an economic level as low as they could reach, and my heart goes out to them. But conditions in other countries are just as bad as in Greece.

I suggest to the able Senator from Maine, because I have the deepest respect for him, that if we start in with Greece and Turkey, we cannot say we will not do something similar when other countries come forward and ask for loans.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the questions, and also the feeling of the Senator. I may remind him that my attitude regarding the British loan has not determined my view regarding the Greek loan. So far as I am concerned, I do not consider that our attitude in any of these matters is determined by our action on any one.

The Senator referred to obligations. I do not consider that we are entering into obligations to anyone at any time. If we make a loan to Greece and Turkey,

we make a loan. I have a good many reservations and doubts, but I am giving the President and his advisers the benefit of the doubt for a time.

The Senator says the line is forming on the right. That may be true. We will have to determine our action as time goes on. We realize the German situation, the Korean situation, and all the others. It seems to me we have to live from hand to mouth, so to speak.

Whatever were the reasons why Britain suddenly abandoned Greece, I do not know. I wish they had carried on 2 or 3 months longer, say to July 1, so that we would have had time to think the matter over. I am not burning any bridges behind me in this affair. I think a great deal of what happens is going to be determined by the manner and the method of administration. I think the men who are selected to handle the thing, and their method of handling it, so far as I am concerned, will have much to do with its success.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President—

Mr. BREWSTER. One other statement before the Senator from New Jersey speaks. I think we all have lessons to learn in procedure, and I hope that this discussion will serve as a salutary warning to our executive departments to be perhaps more frank and more open and more mature, if I may use the word, in their approach to the Senate of the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. My experience in life has taught me that whenever anyone makes an immature request and it is granted, it does not serve as a lesson. My whole life has taught me that when anyone comes to me with an immature, an ill-considered, or a not thoroughly considered request, and I say, "Yes, all right; I do not like it, but all right," the next time he comes right back with another.

I have always trained men to work with me in this way, that when they made a request for something which had not been considered, it was turned down or was delayed until we gave it consideration.

I want to ask the Senator from Maine a question. He may have known more than I did about it, but I never heard a word about England pulling out of Greece on March 31, until the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate (Mr. VANDENBERG) told us in caucus just the day before the message was delivered. Does the Senator from Maine think it fair to me, to himself, to the other Senators, and to the people of the United States, to have us lead them into this thing without time to know all the facts and reflect upon them? After all, it is they who fight the wars, not us; it is they who pay the bills, not us; and if we lead them into a situation from which they cannot extricate themselves, it is we who must take the blame and have it put squarely upon our own shoulders.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I trust that statement does not carry the implication that I have withheld information and suddenly given it to the Senate.

Mr. HAWKES. No, no. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Michigan simply emphasizes my point, and I think he will agree with me that so far as we know nobody on this side of the aisle, at least, knew one word about this thing until the day before, March 12, 1947.

Mr. BREWSTER. Two days before.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well, the day or two days before the President delivered his message. My point is this: We are not talking about our own lives. We are not talking about our own future and our own welfare. In the history of the United States since this great country was founded, there have been—I do not have the exact figures—approximately 10,000 men and women who have represented the people of the United States in the Congress. There have been only about 70 Justices of the Supreme Court and 12 Chief Justices, and 32 men who have served as President of the United States of America. The figures are astounding. There have only been about 8,500 Representatives in Congress and 1,400 or 1,500 Senators. Those figures should impress us with the responsibility that rests on our shoulders. I cannot wash it off. I know something about the war through which we have recently passed. I paid a price in that war that was half of everything I had in this world, and there are other Senators here who paid a similar price. I am saying to the Senator from Maine that it is incumbent upon him, and I am saying to all other Senators that it is incumbent upon them, to think well before taking this step which does not have to be taken, and to realize that this question does not have to be handled in the way it is being.

I would give Greece \$100,000,000—give it to her. I would give her \$200,000,000, and I would leave out the military implications. I would have given England \$400,000,000 and would have let her remain in there, because she knows, back through all history, the habits and the sophistries and the intrigues of those people. And then I would like to have what the distinguished Senator from Maine says he would like to have—and I think the suggestion is very wise, but he is going to vote the other way—namely, time to consider this far-reaching proposal. I want to tell Senators that, if I know anything in this world, I know that the American people would like to have time to consider it themselves and let their representatives know what they want.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not wanted to interrupt the Senator. I assumed that he was entitled to make his own speech, but I cannot allow this persistent drumfire to go without at least a casual rejoinder. I fully understand how keenly the able Senator from New Jersey feels about this question, but I should like to have the Senator from Maine know that I feel just as keenly that, if at this strategic point we surrender to Communist aggression, we have set in motion a chain reaction which may make it impossible

for us ever again peacefully to meet the Russian menace. So far as I am concerned, I am just as deeply and conscientiously wedded to the fact and the belief and the conviction that the step we are proposing to take is essential to the peace of the United States, as the able Senator from New Jersey feels otherwise. I have said 50 times on this floor that no man has the right to be dogmatic about it. The Senator may be right; I may be right; but our opinions differ in respect to a net result.

In my opinion, if the Senate of the United States should decline to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in this emergency, America would have sacrificed her moral and spiritual leadership for all time in the great conflict which sweeps this earth between two rival ideologies.

I insist that there is a chance for Moscow and Washington to live together—"live and let live" in the same world, providing we now make it perfectly plain to Moscow on the one hand that we intend nothing but scrupulous fair play to her, and on the other hand, that there are deadlines—I say it again—in our ideals, which we will not surrender; and, except as this latter fact is established in the Russian conscience, we shall never have a chance to settle this rivalry short of war. So my opinion is just as deeply attached to my conscience as is that of the able Senator from New Jersey, to his conscience, that the course I shall support is the peace course, and the course he supports is the course which makes peace almost impossible.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that any manifestation of approval or disapproval by the occupants of the galleries is contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want to prolong this argument, but I should like to say that I have never implied that the Senator from Michigan was not hewing to his conscience. All that he has said in that grand speech does not change the fact one iota that the people of the United States have not had a chance to consider this thing. If the Senator does not believe what I am saying, let him go through the country and hear what I am hearing. Let him see what I am receiving in my office.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I certainly appreciate how he feels about the subject of war and peace. I also have such respect and admiration for the success of the Senator from New Jersey in private as well as public life that I have a great deal more respect for his opinion than for that of any plebiscite which can be conducted through the medium of the mail.

I have seen the Senator from New Jersey reject the conclusions of his mail on many an occasion, because he did not believe that it accurately reflected the

interests of the country that he was sworn to protect. A Senator takes an oath to uphold the Constitution and do his duty, here. He has a little duty, himself. It is not a matter of a mail referendum, which, as Senators know, may be stimulated in a variety of ways. I have had several hundred letters of one kind and another that were mere propaganda pieces.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand that I am talking about a mail referendum. I have gone out and talked with hundreds of people, and I have talked to them very earnestly and sincerely. It is not the mail referendum. It has been an exchange of viewpoints in which a person could say one thing and get an answer in return. So I do not want the Senator to think I am talking simply about a mail referendum. I am talking about the over-all picture.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think our responsibility here is greater than that of any other people in this country, because we are paid to serve here and are sworn to do a job, and we ought to know more about this question than almost anyone else, because this is primarily our responsibility, and we presumably have sources of information, and so on. We recognize our limitations; we try to carry on; and I am sure that the Senator has not, in any words he used, meant to imply any doubt as to the sincerity with which others of us were pursuing the cause of peace. His language constantly is that we are following a war part.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I must ask the Senator to yield to me, there, because under no circumstances do I wish to imply the lack of sincerity on the part of any Senator. But I do want to repeat something which I think is worth while remembering by every representative of the people. Abraham Lincoln said, when he ran for Congress, "If I am elected and go to Washington, I shall try to represent fairly all those who opposed me, as well as those who supported me. I shall make it my business to try to ascertain what my constituents believe is right and should be done. I shall use every effort to ascertain this, but if I find I am unable to do it or if I find I cannot keep faith with the Constitution in doing it, then I shall have to use my own judgment."

I am not sure that there is anything in the Constitution which gives us the right to loan to countries all over the world, hundreds of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and lead them into a situation of this kind. I have talked with some very able lawyers, who think that the question of constitutionality should be raised as to the authority of this Nation, not under attack, to grant away the money of the people, obtained by the power of taxation, without knowing the will of the people.

Mr. BREWSTER. The question is to me not free from doubt. Irrespective of the constitutionality of the proposal, I think we are embarking upon a new course taken under very distressing circumstances. The Senator says there has not been an expression of the people.

The last campaign, so far as I know, was conducted so far as this side of the aisle was concerned, against communism.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; and in favor of economy, too.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. The thought was "get tough with communism." It embarrasses me a little when the President takes us at our word and suggests that he is going to get tough with communism, to note how quickly some would seem to want us to pull out from under and say, "You should not have believed what we said."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does not the Senator think that the people of the United States meant "get tough with communism" inside the borders of the United States, and not outside?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the American people are so simple as to think that communism is simply confined to the United States.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not saying that.

Mr. BREWSTER. The whole concept of communism has been a world ideology.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Whether or not communism is on the march to take over the world is the question we are considering. If it is that, then the sooner we stop it the better.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one moment, and then I shall not ask him to yield again?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say that I understand the people of the United States are not so simple as to think that communism is confined to the United States. I never suggested that. I have spoken with hundreds of people on this subject. If the Senator will go over the country and talk with them he will find that they say, "Why do you not get your own house in order before you go out to clear up the whole world?" They want to see us clean the communistic elements out of our Government. The President of the United States, himself, has brought that out lately. That is all I mean.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state to the distinguished Senator that the reason for the observation I am about to make and the question I shall finally ask him is that I am one who is trying to make up his mind about this question. I have tried to keep my mind open. I have listened to the debate which has taken place. I wish to ask a question, and I should like to have the Senator from Michigan hear my question. I think the statement made by the Senator from Michigan a little while ago that the choice he was making was the choice for peace, and that the choice which the Senator from New Jersey had already made might not be for peace, is not justified by the facts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is not what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. If I misunderstood the Senator, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me to repeat what I said?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I would not for anything in the world want to misquote the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I should like to be corrected if I did not understand him correctly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I said the course I was pursuing I thought led to peace, precisely as the Senator from New Jersey thought the course he was pursuing led to peace.

Mr. WHERRY. I will restate the question then.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is no criticism of the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Nebraska, or anybody else.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as yet I have not said what I was going to say. I do not wish the Senator to get the impression that I am saying anything in criticism of him. What I have been trying to do is to understand what the Senator from Michigan said. There was no criticism intended. The Senator from Michigan seems, for some reason, when questions are propounded to him, not only to resent them sometimes, but he has been a little impatient with those who try to seek light upon the subject. I certainly do not mean to misquote the Senator. I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and he knows it. But I want to tell him that this is the most important vote I shall have cast since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, and I shall ask questions and secure as much light as possible before I cast my vote, and I am not going to be intimidated or stamped by anyone in my endeavor to secure all the light and information possible, so as to be able to make up my mind on the subject.

If the distinguished Senator from Michigan means that it is his opinion that the following course he advocates leads to peace, of course he has the right to his opinion, and to follow that course. But I want to receive all the information I can, so as to enable me, before I vote, to decide whether the pathway to peace is the one proposed by the Senator from New Jersey or whether the pathway to peace is the one proposed by the Senator from Michigan, and which he now follows.

The other day I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan, "What if we were to take the other course from that advocated by the Senator from Michigan?" The Senator calls it a matter of compliance or noncompliance. I can easily understand what the result will be if we do not comply, because I can visualize that communism will overrun Greece and Turkey. I think there is no doubt about that. But on the other hand I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. At that point let me say I think there is a clear distinction between Greece and Turkey.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is true. Let us speak, then, of Greece. The Senator from Maine has just come from Greece. Yesterday I asked the Senator from Michigan the question: "What will be the price we pay if we do comply and go into Greece, and Russia comes down and overruns Greece just the same, and bloodshed results. What will the price be then?" I would not want to misquote him for the world, not after the remarks he has just made, but I think the Senator said, "Your guess is as good as mine," or words to that effect. I ask the Senator from Maine, What does he think the price will be?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is what I think it will be. I do not think the Soviet is ready to fight us.

Mr. WHERRY. I said if they did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me answer.

Mr. WHERRY. I said if they did.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will come to that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the Soviet Government is ready to start a war. That is why I asked the Senator from Nebraska to eliminate the Turkish situation, because there is every indication that the Turks are lined up on the border and that they mean business. Even if they all die in their tracks, they look perfectly capable of doing it. Britain and the other 54 United Nations are pledged, if there is an act of aggression against the Turks, to come to their aid individually or collectively. That is why I want the Senator to leave the Turkish situation out of the question because I think they will fight if they are attacked, and if they are attacked the rest of the world will come to their aid. The result will be a world-wide war.

So as far as Greece is concerned the Russians will certainly pursue the policy of infiltration through Bulgaria, Macedonia, and other countries just so long as they can by the various methods through which they have taken over other Balkan countries. I think the prospect of an open Soviet attack upon Greece is so remote at this time that we do not need to take it into our calculation.

As I said, I am buying time. I am buying 15 months. I favor the idea, as the Senator from New Jersey suggested, of \$100,000,000 grant. Even if we have to give \$100,000,000 to Britain, I say, go ahead there and take care of them for the next 3 or 4 months and let us study this problem. I would have preferred that solution. But that did not seem to me to meet with effective response. I believe the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, at one time suggested that idea. I thought it was a good idea. But there seemed to be reasons why that was not more seriously considered and proposed.

So we came back to the original proposal. I am ready to vote for \$400,000,000 for 15 months. I am going to observe very carefully what is done with that money, how it is administered, how it is handled, what the Greek Government does, what the Soviet Government does, what happens in Greece, and what happens in Turkey. We know now that we have a job on our hands, and I hope that 6 or 8 or 10 months from today

everyone in the Senate and in the United States will know a great deal more about these problems, in the Mediterranean and elsewhere, than we can possibly know today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly do not want to detain the Senator. I am sorry to break into his remarks. We are all interested in his report.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am practically through.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows that already Greece has had from the United States in the neighborhood of, I think, \$300,000,000, either through UNRRA or through other contributions or loans or grants or whatever they may be called. I understand that England has placed in Greece since the war nearly \$350,000,000. As I understand, the Greek economic situation is even worse today than it has been. Is that not correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not in a position to say. The whole area impressed me as being in a state of cultivation. The thought which constantly recurs is, Why cannot the Greeks feed themselves, as they have done for 5,000 years? It is felt that it should not take very much to get them back on a producing basis if the program were properly administered. This money can do a great deal of good. I hold no brief for what has been done heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator favor an amendment to this bill deleting military aid to Greece, and giving Greece \$250,000,000 for economic and agricultural relief exclusively?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I believe that military aid is very essential, to get them back on a going basis. Raids are obviously being made over the border, and supplies are being transported. If Soviet Russia can surreptitiously extend aid to the rebels, I do not see why we cannot extend aid to the established government.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event we should give military aid and there should be a conflict in which our military personnel were involved, resulting in bloodshed, would we be at war with Russia?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not under the present circumstances, because Russia is not showing her hand. She is operating behind the scenes.

Mr. WHERRY. If we should extend military aid and send our military personnel over there to bolster up the established government, as the Senator says, and Russia should come down from the north to aid the Communists, and there should be an engagement resulting in bloodshed, would we be at war?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not with Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. With whom would we be at war if that should happen?

Mr. BREWSTER. At the present time all that exists is what seems to be a Communist-inspired rebellion in Greece. We are extending aid to the established Greek Government, as we have done in many other instances. If any difficulty occurs, it is simply an internal problem so far as the record is concerned. We are open about it. Rus-

sia is secret. If Russia decides to move in and really start operations, we must then decide what to do. We must decide whether to back down. We must decide whether we are going to say, "If you want to attack Greece, go ahead. We are obligated under the United Nations to protect her. We are obligated in various ways, but you go ahead and take all the world you want, and when you get through we shall thank God if you leave us alone." We tried that theory 25 years ago. The Senator and I were both partners in this thing. The first thing we knew we landed in Pearl Harbor. I have conducted many investigations. One might make out more or less of a case on the ground that the President might have done things he should not have done; but by and large, without primary provocation on our part, we landed in a second first-class world war. I am as anxious as is the Senator to prevent the repetition of such a thing, and I am trying to find a course better calculated than our last one to prevent us from again landing in such a situation. I do not challenge the Senator's conclusions. I am not omniscient, and I do not claim to be. I think we shall all learn a great deal more in the next few years.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think the Senator has just said a very remarkable thing, and I hope he will stand by it. He has stated that he is not in favor of going further and further with such loans.

Mr. BREWSTER. I go along with this one with very great reluctance. I believe that democracy can spread itself only by example.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator from Nebraska inquired as to what the situation would be under certain circumstances and with whom we might be at war. I can tell the Senator with whom we may be at war. We may be at war with ourselves. We would be at war trying to find out where to get the money to pay our own bills and keep our own economy in shape if we were to become nationally bankrupt because of foolish, extended, and continuous loans to irresponsible nations and people who have no collateral and no security and little intention to pay.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his observations.

If the Senator from Maine will further yield, I stated that I would ask only one question. I distinctly recall that the distinguished Senator stated that he felt that inasmuch as the President had declared an all-out war on communism, we should all uphold his hands. I think we all want to uphold his hands.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not quite say that. I said that I would be a little embarrassed immediately to pull the rug out from under his feet. I am in favor of giving him a little latitude. We were pretty rough on him in the last campaign.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that I think the place to clean up communism is not only abroad, but here at home, as the Senator from New Jersey has said. I know that the Senator feels exactly as I

feel on that subject. Why do we go to Greece and spend \$400,000,000 to whip communism when we continue a communistic policy in South America? If this administration is sincere in its desire to eradicate communism, why does it not change its foreign policy in Argentina and the rest of the South American countries?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Nebraska has struck gold so far as I am concerned. I spent a month in South America during November and December, and I came to certain very strong conclusions. I was very much gratified when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his pronouncement at Cleveland on foreign policy, stated that our current policy so far as Argentina was concerned was not a matter on which he had been consulted or with which he was in sympathy. He felt that it was time for us to reconsider our policy regarding Argentina, and he indicated that similarly, in China, the time had come for a change of front.

I welcomed that attitude. I appreciate the fact that he had been preoccupied with the European settlement problem, and problems with respect to other areas, as to which he clearly indicated he had not been consulted except in a most casual manner. I assume that in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as soon as we can get a Secretary of State who will be in Washington for a couple of weeks, he would like to have an opportunity to sit down and talk things over, and that that subject would invite most earnest attention. I hope we shall move in that direction. I think it is high time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree in toto with what the distinguished Senator has said. I trust that the condition which he hopes for will come to pass. I suggest to the able Senator that we still have in the State Department Mr. Braden, who is responsible for communistic activities in Argentina. Nothing has been done about it. The administration asks us to spend \$400,000,000 in Greece to stop communism. The first place where we should start a clean-up is in our own backyard. Some of the top-flight men in the Department of State are the ones who should be eradicated.

Mr. BREWSTER. The problem is not simple, because in Brazil in the recent election the province of Sao Paulo, with the aid of the Communists, elected a governor. In Chile the President has three Communists in his Cabinet. That is the difficulty with implementing the so-called Presidential program. I was very much interested in the observations of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday as to whether this was a program, a policy, or a doctrine. I think we shall have some difficulty in formulating a policy and a doctrine to deal with this problem. I think it is much better to recognize that in Greece we confront a condition, and we are taking certain action. Under the circumstances

as they exist the President's proposal is a part of the problem. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt. In Turkey we have a somewhat different situation.

In those two situations we are at this time under the circumstances taking certain action with the hope, under high heaven, that we shall be enabled as the weeks and months go by to know more about this problem as we come into the struggle with this ideology. Whether Stalin, the men in Moscow, and the Politburo contemplate a world-wide sweep, such as the Nazis planned, can be determined only by events. There are certainly disquieting aspects in the situation. The most disquieting is that so long as there remains a dictatorship we always find situations involving the fomenting of disagreements. We saw in our recent journey to Egypt and the Near East remnants of civilizations of 5,000 years, and we can apply the same formula to them all. That is why, irrespective of the benevolent intentions of Mr. Stalin or anyone else, so long as their governments are dictatorships—and that is what they are, practically—we always find that peril. I think we must recognize it and must take such measures as seem justified to try to serve warning, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that "thus far and no farther shalt thou come. Thou shalt not pass."

That is the basis upon which I go forward with all the reservations I have indicated and with no disparagement or criticism of anyone who may disagree. Here I stand at this time. I can take no other.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of figures regarding lend-lease shipments to the Soviet Union since VJ-day, and related mathematics. I asked the State Department to prepare a factual statement on the subject for the information of the Senate, and for whatever it is worth I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

LEND-LEASE TO THE U. S. S. R.

I. LEND-LEASE ASSISTANCE TO THE SOVIET UNION DURING THE PERIOD OF HOSTILITIES

Lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union during the period of hostilities amounting to about \$11,100,000,000 was rendered under the terms of a master lend-lease agreement with the Soviet Government signed on June 11, 1942. Aid on this basis was ordered halted on VJ-day, September 2, 1945, and no further shipments were made except for goods then in process of loading or in transit to ship-side. Aid rendered from VE-day, May 12, 1945, to VJ-day, September 2, 1945, was solely for support of the Soviet Far Eastern Army and the strengthening of this area for operations against Japan. Ninety-five merchant ships now remain in Soviet possession out of the 126 which were transferred under the terms of the master agreement of June 11, 1942. The Soviet Government has now agreed to commence discussions for settlement of its obligations for lend-lease aid rendered under this agreement. These discussions will include the disposition of the 95 merchant ships.

II. LEND-LEASE SHIPMENTS TO THE SOVIET UNION SINCE VJ-DAY

On VJ-day, September 2, 1945, there remained in warehouses and in production quantities of lend-lease articles which had been ordered for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the period of hostilities. These articles were the residue of a larger quantity of orders, many of which were canceled shortly after the cessation of hostilities in Europe on VE-day, May 12, 1945. On October 15, 1945, an agreement was concluded with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act which reads in part as follows:

"Until July 1, 1949, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1946."

The agreement of October 15, 1945, was concluded independently of the master lend-lease agreement of June 11, 1942.

Under its terms the Government of the United States agreed to deliver and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed to accept under terms of payment stated below a specific quantity of these residual supplies. The supplies included in the schedules of this agreement consist primarily of industrial and transportation equipment fabricated to Soviet specifications. (No arms, ammunition, or implements of war were included for shipment under the agreement of October 15, 1945. It will also be noted from the tables below that no cargo trucks were included in the "pipe-line" schedule.) As a whole this equipment would have brought a limited return if disposed of in the United States as surplus. In many instances contract cancellation charges for material still in production on VJ-day would have been excessive. Up to December 31, 1946, materials valued at \$233,000,000 had been transferred to the Soviet Government under this agreement, and only about \$17,000,000 of equipment still remained untransferred, either located at warehouses or in production. All transfers are now suspended pending consideration by the Congress.

The articles shipped after VJ-day and up to December 31, 1946, were as follows:

Machine tools.....	\$40,850,000
Steam locomotives (Russian gage).....	30,634,000
Generator sets.....	22,800,000
Cranes, derricks, hoists, etc.....	8,129,000
Electric rotating equipment.....	8,633,000
Marine engines.....	6,824,000
Canned tushonka.....	4,054,000
Pumps.....	4,620,000
Crushing equipment.....	4,135,000
Valves and fittings.....	5,114,000
Gas-producing equipment.....	4,177,000
Secondary metal-forming machinery.....	4,956,000
Diesel electric locomotives (Russian gage).....	3,001,000
Industrial trucks and tractors.....	3,768,000
Fan and blower equipment.....	3,182,000
Power transmission equipment.....	3,162,000
Power conversion equipment.....	3,117,000
Rolling mills and equipment.....	3,372,000
Mine and quarry machinery.....	3,690,000
Insulated wire and cable.....	3,765,000
Bearings.....	2,893,000
Metal melting and heating furnaces.....	2,079,000
Welding machinery.....	2,965,000
Meal-cutting tools.....	2,289,000
Mine-type locomotives.....	2,085,000
Leather.....	2,117,000
Various industrial equipment and materials.....	46,589,000
Total.....	233,000,000

The equipment remaining to be transferred to the Soviet Government under the agreement is made up as follows:

Oil-refinery equipment to expand refineries shipped to the U. S. S. R. before the cessation of hostilities Sept. 2, 1945.....	\$6,972,000
Mine hoists.....	3,058,000
Locomotive-storage batteries.....	1,777,000
Power equipment.....	1,272,000
Electrical equipment.....	945,000
Mining equipment.....	674,000
Electric motors and controllers.....	350,000
Miscellaneous machinery and equipment.....	1,648,000

Total..... 16,696,000

Payment for articles covered by the "pipeline" agreement as set forth above is to be made over a period of 30 years ending in 1975, with interest at 2½ percent per annum. The first payment of interest will be due July 1, 1947. The first payment of principal will be due July 1, 1954.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite agree with my friends who state that the world must have a consistent policy in connection with these matters. So far as I can discover from the State Department's letter, three facts stand out: First, that no shipments of civilian lend-lease materials have been made to Russia since VJ-day, except for payment by Russia under the civilian pipe-line agreement concluded under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act.

Second, no lend-lease war materials have been shipped to Russia since VJ-day except those in transit on that date.

Third, no new procurement contracts for civilian or war lend-lease materials for shipment to Russia have been let since VJ-day.

At any rate, the full story is in the document which I presented for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I have the same document which the Senator has offered. It is a fact, is it not, as indicated on page 3 of the letter, that the equipment, which has been sold under lend-lease contracts extending over a period of 30 or 40 years, ending in 1975, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent, includes \$16,000,000 of which \$6,972,000 is for oil-refinery equipment which has not yet been sent to Russia, but is under agreement to be sold to Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's figures are correct. I am simply referring back to the fact that it is my understanding that this all occurred under an agreement made on October 15, 1945, which was approximately 5 weeks after VJ-day.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator; but the point which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was making yesterday and today was that this material has not yet been sent to Russia. It has been held up because the General Accounting Office would not O. K. authority for a credit of \$35,000,000 worth of merchandise, and included in that merchandise is the machinery for refining 100-octane gas. That is a very serviceable piece of equipment for Russia to have, especially if there should be any difficulty in a military way.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's statement is substantially correct. I do not understand that it is an oil refinery, but equipment to expand refineries. It is a distinction without a difference, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will yield a moment further, I should like to say that I happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations and heard the matter discussed when it came up. The members of that committee were surprised, inasmuch as lend-lease had terminated on December 31, 1946, that we were still sending to Russia under 30- and 40-year contracts, at 2½ percent interest, equipment which from a military standpoint would certainly meet the needs of that country if there should be military eventualities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's statement is correct, and it is being done, as the record will show, under an agreement made approximately 5 weeks after VJ-day. So far as my viewpoint is concerned, it is a very simple and clear one. I very deeply regret that those shipments are being made, but I shall more deeply regret it if we do not scrupulously keep our word with the Soviet Union with respect to these last lingering contracts, lest we should not be in a totally clear, clean, and positive position to challenge the Soviet Union for its failure to keep its promises and its contracts.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not want the Senator from Michigan to think that I intended to imply that I want the United States to break its word. I should be the last man to give authority to the Comptroller General to send this merchandise over there under the terms on which Russia bought it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it is one of the major contentions of those proposing this bill for military intervention in Greece that the action is necessary to fight communism.

I do not believe there are many people in the United States or many Members of this Senate who believe that it is possible to curb an idea by military methods. I think that has been demonstrated in China; and in that connection I cite a report by Mr. William Newton, a correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a dispatch from Yen-an which appeared in the Washington Daily News as recently as March 11.

Of course, Mr. President, since Mr. Newton sent the dispatch, the Central Chinese Government has overrun and captured Yen-an. But on March 11, here is what Mr. Newton wrote from Yen-an:

YENAN, March 11.—Here in the capital city of Red China the wind is biting cold and the people live in caves in the sides of the mountains.

They have none of the creature comforts of the big cities in the government areas. There is no electricity or water supply system and the only way to go any place is to walk or ride a donkey.

DIFFERENT SPIRIT

Their principal food is millet, a small-grained cereal which the peasants somehow manage to cultivate in the rough mountain country which makes the North Dakota Badlands look like a garden spot.

But there is a spirit here among the people which is too real to put down as Communist window-dressing, or studied propaganda.

There's a friendliness among the peasants and the soldier and officials. There's a consideration for the rights and the needs of others which is not seen in many of the Nationalist government areas.

Mr. President, that is a spirit which I believe would accrue to any party or organization which would oppose the unbearable oppression of the reactionary Chinese Government of Chiang Kai-shek. That is the kind of spirit which I believe was in the hearts of the American colonists when they fought for and won freedom from tyranny in 1776.

That is the kind of spirit, Mr. President, which exists in Greece today. And it is not born of communism unless communism is the only force opposing oppression and suffering.

If we align ourselves with the present Greek Government or the present Chinese Government, we must automatically try to kill that spirit, and I think that is an impossible job.

How much easier would be our task if we aided these oppressed peoples to throw off the yoke of reaction and tyranny, and if we generated for democracy that kind of spirit. How much better it would be, how much more in keeping with our own traditions, if instead of sending arms to the dictators, we would honor the memory of Lafayette by actively aiding other peoples to attain the freedom which Lafayette so nobly helped us achieve.

Mr. Newton's dispatch elaborates on that theme, as follows:

In most of China the people fear the Government. Here in Yen-an they feel they are a part of it. The difference is noticeable in a thousand ways as you walk through the dusty streets or call on the officials in their caves or humble offices. You can see it when a soldier helps a peasant find his way, when a farmer calls at a government office, or when a merchant pays his tax bill.

This feeling on the part of the peasant toward his government is new in China and it may be that it is the greatest accomplishment of the Chinese Communist leadership.

That is plain, Mr. President. They have not brought material prosperity to those people, but they have given them a feeling of belonging to their government, of having something to say about their government, of being a part of the scheme of things, and not just being kicked around like dogs, as Chiang Kai-shek does.

I read further from the article:

EVACUATION BEGINS

Today the women and children are being evacuated from Yen-an. They pile their possessions on a covered stretcherlike contraption tied between two horses or swaying precariously on a camel. The Nationalist armies are 70 miles away and may try to capture the city at any time. Stores are being boarded up and everything moved back into the mountains.

There is no confusion and no disorder and, surprisingly enough, morale is high. These people really believe they are going to win. It may take 10 years or it may take 100, but they believe it to the depths of their being.

From the standpoint of material possessions it is probable the people of Yen-an have no more and perhaps no less than they would have if the city was in Nationalist hands. In the shops and stores the goods are about the same as elsewhere in rural China and the prices are comparable.

There are men here who ride horseback and men in fine fur-lined coats. There are men in tattered animal skins and rags. But rightly or wrongly the peasants here believe in the men who lead them and believe they have a voice and a part in their government.

NO BEGGARS, NO LOAFERS

"We have no rickshaw coolies, no beggars, and no loafers in Yenan," said our interpreter, Ma Moo-ming, a former professor of English at Peking who is now a Communist press officer.

Twenty or thirty peasants were dogging our footsteps as we walked through the town, grinning at us and trying to understand our text-book Chinese.

"Why aren't these men working?" we asked Mr. Ma.

"They just came to town to do their marketing," he explained.

The fanciest building in Communist Yenan is a new bank. New currency has been issued by the Communist government, but the basic medium of exchange still is grain.

Mr. President, I have thought it worth while to read that article into the RECORD, just to show that people crave a measure of freedom. We have contended that communism is dictatorial. I am not arguing the point at all; but it seems, at least, that the people of China feel that they have more freedom under the Communists than they do under Chiang Kai-shek. People love freedom, even if they have only a small degree of it. At least what the people in Communist China have today is more than what they had before under Chiang Kai-shek. We have been trying to kill that Chinese spirit. I do not believe it can be done.

On the other hand, we captured Formosa, which had been under Japan for many years, and we turned it over to Chiang Kai-shek. His government robbed the people; it took their crops away from them, and sold the crops back to them at exorbitant prices. The people rebelled. Then Chiang Kai-shek sent his troops there, and they massacred 5,000 of those people and committed terrible atrocities. That simply cannot be continued. Even another government, if set up under those circumstances, might be just as bad; and if we tried to support any government of that type, we would find ourselves in an impossible situation.

Mr. President, I should like to have an article about Formosa printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1947]

FIVE THOUSAND FORMOSANS SLAIN, EDITOR SAYS—YOUTH EMASCULATION, CUTTING OFF OF EARS, MURDER OF HOUSEHOLDERS BLAMED ON CHINESE

Shanghai, March 30.—John W. Powell declared today in an article in his magazine, China Weekly Review, that Chinese troops sent to Formosa to quell riots which started there February 28 had perpetrated "some of the most unimaginable atrocities."

Powell, son of the late famed editor, J. B. Powell, wrote that a conservative estimate placed the number of Formosans killed at 5,000, with thousands more imprisoned. He has newly returned from a visit to Formosa.

So far as is known, Powell is the only American correspondent who has succeeded in go-

ing to and returning from the big island province off China's east coast since rioting began.

GOVERNMENT SILENT

No immediate comment was forthcoming from Chinese Government sources. On March 14 Peng Hsueh-pei, Chinese Minister of Information, told foreign newsmen in Nanking that the Formosan "incident will soon be closed." He declined to assist reporters in going there, saying that the Government was too busy to look after them.

Powell said the disorders culminated a year and a half of flagrant Chinese misrule far worse than the Japanese.

China lost Formosa in 1895; it was restored to her in 1945 after the Japanese surrender.

Powell wrote that the riots were preceded by extremely severe searches of shops and peddler stands by police who, he said, were trying to enforce new economic regulations which virtually abolished private trade. On February 27, he declared, police killed a 40-year-old woman in Taipei (Taihoku), the capital, when she protested seizure of her cigarette tray.

MOB PETITIONS REDRESS

Next day the riots began, he continued, and a mob marched toward Gov. Chen Yi's office to petition for compensation. He said police fired into this crowd and killed four Formosans, wounding several others. He said mobs roamed the streets, grabbing and beating all mainland Chinese they could find and sacking many Chinese homes.

By March 1, he related, rioting had spread to most of the cities. Powell said the Government tried a countermove with flying squads which fired into all crowds with machine guns, and that examination of wounded showed dum-dum bullets were used. He said such action killed 25 and wounded 125 Formosans outside the railway station.

He said a truce was arranged with a committee of prominent Formosans who drew up 32 demands which he said would have assured near independence. Powell reported that the Governor, who was expecting troops from the mainland, gave the impression he was making concessions, but when troops arrived March 8 the committee was arrested.

PEOPLE SHOT ON SIGHT

From then on through March 13, he wrote, there was a blood bath, in which troops shot Formosans on sight.

He quoted foreign eyewitnesses as saying in one instance 20 youths in a village between Taipei and Keelung were emasculated and their ears were cut off and noses slit before they were bayoneted and thrown into a creek.

He said one foreign observer watched troops searching houses wantonly shoot down whoever opened the door.

Powell concluded that "with the situation what it is in China today, there is little hope that anything constructive can be done in time to save the island economically or politically for China."

The pro-Government press in Nanking reported on March 26 that more than 70 Formosans had been executed. The official Central News Agency said 100 had been arrested and 3 executed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a telegram from Hon. Aubrey Williams, editor of the Southern Farmer, giving, I believe, a very vital and very excellent program for democracy in Greece.

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

MONTGOMERY, ALA., April 15, 1947.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Nation's leadership is confused. The natural leaders of the people are divided, and

appear to be in a frenzy of fear and disillusionment because of the inexplicable course of Russia and the Communists.

Many liberals are rushing into a position which can lead only to a new version of the anti-Comintern pact. The implications of their position grow ominous. They are now allied with those who are demanding that Wallace be prosecuted for stating a position which reflects the sentiments of two-thirds of the American people—as shown by the latest Gallup polls.

The time calls for a simple, clear program which decent, peace-loving Americans can accept. It also calls for a program to which President Truman and his advisers can accede.

If Franklin D. Roosevelt were here, this is the kind of dramatic program he would probably announce:

First. The United States cannot undertake to establish democracy in a nation where a king rules surrounded by monarchists and plutocrats. Help must be conditioned on withdrawal or collapse of these forces.

Second. Order and peace must be restored within Greece. As matters now stand, our Army officers will know nothing except to arm the monarchists and assorted reactionaries. This will inevitably enrage and frustrate the Greek people who have been revolting for 20 years against these forces, despite hunger, privation, and war. We must arm only Greek republicans and democrats. This requires that Americans or UN representatives know something about political philosophy.

Third. We must rebuild the Greek economy. We must do this in a way which the American people will understand, and which is within the framework of our own system. We must not make a lot of Greek plutocrats into tyrannical millionaires in the process. Franklin D. Roosevelt would rebuild the Greek economy in the same way he rebuilt our own:

(A) Provide for electric power, which is basic, by a Greek TVA owned by the Greek people.

(B) Reestablish transportation by first paying off any private individuals who claim ownership of the dilapidated Greek railways. Rebuild these railways in the name of the Greek people to be owned as our own post-office system is owned.

(C) Establish a Greek national bank, similar to our own Federal Reserve System, or the present Bank of England.

(D) Provide for rehabilitation of private productive enterprises through an RFC. Provide for the farm economy through a farm-credit administration based on co-operative loan associations, together with a farm-security administration.

This program will make sense to the American people. It will make sense and give tremendous encouragement to democrats everywhere. It will win the support of all middle-of-the-road nations, such as Britain, the Dominions, the Scandinavians, France, Central and South America.

This program can be undertaken by American leadership acting under the sponsorship of the United Nations. If the world is in great danger, we should act to win spontaneous support of all democratic nations.

If this makes sense to you, talk it over with others who may be potentially interested. America's great need today is for a positive program to strengthen democracy, rather than a negative program aimed solely at a futile attempt to stop communism without offering anything better than the strengthening of autocracy and dictatorship.

NOTE.—The above material is the basis of article to be printed in Southern Farmer 2 weeks hence. It may be used with or without credit.

SOUTHERN FARMER,
AUBREY WILLIAMS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT IN THE WEST

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter I have received from Mr. Lynn Crandall, watermaster of district No. 38 at Idaho Falls, Idaho. Mr. Crandall's letter, addressed to all of the Members of the Idaho delegation, points out a very serious threat to continued irrigation development in Idaho, and throughout the West, in S. 972.

In Idaho, and in most other areas of the West, it is possible to use that portion of the reservoir space of a multiple-purpose project which is allotted to flood control both for flood control and for the storage of the irrigation water. That dual use of the storage space, in fact, is the difference between feasibility and nonfeasibility of many projects.

Mr. Crandall points out that section 4 of S. 972 would prohibit such dual use and, therefore, greatly impair the usefulness of our western multiple-purpose dams. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be incorporated in my remarks in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF RECLAMATION,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, April 4, 1947.

HON. GLEN TAYLOR,
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK,
HON. JOHN SANBORN,
HON. ABE MCG. GOFF,
Members, Idaho Congressional Delegation.

DEAR SIR: Beginning on page 2379 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1947, there is printed a copy of S. 972, declaration of public power policy, and comments thereon by the author of the bill.

Section 4 of the proposed bill implies that the flood-control space in a multipurpose project shall be dedicated exclusively to flood control. Such a requirement may be advisable in regions where floods may occur unexpectedly at any time from heavy rainfall. In such regions it might be necessary that the flood space should always be available to store floodwaters when they come.

In the Rocky and other western mountains, however, the floods come from the melting snows during May and June and can be foretold quite accurately from the snow surveys made from January to April. Based on such snow surveys sufficient flood-control space can be vacated in time to adequately control these snow-water floods. At the same time considerable water can usually be retained in the flood space by the time the peak flow has gone and provide a valuable addition to the reservoir supply for use during the subsequent summer months. In the arid regions the entire development of the country is dependent on the conservation and fullest use of the available water supply. In multipurpose projects such as Palsades Reservoir the irrigators expect to buy the entire active reservoir capacity, the irrigation and flood-control space to be used jointly for flood control based on study of snow-survey results by a committee representing the Bureau of Reclamation, United States engineers, and the water users.

When this bill (S. 972) is being considered the proposed section 4 should be amended to provide for a more flexible procedure in mountain regions where the floodwaters come from melting snow.

The usefulness of Palsades and other western reservoirs would be greatly impaired if it was made impossible by statute to retain any water in the flood-control space, when that could safely be done, for later beneficial use.

Very truly yours,

LYNN CRANDALL,
Watermaster, District No. 36.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Thomas M. Robinson, of Montana, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Montana, in place of Lewis Penwell.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

T. Vincent Quinn, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, help us to see clearly that the pace at which we are living these days shuts Thee out of our minds and hearts; and leaves us, even with good intentions, to wander in the misty land of half-truth and compromise.

Deliver us, O God, from the God-helps-those-who-help-themselves philosophy, which is really a cloak for sheer unbelief in Thy ability and willingness to take care of us and our affairs.

Give to us a passion for that which is in principle excellent, rather than in politics expedient, for that which is morally right rather than socially correct.

These things we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 18, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Pepper
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lodge	Thye
Connally	Lucas	Tobey
Cooper	McCarran	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Downey	McFarland	Watkins
Dworshak	McGrath	Wherry
Eastland	McKellar	White
Eaton	McMahon	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
George	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JED JOHNSON TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Keefe, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated: