

H. R. 5699. A bill for the relief of Rose Quong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 5700. A bill for the relief of Zora B. Vulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 5701. A bill authorizing the Alien Property Custodian to return certain real property and water rights to Ernestine Block Grigsby and Josephine Block Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5702. A bill for the relief of Frederick W. Lass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5703. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 5704. A bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 5705. A bill for the relief of Basile Cretos, Chrissa Cretos, and James Cretos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1472. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Independent Lodger Young Men, of Paterson, N. J., urging action for the immediate implementation of the Palestine partition decision of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1473. Also, resolution of the board of commissioners of the city of Passaic, N. J., urging action for the immediate implementation of the Palestine-partition decision of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1474. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Senate, urging enactment of legislation to provide for the world's strongest regular air force and air national guard and appropriations therefor, and to provide for creation of a National Science Foundation for research to make available scientific discoveries and knowledge for guidance of officials responsible for our national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1475. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Senate, urging enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, facilitating construction of housing for veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1476. By Mr. HART: Petition of the West New York Liquor Dealers Association, West New York, N. J., presenting a resolution opposing the passage of S. 1842 and H. R. 4626; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1477. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1478. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation to provide adequate appropriations for the security of the Nation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1479. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Hervey S. Bean and other citizens of Vienna and Mount Vernon, Maine, to stop shipments of food, precision tools, industrial machinery, Diesel tractors, and other machinery to Russia and Russian-dominated countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1480. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Alexandria, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making housing available as low-rent housing for families of low income; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1948

(*Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948*)

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

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D. D., pastor, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, out of the dim past we hear again the voice of Thy prophet, saying, "Eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared." Thou hast greatly blessed the tables of America with fatness and sweetness. Help the Members of this body as they try to decide what, in the light of our blessings, is America's responsibility toward the nations of the world. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION RELATING TO ELECTRIC ENERGY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of newly issued reports of that Commission entitled "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy" and "The Financial Record of the Electric Utility Industry" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Commission, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the calendar year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission of the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement of the American Legion as of December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of several citizens of the State of Virginia, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from James E. Curry, of Washington, D. C., embodying a resolution adopted by the Council of Annette Islands Reserve, Alaska, protesting against the enactment of legislation to rescind certain orders of the

Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by some 75 citizens of Cherryvale, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMENDATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF COL. DAVIS GORHAM ARNOLD—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during the January 1948 session of the General Assembly of Rhode Island a senate resolution was adopted commanding the public service of Col. Davis Gorham Arnold, manager of the United States Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence. It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, since it expresses not only the opinion of the general assembly itself, but of the people of Rhode Island generally, as well as of the veterans and the general public.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution commanding the public service of Col. Davis Gorham Arnold, manager of the United States Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence

Whereas the veterans of Rhode Island have had the benefit of Col. Davis Gorham Arnold's years of experience in the Washington office of the former Veterans' Bureau, later known as the Veterans' Administration, who for 5 years has been the manager of the United States Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence; and

Whereas during his assignment in Rhode Island for this period the entire Veterans' Administration program has been subject to decentralization and authority delegated to the branch office for this area in Boston, which was intended to expedite action for the veterans, but instead proved an impediment, resulting in controversy when initiative was in order in the local office here; and

Whereas Colonel Arnold's deep personal concern for every issue affecting veterans and their families has been the subject of commendation in State and National resolutions by several veterans' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Rhode Island General Assembly places itself upon record as endorsing the service of Col. Davis Gorham Arnold as manager of the United States Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence, its confidence in him as a veteran of both World Wars, and pride in his achievement in veterans' affairs here in his native State of Rhode Island, earnestly requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give consideration to this resolution, which embodies the sincerity of the feeling among the veterans in this State and be speaks the desire of this legislature also to endorse the work of and continue in such office Col. Davis Gorham Arnold as manager of the United States Veterans' Administration regional office in Providence; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary

of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to Col. Davis Gorham Arnold.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize section 32 funds to encourage the exportation of surplus agricultural commodities and products thereof under foreign-aid programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 966).

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1948—

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 131) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948, reported it adversely, and submitted a report (No. 967) thereon.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT—MINORITY VIEWS (PART OF REPT. NO. 951)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] I ask unanimous consent to submit minority views to accompany the bill (S. 984) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, heretofore reported, and request that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEM:

S. 2256. A bill relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2257. A bill to provide that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 shall not apply to divorce proceedings; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2258. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; and

S. 2259. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2260. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2261. A bill to amend section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UMSTEAD:

S. 2262. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UMSTEAD (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 2263. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to transfer and convey certain property to the city of High Point, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2264. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the construction of greatly needed rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 2265, to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, as amended, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2266. A bill for the relief of Low Way Hong; and

S. 2267. A bill for the relief of the widow of Frank E. Chaffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2268. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Petrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 2269. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act in order to reduce the qualifying age for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to 60 and broaden the old-age and survivors' insurance system to include benefits on account of disability; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2270. A bill for the relief of Anna Rajmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, and I request that an explanatory statement of the bill by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2265) to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, as amended, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services, and for other purposes," introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAT McCARRAN

I have today introduced a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923 so as to lay the foundation for a real career service for administrative and executive workers in the employ of the Federal Government.

My bill would accomplish this by creating a new administrative and executive service.

This would be a service of professional grade, on a par with the present probational service.

The new A. and E. service could be well used for graduates from the subprofessional, the CPC, and the C. and F. services. (The CAF service would become C. and F., with administrative positions transferred to the new A. and E.)

There has always been a need for higher grades to cover administrative positions

which properly belong in the subprofessional service but which because grade 8 was the highest grade in that service, were allocated in the professional service, where they did not belong.

The new A. and E. service would provide a place for administrative personnel in the SP service, such as high-grade foremen, masters, supervisors, section chiefs, and superintendents, who have jurisdiction over subprofessional employees. The same is true in the CPC class particularly, and could be safely applied to the C. and F. service.

In considering and acting on this bill, I hope the committee will take advantage of the opportunity to even up the rates of pay so that they are devisable regularly by 2080, 260, or 26, so that pay tables can be computed simply and the work of pay-roll clerks, auditors, and accountants can be facilitated and eased. However, I have preferred not to make any changes in compensation rates myself, since I want it to be perfectly clear that this is not a pay-raise bill, but a bill for the purpose of improving the civil-service system by providing a service in which men and women of executive and administrative talent may rise to the very top without sacrificing their civil-service status, and in which top-grade executives and administrators will be available for transfer among and between departments.

I should be glad if the committee would consider using this bill as a vehicle for providing higher salaries in the upper brackets of Government professional, executive, and administrative work. Again, I have not initially included such provisions in the bill, because I feel the basic principle of a separate service for administrative and executive personnel is more important than pay raises; and I am not sure but what the committee might prefer to deal with the question of raises in separate legislation.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 22, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new subsections:

"(c) The procurement in the United States of grain and grain products under this act shall, to the maximum extent possible, and subject to the determination of the Administrator as to amounts which may be transferred to a participating country, be made by such country or its agents directly from commercial firms rather than through any department, agency, or establishment of the United States Government.

"(d) In order to assure the conservation of domestic grain supplies and the retention in the United States of byproduct feeds necessary to the maintenance of the agricultural economy of the United States, the amounts of wheat and wheat flour to be transferred to participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of wheat used to produce the wheat flour transferred to such countries under this act shall not be less than 50 percent of the aggregate of the

unprocessed wheat and wheat in the form of flour transferred to such countries under this act."

On page 22, line 12, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a perfecting amendment for the amendment which I submitted yesterday relative to exports to nonparticipating countries, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 22, after line 20, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(d) No export shall be authorized pursuant to authority conferred by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto, of any commodity from the United States to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country, if the Secretary of Commerce determines that the supply of such commodity is insufficient (or would be insufficient if such export were permitted) to fulfill the requirements of participating countries under this act as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, however, That such export may be authorized if the Secretary of Commerce determines that such export is otherwise in the national interest of the United States."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 9, line 2, strike out "\$321,282,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$321,782,000."

On page 9, line 22, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$500,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available only for construction and maintenance of the project on Milk River for local flood protection at Havre, Montana, authorized by the act of December 22, 1944."

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING— STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement dated October 1, 1947, issued by Senator TAFT in opposition to universal compulsory military training, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—NEWSPAPER COM- MEN TON ADDRESS BY PROF. THEODORE SCHULTZ

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "University of Chicago Professor Tells

Off Harvard on Marshall Plan," written by George Weller and published in the Chicago Daily News of March 2, 1948, dealing with an address delivered by Prof. Theodore Schultz, head of the department of economics of the University of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE FOR BREAD—EDITORIAL BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Battle for Bread," written by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-RIGHTS AGITATION — EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "From the Grass Roots, the South Is Acting," published in the Nashville Banner on March 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL RFC—LETTER FROM WILLIAM H. KRIEG

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by William H. Krieg regarding the international RFC, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEPRECIATION AS AN INFLATION PRO- BLEM—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ERICSON

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Depreciation to Fore as Inflation Problem," by George Ericson, from the Christian Science Monitor of February 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII — EDITORIAL FROM THE CHESTER (PA.) TIMES

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Question of Hawaiian Statehood," from the Chester (Pa.) Times of February 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to meet at 2 o'clock today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, and regretfully, consent is granted.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I wish to ask to be absent for a few days. I am anxious to vote on the Marshall plan which is being debated, and I hope I shall be able to return before any crippling amendments, at least, have been offered. I expect to return the first part of next week, about Tuesday. Until then, I ask consent to be absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

STATEMENT AS TO SATURDAY SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has the floor by order of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a moment?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked about a Saturday

session. I think the Members of the Senate should hold themselves in readiness contemplating that we will continue the debate on the pending legislation at all times, if possible. Later on, either this afternoon or tomorrow, we will attempt to make an announcement that will be satisfactory to Members of the Senate as to a Saturday session this week.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of a great son of Poland and a great hero of the American Revolution, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. The facts about General Pulaski's life are so well known that they need bear only slight repetition. We are all familiar with the fact that Casimir Pulaski, born at Podolia, took a prominent share under his father, Count Joseph Pulaski, in the formation of the Confederation of Bar and thereafter in the military operations. Ultimately he became commander in chief of the Polish patriotic forces. Having been driven into exile in 1772, Pulaski came to America and joined the army of Gen. George Washington.

He distinguished himself in the Battle of Brandywine, was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by order of Congress. He fought at Germantown and in the battles of the winter of 1778. After that, he raised a mixed corps called the Pulaski Legion, with which he defended the city of Charleston in May 1779. We all know that General Pulaski was mortally wounded at Savannah and that he passed to his eternal reward on October 11.

Mr. President, I call attention to the birth of this great patriot of Poland and this great friend of the United States, not as a mere tribute to a man who has long since passed into the realm of history. Rather, I call attention to his magnificent life because the inspiration of his deeds is so important not only to the United States, but to all the sons and daughters of Poland—the inhabitants of that stricken land which was the first to fight in the Second World War, but which seems to have paid for its sacrifices only by continued enslavement.

The inspiration of General Pulaski, I am sure, will continue to give courage and confidence to all the friends and lovers of Poland, both within that ravaged land and beyond its boundaries.

It seemed as difficult in Pulaski's time as it does in ours that the forces of enslavement and tyranny would one day be driven back from the borders of Poland; but we are certain that that land shall indeed experience her freedom, that the dream of Pulaski and the dream of other Polish patriots shall be fulfilled.

Although the great state of Poland is now behind the iron curtain, the people of the United States have lost none of their friendship, none of their sympathy, none of their admiration for the heroic Poles. We are tied to that land not only

by bonds of gratitude for what Pulaski and other Poles did for us in our hour of need but we are tied by the bonds of kinship between the millions of Americans of Polish descent and their relatives abroad.

We are tied too by a common devotion to liberty, a fierce pride in independence, an unswerving desire to have each land work out its destiny through its own efforts rather than through the dictates of a foreign tyrant.

And so, today, on the anniversary of the birth of this patriot, America feels closer than ever to the land which gave him birth. We stretch our hands figuratively across the sea to shake the hands of the people of Poland and to bid them: Take heart; maintain your courage; your great ideals shall yet be realized; the dream of Pulaski of Polish independence and freedom shall not have been in vain.

Finally, I express the hope that early action will be taken on my joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) for proclamation of General Pulaski Memorial Day on October 11, the anniversary of the patriot's death. This resolution passed the Senate last year although, unfortunately, it was tabled by the House Judiciary Committee last May. I am, however, hoping that the committee will reverse its action.

Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a moment further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

STATEMENT OF NORWEGIAN PRIME MINISTER ON THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM TO NORWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I call attention to a statement made by the Norwegian Prime Minister, Mr. Gerhardsen, in a speech last Sunday referring to Czechoslovakia. This particular item was given to Mr. Lovett at the State Department to emphasize the importance that Norway attaches to the anti-Communist fight. I read this into the RECORD, Mr. President, because anyone who has eyes to see with knows that the world is lining up in two camps. We cannot get away from that fact. This little land up there toward the North, the Land of the Midnight Sun, whose people have always stood for liberty, and who made such a gallant fight when invaded by Hitler, now speak out in no uncertain terms.

This is the quotation from the Prime Minister's reference to Czechoslovakia:

These events have awakened gloom and apprehension among us. As far as I can see, the problem for Norway is, first and foremost, of a domestic nature. The threat to Norway of the freedom and independence of the Norwegian people is the danger which the Communist Party represents at the present time. The most vital task in the fight for independence, democracy, and security under law in Norway is that of reducing the Communist Party and its influence to the greatest possible extent. We will fight against the Communists with the means and spiritual weapons of democracy. We will try to convince those who joined them in good faith during the war in the belief that the Communist Party was national and democratic. Today there is no longer anyone who has the right to nurture such a belief. Those who head the Communist Party in Norway today are Comintern Communists. Like their fel-

low workers in other lands, they are disciples of terror and dictatorship. No longer must well-worded declamations be allowed to prevent people from recognizing this brutal fact, even though for many it might constitute a sinister discovery.

Mr. President, this little land recognizes the menace, and their Prime Minister says they will not be caught napping. I trust that we will hasten the European recovery program. I shall have something to say in a few days on that subject, but the sooner we act the sooner we get the bill in operation under an appropriate administrator; the sooner we will strike a spark of encouragement to people like the little group of Norwegians, some 3,000,000 of them, who have the stamina and the courage to utter in no uncertain words how they look upon the threat of communism.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT BILL—MEMORANDUM RULING

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it will be remembered that on February 26, when the Senate was considering the conference report on the civil-service retirement bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised, informally, a question of order. The question of order was as to whether the changes made in the conference report constituted germane modifications under the rules by which this body acts.

It is my understanding that, for the guidance of the President of this body, a memorandum was prepared by the Senate Parliamentarian, which he has placed in my hands. I ask, Mr. President, that the memorandum on that point be inserted in the RECORD, so it may be referred to on other similar occasions. I suggest that an appropriate place for inserting the memorandum in the RECORD would be on page 1741, near the center of the second column, after my paragraph of participation in the debate at that point. Unless there is some request for reading the memorandum at this time, I would simply ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD, at the point I suggested, merely stating that it sustains the action of the Senate in accepting the conference report. Therefore I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I point out to the Senator from Vermont that no point of order was raised at that particular time.

Mr. FLANDERS. I said informally; not formally.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to the Senator from Vermont inserting the statement in the RECORD today. I do have objection to having it inserted in the RECORD as of the previous date to which he referred, since the point of order was not then raised. I feel that any Member of the Senate who was on the floor at that time had the privilege of raising the point of order at the time, and of having a decision made on it. I

would not want the memorandum to appear in the RECORD as a decision on that particular question, because the Parliamentarian was not asked to prepare a memorandum for a ruling on that occasion.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am glad, Mr. President, to yield to the suggestion of the junior Senator from Delaware. I ask that the memorandum be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 4127—THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

(Memorandum prepared by Mr. Charles L. Watkins, Senate Parliamentarian)

H. R. 4127, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was passed by the Senate with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The House bill amended section 1 of said act by providing, among other things, in subsection (b) that an officer or employee between the ages of 55 and 60 years, under certain conditions, upon separation from the service, should be paid an annuity reduced by one-half of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee was under the age of 60 years.

The Senate substitute contains no provision whatever dealing with said section 1, and therefore the only matter in controversy with respect to this section is the language in the House bill.

The conferees in dealing with subsection (b), in the annuity percentage reduction, substituted one-fourth of 1 percent for one-half of 1 percent, the effect of which is to increase the annuity to be paid to such officer or employee. The contention is made that the conferees, under the new conference rule, were prohibited from taking any action that would increase the annuity above that computed under the House provision, and that the action taken was not a "germane modification" of the matter in dispute.

The rule referred to, as contained in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2 of that year, is as follows:

"(a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to the conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement."

In the report accompanying the reorganization bill, submitted by Mr. LaFollette on May 31, 1946, the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, in making an analysis of the foregoing rule, said:

"This section in effect makes specific the application to amendments in the nature of a substitute of the conference rules now applicable to numbered amendments, and will outlaw the expedient resorted to in recent years of conferees bringing back legislation not passed by either House."

The matter dealt with by the conferees, being in the House bill, is, of course, not new matter, and there being no provision in the Senate substitute affecting section 1 of the Retirement Act, the conferees, under the established procedure of the Senate, in making any change, modification, or amendment (by whatever term it may be described), were limited and restricted to the sole question of germaneness. They could increase or decrease the percentage reduction in any degree they deemed proper. If the Senate, in its substitute, had adopted a provision different from the amount in the House bill, the conferees would have been restricted to a

range from the lowest to the highest figures. The conferees in this case, however, had only the House provision before them for consideration.

The Senate as yet has made no interpretation of the phrase "germane modification," as contained in the new conference rule. Rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides, among other things, that—

"Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays."

Under the practice of the Senate, a Senator, acting under this rule, is not limited or restricted as to the nature of the modification he desires to make. He may narrow or broaden the scope of his motion, resolution, or amendment in any manner and to any extent that he desires.

The following precedent of the House of Representatives of March 15, 1922, cited in Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 3268, is in line with the present case: A point of order was made that the conferees had exceeded their authority by providing a limitation of \$100,000 beyond which contracts must be awarded to the lowest bidder. The House bill made no limitation, and the Senate amendment fixed a limitation of \$5,000. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts) overruled the point of order, saying:

"It will be noticed that the original provision of the bill contained no limitation whatever providing for the purchase, repair, or reconditioning of any vessel, commodity, article, or thing on the part of the Government. The Senate struck out all of the language of the original House provision and inserted an amendment which required the reconditioning or repairs in excess of \$5,000 to be done in Government yards under certain conditions. The conferees have agreed to substantially that language except that they have stricken out \$5,000 and inserted '\$100,000.' In the view of the Chair, the whole controversy before the conferees was whether there should be a limitation upon the amount of the repairs, and, if so, what the limitation should be; in other words, it was between \$5,000 worth of repairs and no limit whatever."

After citing an applicable case in Hinds' Precedents (vol. V, sec. 6424), the Speaker pro tempore further said:

"It seems to the Chair that * * * the conferees were authorized either to agree to the provisions without any limitation whatever, or to a limitation of \$5,000, or to any limitation between that and no limitation whatever, and that the point of order that they have exceeded their authority is not well taken."

A further precedent of the House of Representatives, shown in Hinds' Precedents, volume V, section 6411, is also cited as bearing on the interpretation of the term "germane modification," namely:

On March 3, 1871, a conference report was under consideration. The Senate amended a House bill to provide for the reference to the Quartermaster-General and the Commissary-General of certain claims. The conferees reported a provision to constitute a commission to deal with the subject.

The Speaker (Mr. James G. Blaine, of Maine) ruled:

"The provision reported by the conference committee is a germane modification of the (Senate) provision, and therefore it comes strictly within the purview and power of the committee of conference."

THE PROBLEM OF DISPLACED PERSONS— STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senate from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with the current debate on economic aid to Europe now focusing world attention upon the deliberations of this honorable body, it seems appropriate to discuss briefly another vital phase of the European problem. I refer to the matter of displaced persons, whose resettlement in some area where they could begin again to take roots and build for the future would seem to be a prerequisite to any genuine and final stabilization of European economy.

I have prepared a statement giving my views on S. 2242, to authorize admission for a limited time of certain displaced persons, which has been reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee and is now on the Senate Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be included in my remarks at this point.

America has ever been ready and more than willing to accept and discharge its humanitarian responsibility to victims of extraordinary misfortune throughout the world. In the case of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons now patiently suffering in Europe, it seems to me there is no sound reason to defer longer the necessary action. I believe the time is here when we should act, and assume world leadership in the settlement of this vexing problem.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

The American people have a test of their humanitarianism in their acceptance or rejection of the proposal to admit displaced persons into the United States. Favorable action by the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. 2242, to admit 100,000 displaced persons to the United States within a period of 2 years, is a welcome recognition of our obligation to a sadly neglected and most unfortunate group of war casualties. However, it does not discharge our full obligation, although it is a step in the proper direction.

No sadder picture ever has been presented to the people of the world than that of the millions of human beings who were torn from their homes in the turmoil of war, suffering untold privations, not the least of which was the knowledge that among all the peoples they had no place which they could call their own. Even with the cessation of hostilities some hundreds of thousands of them found their homelands still barred to them because they had dared resist dictatorship, had persisted in their search for freedom to live their own lives.

Now, approximately 800,000 or 900,000 of these displaced persons—men, women, and children—are living in various camps throughout western Europe, under conditions that are destructive of self-respect. Among them are many of Europe's most cultured inhabitants. By and large, all of them are imbued with a spirit of independence and determination to find liberty or to perish. It is for these reasons that they now cannot or will not return to their homelands. In many cases, where these homelands are under the iron rule of Russia or other despotic rulers, return to their homelands would mean imprisonment or possible death.

Officials of our Government, familiar with the situation in Europe, and thousands of

our citizens have been agitated since the war's end for legislation that would permit entry of some of these displaced persons into our country. There has been, at the same time, opposition voiced to these proposals based on fear of undue competition for employment here and on various other contentions.

For the displaced persons, it has been argued that their admission not only would be a simple act of humanitarianism on our part but that they are the type of people America has always welcomed and the type that would most thoroughly and quickly take to American ways and fit into the American pattern. Secretary of State Marshall told the House Judiciary Committee that admission of a substantial number of displaced persons to the United States would remove one source of conflict with the Soviet Union. Other officials and Americans who have had opportunity to meet and observe these displaced persons in their daily lives throughout Europe have voiced high praise for their culture and abilities, for their ideologies, and for their abilities to contribute to the continued progress of American life if they should be admitted.

One of the greatest fears that has been raised against their admission, namely, that they would be tainted with the communistic teachings so prevalent in Europe now, is thoroughly refuted by the very fact of their being displaced persons. Representing countries like Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which have been absorbed completely within the Russian sphere, and stemming from the Ukraine and other eastern European countries which, to some degree or other, are completely Communist-dominated, the very fact that these people refuse to go back is clear indication of their hatred for communism and all its works.

A great proportion of them are agricultural people, hard-working, conscientious types, who would be a valuable addition to many of our midwestern farming States, whose populations have decreased in the last 8 or 10 years. Others are skilled workers of many types who would bring with them to this country the same expert craftsmanship and the same devotion to traditional high quality of work that distinguished earlier settlers in America from those very same countries, and have helped to make America the greatest nation in the world.

To bring only 100,000 of the total number within the period of 2 years will not relieve the problem of the entire group. Likewise, the exacting conditions as to types of persons to be admitted, requirements for assurance of employment in this country, etc., may make it very difficult to assemble the number designated for admission.

I hope, and will certainly lend my efforts toward expansion of the numerical quotas for each year to a point at least double, but preferably even more than the present bill would permit. It is my conviction that United States leadership in this regard would spur other nations to welcome additional displaced persons so that the world might look to a settlement of this entire problem within the matter of a few years.

The objections raised to entry of this additional number by persons within our country are hardly reasonable, it seems to me, when it is realized that even under the reduced immigration quotas established more than 20 years ago it was planned to permit 154,000 immigrants a year. Just prior to World War II, and all through the years of that war up to now, immigration has been far below this 154,000 minimum. Any number of displaced persons that might be taken in now within the next 2 years would be less than we would have taken in regularly on the yearly basis during the past 10 years.

It is hard to understand how any American citizens, living here in luxury compared to

the rest of the world, could reject these unfortunates, who should be held up as examples before the entire world, for their steadfast refusal to accept communism rather than, as is presently the case, to be condemned to the most ignominious form of dependency and degradation. Here in America we have always held up as an inspiration the courage and indomitable purpose of our early colonists, who chose to dare the dangers and privations of life in a new world rather than to endure loss of personal liberty or of the right to worship God in their own way. What most of these displaced persons have done is strictly in accord with the heroic sacrifices of our colonial ancestors.

We here in America have never failed to respond to misfortune throughout the world. In common decency, we cannot longer reject the pleas of these suffering and hopeless displaced persons. To deny them aid is to stultify our own humanity. To refuse to recognize their sacrifices on behalf of freedom would be to turn our backs on all the principles of Americanism which have always been our greatest boast. America should accept at least enough of these displaced persons each year to bring our immigration quotas up to the 154,000 that was contemplated as a minimum by earlier legislation.

We talk about setting up a bulwark against the continued spread of communistic doctrine. I can see no better defense against such a doctrine than to admit to our country, for absorption into our citizenship, the heroic people who have given up everything and who have suffered beyond all endurance rather than to bow their neck to the communistic yoke.

FAIR PRICES AND FULL EMPLOYMENT—STATEMENT FROM TRAINMAN NEWS

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief statement discussing fair prices and full employment, appearing in a recent issue of the Trainman News, official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

In it the Public Affairs Institute states that one of the most pressing problems confronting our economy just now is stabilizing prices at such a figure as will continue to provide full employment at fair wages.

The report points out the important fact that the individual farmer is a small factor in the total farm market and, having no effective organization to increase his strength, he is at the mercy of a food market which he cannot decisively influence. It is not so with most manufactured products and some essential raw materials, for here a relatively few big producers dominate an important segment of the total product and influence directly the price to be charged.

What that price will be, as demonstrated by the recent price advances in steel, is all too often not the adaptation of price to the requirements of the mass market but the price which the dominant big-business men think the traffic will bear. They seek the highest immediate profits without regard for the probable damage to the economy in the long run.

Rigid prices are so often found in industry where the concentration of control has assumed near-monopoly proportions that we find manufacturers meeting buyers' price resistance by curtailment of supply, to avoid the reduction in price to consumers which a really

competitive market would dictate. This, the report of the Public Affairs Institute points out, is a serious threat to full employment. The report concludes with a most provocative statement that "the danger is that industrialists will maintain prices at such a high level that the economy will tend to become stabilized at a lower level of production, which will mean widespread unemployment."

Mr. President, I commend this brief statement to the Members of the Senate in the belief that this body through its appropriate committees will act to prevent further unbalance in our price structure which may well result in widespread unemployment.

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

FAIR PRICES AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(A report by the Public Affairs Institute, founded by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Dr. Dewey Anderson, director)

The most pressing economic problem facing the American people is stabilization of the general level of prices at an appropriate figure.

By "appropriate" we mean a price level that will make it possible to provide continuing jobs at fair wages for all of our people who want to work—the major economical goal of our people since Roosevelt proclaimed that principle in his economic bill of rights.

However, the behavior of prices since scuttling of price controls in June 1946, and the recent near-panic that accompanied the slump in farm prices demonstrates that prices are not at that appropriate figure which will make possible continuing full employment. The slump in farm prices has again raised the specter of the post-World War I collapse.

Let's take a look at why farm prices broke when they did and why they broke so sharply.

We know that the demand for farm products has not by any means been satisfied so this cannot explain the break in prices. We know there are substantial numbers of American families who still have inadequate diets. Who need more meat, milk, butter, etc.—but can't afford them because of present prices. The same applies to housing, clothing, and other necessities that are required for an adequate standard of health and decency.

Why then did prices break?

The answer lies in the relationship between farm prices and the amounts consumers are willing and able to spend for food products.

As food prices continue to rise higher and higher at retail, more and more consumers, confronted also by increases in the prices of other necessities, found it increasingly difficult to finance their previous levels of food consumption at current prices. This led to a softening of demand and accumulation of stocks, which was finally carried back to the farm markets where prices broke.

The haste in advertising price reductions at retail long before the farm price declines could trickle down to the retailer, and in some cases reducing prices more than the drop at wholesale levels, points up a basic underlying weakness that broke prices at the primary markets—the weakening of consumer demand.

As we all know we've been paying out a lot more of our wages and salaries for food than ever before. The following figures from the Department of Commerce show exactly how much more food is taking.

In 1939, when our per capita spendable income was \$636, we spent 22.6 percent for food. In 1947, despite the fact that per capita spendable income had more than doubled 1939, and rose to \$1,219, we spent 29.1 percent for food.

The Department of Commerce's survey of current business for January 1948 recognizing the abnormal food-price pattern relative to other prices and consumers' income stated: "There is little warrant for the assumption that the present high ratio of food expenditures to disposable income and the resulting relatively high prices for food will continue indefinitely."

Although farm prices following the 2-week slump have shown a tendency to recover, it is doubtful whether this movement can continue in view of the fact that effective demand at the retail level continues to show signs of weakness.

Further postponement of the adjustment will pave the way for a more severe collapse when the adjustment takes place, as it surely must.

Farm prices fluctuate far more freely and frequently than other commodities, because the individual farmer is so small a factor in the total farm market that he must simply accept the price as he finds it. So when these prices get out of line with purchasing power, they respond in the form of downward readjustment.

But this is not the case with most manufactured products and some raw materials. Here we have a few big producers controlling an important part of the total output and exercising a very real voice in deciding what the price will be.

ALL TRAFFIC WILL BEAR

In these areas reaching an appropriate level of prices consistent with full employment is hindered by the absence of real price competition. What we have is not the lowest price consistent with a fair return but rather the highest price that the traffic will bear.

The recent announcement of increases up to \$6 per ton in basic steel illustrates the decision on the part of the industry to extort what the traffic will bear, in order to realize immediate maximum profits, regardless of the effect upon the mass of American consumers.

Moreover, we do not get a response to softening of demand in the form of lower prices, but rather cut-backs in production in an attempt to maintain prices.

This arises from a policy of business that is primarily concerned with increasing profits. Because of the relationship between prices and profits, business is reluctant to adapt prices to the requirements of the mass market.

During the past year we have had indications of how business operates when demand for specific products softens. A good example is what happened to the production of cotton duck, drills, and jeans—goods used in the manufacture of work clothes. At the beginning of 1947 the textile industry found the prices were declining slightly in duck, drill, and jeans, but print cloth was rising steadily in price. So the industry cut down the production of the heavy-weight goods and gradually increased the number of looms on print cloth. The Journal of Commerce, January 16, 1948, commenting on this development stated:

"The significance of these loom changes can be realized when it is noted that whereas 6 months ago drills and jeans were in good supply and easing off slightly in price, today both of these constructions are very tight and have experienced several price rises in forward sales."

Similarly in the shoe industry, as demand tended to soften early last year, the industry resorted to production cut-backs, rather than permitting prices to respond to market conditions.

FULL EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE THREATENED

The two cases cited are relatively insignificant when compared with the impact of rigid prices in such basic commodities as steel and building materials. The examples are important, however, in recognizing that the

psychology of resisting price adjustments in response to market conditions has become more and more widespread throughout the American economy and is currently wrecking the full-employment structure that emerged from the war.

Recognizing these danger signals, the President's Council of Economic Advisers in their Second Annual Report warned that "many industrial prices must come down, * * * many rates of profit must subside, * * * (and) better balances of income among sections, groups, and individuals must be attained."

It is particularly important to recognize in view of the developing weakness of effective consumers' demand that prompt adjustment of prices is necessary now.

During the initial period of a business downturn, a prompt readjustment of prices could retard the decline and provide time for compensatory factors to be brought into play. But if this is delayed and the recession sets in and wipes out much of our purchasing power through unemployment, then the effect of price readjustment will be very limited.

The danger is that industrialists will maintain prices at such a high level that the economy will tend to become stabilized at a lower level of production which will mean widespread unemployment.

COMPILATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS OR AGREEMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall cause to be prepared and distributed to each Senator a compilation of all international commitments or agreements which have been entered into on behalf of the United States during the course of the last 10 years.

Sec. II. It is the sense of the United States Senate that the Senate shall not be bound to implement by appropriation or other legislation any international commitment or agreement which shall be made or entered into on behalf of the United States of America unless such commitment or agreement shall be transmitted promptly after its execution to the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 209) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in connection with the resolution I have just submitted.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It would seem safe to assert that the insertion of this provision in our basic law was prompted by the conviction that the representatives of the people were to participate in the consummation of international commitments, even though that participation should be only by acceptance or rejection of a document previously negotiated by the President.

During the course of the last several years, however, this provision of the Constitution has been little used. Instead, there have been scores of international commitments made and entered into on subjects of major importance which vi-

tally affect the people of this country, but concerning which the Senate is not only denied the right to pass upon, but is denied information concerning their contents.

I hasten to admit, Mr. President, that the courts have recognized the power of the President to conclude international agreements. The courts have, in effect ruled that an international agreement shall have the same sanctity, the same force and effect and can cover the same subject matter as a treaty. It appears that the only difference between a treaty and an executive agreement is that if the document is submitted to the Senate for ratification, it is called a treaty, but if the document is not submitted to the Senate for ratification, it is called an executive agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from North Dakota have in mind that commitments and agreements are made and entered into of which the Senate often has no knowledge whatever, and does not the Senator agree that the viciousness of entering into agreements or commitments in that manner is that the American people know nothing about them until perhaps 3 or 4 years later, when someone writes an article or perhaps a book about them?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly the situation.

In recent years, Mr. President, there have been hosts of commitments made on behalf of the United States in the consummation of which the Senate had no participation but which are now arising to plague us and for which we are deemed to have responsibility by implementing them either by appropriation or other legislation. Cairo, Yalta, Casablanca, Potsdam, Teheran, Quebec, conferences of foreign ministers—in these and scores of other conferences, on various levels of officialdom, declarations and commitments have been and are being made affecting not only the United States but the world at large.

From time to time piecemeal information concerning some of these commitments heretofore made, concerning which the Senate had no knowledge, is brought to light and we are implored to implement them by appropriation or other legislative enactment.

At this very moment, Mr. President, there is in existence in the office of the Secretariat of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in room 2E232 of the Pentagon, a complete compilation of the many decisions of the Combined Chiefs of Staff which involve global commitments by this Government made during and since the war. How many Senators in this Chamber today have ever seen the full text of any of these commitments? According to the memoirs of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, not even he had access to or was consulted regarding many of these commitments. Just a few weeks ago we learned for the first time of an international commitment by which the Kurile Islands were granted to Russia by a decision of the Combined Chiefs of

Staff as a consideration to that country for entering the war against Japan. Does any Senator in this Chamber know what other concessions were also made to Russia? Just a day or so ago a press statement appeared as follows:

Back in December 1945 Mr. Truman and T. V. Soong, for China, came to a general agreement that the United States would furnish air aid to Chiang Kai-shek. On the basis of that agreement, our air experts worked out a deal to equip Chinese with 8½ air groups, consisting of 1,071 combat planes, plus spare and replacement parts, ammunition, and so forth.

Did any Senator know of this agreement?

Has any Senator ever seen the contents of a document known as JCS1067, which document contains the commitments for the partition of Germany into four zones? This document is now in the files of the Secretariat of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was by this document, Mr. President, that Russia was given the bread basket of central Europe, England was given the industrial region, and the United States was given the scenery and the obligation to finance the major portion of the total occupation costs.

Was any Senator ever consulted as to the decisions made in August 1945 at Potsdam, pursuant to which more than 10,000,000 people of German ethnic origin were divested of their property and driven from their homes in countries of eastern Europe and forced into Germany and Austria, to become unwilling wards of the United States Army of Occupation? Does the Senate know of the Potsdam decisions on reparations whereby the Russians are now confiscating millions of dollars of property and taking it to Russia? This, Mr. President, is not pursuant to treaty, because there is as yet no treaty, but is pursuant to executive agreement.

Was any Senator ever consulted as to the decisions which sounded the death knell of European economy by creating an economic vacuum in Germany as a result of which the American taxpayer is called upon for billions of dollars to sustain that which our own agreements have destroyed? Were these decisions, Mr. President, ever debated in this Chamber?

What are our present commitments to Russia, to Greece, to Turkey, to China, to Great Britain? Will any Senator know when he is asked by his constituents back home? What are our commitments on the Palestine situation, which presents issues which have arisen as a result of decisions made on behalf of the United States, but which again have not even been communicated to the Senate?

During the war, Mr. President, there was an organization, and a very effective one, called the Combined Chiefs of Staff. This organization, made up of representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States operating through their military leaders, prepared the agenda, wrote the papers, and implemented the decisions of the Big Two as well as the Big Three. The Combined Chiefs of Staff was divided into several organizations. I shall name

them, because, as history reveals itself, this organization will take on a new meaning and bring to light the activities and the decisions of those who were in command during the war years. Under the Combined Chiefs of Staff there are the following organizations: the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Logistical Committee, the Combined Administrative Committee, the Joint Military Transportation Committee, the Combined Military Transportation Committee, Joint Production Survey Committee, Joint Strategic Survey Committee, Joint Staff Planners, Combined Staff Planners, Joint Intelligence Committee, Combined Intelligence Committee, Joint Committee on New Weapons, Munitions Board, Army-Navy Petroleum Board, Joint Civil Affairs Committee, Combined Civil Affairs Committee, and State-War-Army Coordinating Committee.

In the files of the Secretary of the Combined Chiefs of Staff will be found the answers to the mysteries of all of the negotiations from Casablanca to Potsdam.

I have today directed a letter to Hon. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense, requesting that the decisions of the so-called Big Three be made available to the United States Senate. I have also requested that all documents of the organizations which I have listed, including the agenda, minutes of all meetings, companion papers, and maps be made available to the Senate.

I am determined, Mr. President, to make available to the American people the mysteries of our global negotiations and commitments both during and since the war. It is now more than 2 years since the end of the war, and the American people are yet uninformed as to the commitments made abroad during and since the war. Indeed, if it had not been for certain books which have been written by men who at that time occupied high official positions, many Members of this body would not know about important events which took place during the war.

How many secret "Munich" agreements have been executed? How much meat in addition to the Kurile Islands, Poland, and Manchuria has already been fed by these agreements to the Russian bear? What has happened to the principles of the Atlantic Charter? How long must it be before the people of this Nation can be let in on the secrets of our foreign policy—a policy evidenced by agreements which are known in the halls of the Kremlin but not in the Halls of the Congress?

We are in the midst of a debate on legislation calling for billions of dollars which represent the toil and sweat of the people of this Nation, and as yet we do not even know the full text of the agreements which have set the course for the chaotic condition the world finds itself in today. I call upon the Foreign Relations Committee to insist that every international commitment or agreement made or entered into on behalf of the Government of the United States in the course of the last 10 years be compiled and transmitted to the Senate. And I do not mean merely the statements of platitudes which have been made public

from time to time as the text of formal agreements.

With the world situation as it is today—civil war in China, in Manchuria; trouble in Korea; insurrections in Palestine; troubles in the Balkans, Czechoslovakia, and Finland—surely now is the time to appraise past events. Surely there is something wrong with our foreign policy—for after having fought the greatest war in the history of the world, we are standing on the eve, perhaps, of world war III.

I repeat, Mr. President, we must take a reading of our foreign commitments made during and since the war. I have read with a great deal of interest the statements by James A. Farley in which he claims that part of the world's ills are a result of the negotiations made by Mr. Roosevelt when he was in ill health. Again, we must inspect these commitments. We must know what they say. We must know what they are doing to us. The documents, some 20,000 in number, include companion papers and contain the answers to the Canal project, oil in the Middle East, the rehabilitation of the Dutch East Indies, civil affairs functions in occupied areas, the disposition of territories owned by Hitler satellites, and the currency for occupation troops, about which much has been said.

They will reveal the entire strategical concept of both the war in the Atlantic and the Pacific and all directives to General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, and Admiral Nimitz.

As to the future, Mr. President, the time is long since overdue for the United States Senate to serve notice upon the President of the United States, the State Department, and other nations of the world, that the United States Senate will not consider itself bound to implement by appropriation or other legislation any international commitment or agreement which shall hereafter be made or entered into on behalf of the United States of America, unless such commitment or agreement shall be transmitted promptly after its execution to the Senate.

If the so-called bipartisan foreign policy means that Senators of both parties must be gagged and play deaf, dumb, and blind in the face of reckless international deals, I for one am ready to pronounce such policy a sham and a fraud on the American people, and I care not whether it involves Republicans or Democrats. I speak as an American representative of the American people. Perhaps, Mr. President, my voice will be the only voice raised in this Congress on this matter; but it is raised in earnest supplication, in the firm conviction that under our system of government the elected representatives of the people have a right to know of the actions of their Government, to the end that we shall maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

DISMANTLING THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to interrupt the procedure further, because there was the unanimous-consent order

that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi should proceed at 12:15. But I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate that the speech about to be delivered by the junior Senator from Mississippi is his maiden speech in the Senate. I know all of us are anxious to hear him. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator would like to have a quorum call at this time, or whether he would prefer to forego that, before he begins his maiden speech in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall forego a quorum call, Mr. President. I thank the Senator very much for his thoughtfulness.

Mr. President, since recently coming to the United States Senate, I have been tremendously impressed with the lack of consideration or thought given that sound principle of government that places certain rights and responsibilities on the States, where they were expressly retained and reserved by the Constitution. Typical of many of the sentiments I hear expressed in loose statements around the Capitol is one to the effect that the Constitution must be interpreted to meet the times and conditions of a living age.

By contrast, I turned to and read the now neglected tenth amendment, which has these solemn and warning words:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Secondly, I have been greatly impressed with the far-reaching power and influence of the organized and well-financed pressure groups and blocs that operate so effectively over the Nation, and particularly in Washington. I am already convinced that, if permitted, these pressure groups will soon undermine and actually destroy the Constitution of the United States, bit by bit and line by line. This plan is in progress now, but it is without the knowledge or the consent of the American people. In the name of so-called civil rights, these pressure groups seek to destroy the Bill of Rights. They seek to gradually liquidate and totally blot out the great American principle of local self-government. They seek these things, not by the legal means of amendments to our Constitution, but by congressional acts through political intimidation of the present Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

These two considerations, Mr. President—lack of consideration for States' rights and the organized efforts of pressure groups—have washed upon our shores a so-called and misnamed civil rights program that is already well on the way toward sowing seeds of strife and ill will that will afflict our people for many years to come.

And, Mr. President, I am amazed to find that these unconstitutional and revolutionary far-reaching proposals are unblushingly presented to the Congress by both major political parties purely as a political move in an election year.

I have been unalterably opposed to these bills as a matter of principle over the years. Since becoming a Member of the Senate, I have deliberately withheld

comment on the floor of the Senate until I could personally make a careful analysis of their legal basis, or lack of it, and also further consider their practical operation, not only in my area but in other areas of the Nation.

Also, I have taken time to determine and understand the spirit and the sincerity, or lack of it, with which these bills are presented to the Congress. Mr. President, I know there are individuals here in the Senate and elsewhere who are sincere in their purposes and high in their motives in sponsoring or supporting these bills. If so, I have no word of personal criticism for them, and I do not impugn their motives.

But, as to the over-all plan, Mr. President, I brand it and denounce it as purely a political fraud, presented here by both major parties, not in the interest of the welfare of the great masses of the people but as a brazen attempt to capture the vote of the misguided and misled rank-and-file Negro in the 1948 elections.

Some may expect me to say in the next sentence that the entire scheme is directed at the South. At first I suspected that it was; but on closer study, I am convinced that it is a well-organized and well-directed conspiracy, not merely against the South but against the people of the entire Nation. These proposals should be stripped of their lamb's clothing, and their true purposes and nature should thus be exposed. I believe they constitute a well-laid and far-reaching scheme to break down, bit by bit, the great, fundamental concepts of constitutional law that recognize and once protected the rights of the 48 States and the rights of the people.

Specifically, it is a well-laid and far-reaching scheme to gain control, bit by bit, of the election machinery of the Nation, so that the 48 States can no longer hold their own elections. Still further, it is a well-laid and far-reaching scheme to break down, bit by bit, the highly advantageous and necessary practice of reasonable and proper segregation regulations that are designed for the mutual benefit of the races and to preserve peace among them. Still further, it is a plan to subject private enterprise to the police power of the National Government in private employment and promotions and to deny to many employers of the Nation due process of law in a trial by jury when accused before a bureaucratic board. And still further, under the antilynch law we have the opening wedge that will place much of our State criminal law in a Federal strait-jacket for Federal supervision in matters down to petit street fights, while, at the same time, it revives the old idea of mass guilt, which was discarded in England over a thousand years ago.

I do not believe a majority of the membership of the Congress are individually in favor of these bills. I do not believe a majority of the people are in favor of them. But unless something is done, I believe they are going to become the supreme law of the land because of their iniquitous political nature and because the people of the Nation have not had a chance, and will not have a chance, to understand them.

And, if the present course continues, the people will not have a chance to understand these bills. The anti-poll-tax bill was referred to the Rules Committee of the Senate, and in turn to a subcommittee of three members, which did not include a Senator from the States most directly affected by the bill. The junior Senator from Mississippi, who is the only member of the Rules Committee from the entire South, requested the chairman of the Rules Committee to enlarge the membership of the subcommittee and to give the most affected States representation thereon. The junior Senator from Mississippi then requested the subcommittee to hold hearings on the bill, including hearings in the States that levy a tax as a prerequisite to voting. Thus the Senators could see conditions in their practical aspects, and the people could directly present the facts.

Mr. President, you will be shocked, and I am sure the entire membership of the Senate will be shocked, to learn that the subcommittee refused to hold any hearings. It refused to develop any evidence on the bill, and it has already concluded the entire matter so far as the subcommittee is concerned, by voting to report the bill to the full committee favorably. This was done in face of the fact that States affected most directly by the bill did not have a representative on the committee.

Thus it is, Mr. President, that the proposal to strike down a part of the time-honored and time-tested organic law of some of the sovereign States of the Union is approved by a subcommittee of the Senate without a hearing.

The last hearings by a Senate committee on such legislation were in the war year of 1943. Such testimony certainly does not reflect ideas and conditions of 1948. Since those hearings, 40 new individual United States Senators who were not then Members have taken the oath on the Senate floor. Certainly they have not taken part in, nor had the benefit of, any hearings, and apparently they will not, prior to voting time.

Furthermore, Mr. President, two of the honorable members of the subcommittee did not become Members of the United States Senate until more than 3 years after the last Senate hearings were held, and the third honorable member of the subcommittee did not become a Member of the Senate until 15 months after the hearings were concluded.

I cannot, and I do not, attribute malicious, evil, or arbitrary motives to the honorable gentlemen on the subcommittee, nor to the honorable chairman of the Rules Committee. I am therefore driven to the conclusion that their action is just a part of the pattern designed by the party leaders of both major parties, and that the word has been passed around: "For political reasons, these bills must pass."

Mr. President, on behalf of those who oppose this particular legislation, and those who also oppose this general type of legislation, we accept that challenge and we say, "These bills shall not pass." These bills and such methods used to pass them must be fought, and they shall be fought, to the very last ditch. Wheth-

er it is realized or not, I have a confident conviction that in keeping them off the statute books, we shall be serving not one area of our Nation but all areas, not just one group, but all groups. We believe in our cause and we shall never yield; we cannot compromise, and we shall not surrender.

The anti-poll-tax bill is one of the most far-reaching measures ever before the Congress. It involves far more than the question of paying or not paying a poll tax. It is a bold plan to start federalizing elections throughout the Nation. It provides in substance that in elections for President of the United States and for Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, the payment of a poll tax shall not be a prerequisite to voting. The real question presented is not the mere matter of paying a small tax but the matter of permitting the Federal Government, through a mere act of Congress, to enter the field of prescribing qualifications of electors in Federal elections. The people or the States can do this by constitutional amendment, but that is not their proposed method.

I raise the specific point that Congress has absolutely no authority whatsoever to prescribe the qualifications of an elector in any State. And, moreover, they are expressly prohibited from doing so by some of the plainest language in the United States Constitution, which is section 2 of article I, which reads as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That language was reaffirmed by the people word for word as to the qualifications for electors when they adopted the seventeenth amendment for the election of United States Senators in 1914. And I submit that there is not one scintilla of respectable legal authority anywhere that can cast any kind of a shadow over that clear, concise language that has guided us now for 159 years.

As to Federal intervention I remind my Republican friends that just 12 short years ago the Democratic Party swept this Nation from coast to coast in a Presidential election which carried 46 of the 48 States. Their membership in the Senate was a mere handful, while now in 1948 their membership has grown to the respectable total of 51. They control every committee and every maneuver not only of this branch but of the other legislative branch of the Government. Suppose that after the elections in 1936 the Democrats with their crushing majority had passed laws prescribing the qualifications of electors and to partially control Federal elections, and that by subsequent amendments they had further regulated the elections in all States, putting them under Federal police power and assigning Federal officers to attend political gatherings to act as referees and censors of political speeches, as recommended now by the President's Civil Rights Committee.

I ask my Republican friends, how many of their group do they suppose

would be Members here now? From crushing and almost destructive defeat in 1936, they have come back and are in a position to control Federal legislation, and they are making a bid for the Presidency of the United States. In their calm moments, they might seriously consider that this is the beginning of a movement to put the elections in a Federal strait-jacket; that they were elected in an election conducted under State laws passed by their own people, and supervised by police operating under State law. In their calm moments, they might further consider whether or not they would or could have been elected if there had been Federal laws under which the party then in power could have controlled or partly controlled the elections.

I believe, anyway, that the poll tax is more of a stabilizing regulation of the voting franchise than it is a tax. The times are fair warning to me that instead of wanting to repeal all of our regulations of the franchise, we should be wanting to protect it more than ever before. And as a most reasonable and moderate regulation, I recommend it to all of the States in the Union. I recommend that they consider imposing a small poll tax, or some other fair regulating equivalent thereof, as a prerequisite to voting in all elections, with the aged and the lame exempt, of course.

I am not thinking of the Negro. I would strongly favor such a regulation in our State as a stabilizer of the ballot if there was not a Negro in the entire State. Our tax applies, of course, to all races alike.

But if after all considerations, Senators should favor abolishing all poll taxes, then in the name of constitutional government, let us approach the question in all sincerity and propose a constitutional amendment. Whether it be adopted or whether it be defeated, constitutional government will have been respected and will have survived.

Because they are a part of the same pattern, as they impress me, I am going to mention, but time does not permit a discussion thereof, the antilynching bill, the FEPC bill, and antisegregation question.

Lynching is a form of murder, condemned by all decent people. It is on the decline. It was down to one in 1947. That is, of course, one too many. All other forms of murder have increased over the years. The problem is almost solved, due to local interest, local pride, and local support of laws. Do not rebuke and then destroy the only true spirit of proper law enforcement, which is a lively local interest and pride.

Mr. President, this program, as it is better understood, is becoming more and more discredited in the eyes of the people. I refer to two recent editorials in Washington newspapers, the Times-Herald and the Post. I shall read but two sentences from one of them, the editorial in the Washington Post, on the antilynching bill:

We cannot help thinking that this vote-catching venture has no place in the present session of Congress. Its effect is to arouse animosities at a time when there is urgent need for national unity.

The FEPC bill is so contrary to my conception of the God-given and constitutionally protected rights of a free citizen that I must admit I perhaps cannot impartially consider it. But it seems to me that if I wanted to convert a free government into a police state, I would start by enacting the FEPC bill.

I shall not discuss this bill in detail, but the following incident further covers my attitude thereon:

Some few weeks ago I received a letter from a German friend of mine who has always lived in Germany. He appealed to me strongly in the following words:

They are dismantling our factories over here. Please help stop them.

In the calmness of an evening in my office, I wrote him, in part, as follows:

DEAR HANS: We are dismantling over here, too. We are dismantling our Constitution. We are dismantling the time-honored and time-tested rights of the States to prescribe the qualifications of their electors, and are setting up the beginnings of federalized and Federal-controlled elections.

I knew my friend would understand this full well, because as a German he once had a constitution—back in the 1920's—and saw Hitler take control of the election laws, and thereafter he saw Hitler win all elections by a 99 1/100 percent majority.

My letter continues:

We are also dismantling the heretofore full rights of a citizen to choose his business associates, and whom he will promote and whom he will discharge. We are about to pass the FEPC bill.

I was not sure Hans would understand that, but I knew he was near the Russian zone of Germany, that he had Russian friends there who came under Soviet Russia's law, and I knew they could fully explain the FEPC to him.

My consideration of this man's sad plight, and my consideration of what is about to happen to my own people through the passage of these bills, emphasizes to my mind all the more clearly that such laws will eventually sovietize our own Constitution. When this is done, our children will eventually be writing to someone in some other nation, if there be anyone left to write to: "They are dismantling our factories, our homes, our entire Government over here. Please help stop them."

Mr. President, I was greatly impressed a few days ago when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], on the mention of water power in connection with the natural resources of his State, with great confidence assured the Members of the Senate that the natural resources of his State were protected by the Constitution of the State of New York, and that the people had no fear that they would be tampered with. I wished at that time that I had the same assurance and confidence in the fact that the necessary regulation of our voting franchise which our people have found over the years to be absolutely indispensable and which is written into our Constitution would not be disturbed and cut down.

A few days later I had the shocking experience of seeing a bill voted out by a

subcommittee of this group, without even a hearing, which bill would absolutely cut down a part of the organic law of my own State regulating our voting franchise, which affects my people in far more sacred capacities than would the water-power provision affect the splendid people of the great State of New York.

It is part of my political thought that both major political parties should look beyond the elections of 1948 and weigh the consequences of this legislation over the years.

Mr. President, I believe that the two present major political parties that have come down through the decades side by side for almost a century now have made a very definite contribution to the stability of our Government, and, on the whole, we have had strong government in this Nation for more than a hundred years. I believe in 2 strong political parties, as contrasted to our ill-fated sister nation, France, which I understand, had 21 parties competing for power during the period from World War I to World War II, to such an extent that no party could form a strong political government to rule for any appreciable time, with the well-known result that soon after the beginning of World War II the nation collapsed.

But now, just at the time we need the sound and constructive thought and leadership of both major political parties, wrestling with our foreign and domestic problems within the framework of our fundamental organic law, we find the leadership of both parties bidding for the vote of various small groups. They appear willing to scuttle the fundamentals of our freedom to get that vote. I cannot understand it. The people do not want it done. They ought to rise up and see that it is not done. I believe they will.

Passage of these bills will destroy the southern wing of the great political party which the South has followed for more than 80 consecutive years. It cannot, and will not follow any political party that helps put these bills, or any substantial part of them, on the statute books. I believe, Mr. President, that their passage would open the floodgates and lead to conditions that will destroy the Republican Party, or at least that part of it which stands for sound constitutional government.

Mr. President, I know as a practical matter that a great part of the so-called civil-rights program hinges around the racial problem, and when people think of the racial problem they sometimes think of the South first.

Many people have been led to believe that these misnamed civil-rights bills represent a question solely of right and wrong, and that the South is on the wrong side. It is partly, but not altogether, the fault of the South that our side has not been fully and effectively told, but before the fight on these bills is over our side will be told, and the people of the Nation will realize that this is not just a battle for the people of the South. They will realize that it is a battle for the people of the entire Nation.

This so-called civil-rights program is presented over and over again solely as an emotional and a humanitarian standpoint. All viewpoints are entitled to consideration, but I want to especially remind the Senate that this is a highly practical matter and must have a sound social and legal foundation.

I know there are some fine people in the Nation who are sincerely interested in the Negro of the South. They want to do something for him. They think legislation will help him. I think I should give the Senate my ideas on the subject.

Political parties as such will not help the Negro.

The only appreciable number of people in the Nation who will do anything worthwhile for the rank and file southern Negro and give him fair opportunities to develop are the southern white people who live where he lives. The white people protect the Negroes and respect them in the proper and mutually understood and mutually desired relations between the races. The southern white is the only one who really understands the southern Negro, and the real southern Negro understands only the southern white. Let them go their way in peace. Let them work out their salvation in this great section where the races live in the closest and friendliest contact and are happier together than are similar people anywhere else in the world under like conditions.

We in the South have no fear of our relations with the southern Negroes. We fear the paid agitators and the organizers who make their living by coming in and stirring him up, arousing his suspicion, inflaming the feelings of both races, and then skipping the country if trouble does threaten.

When we superimpose over the fine relations we have and the progress we are making in the South, the so-called civil-rights bills, including local segregation laws, which would destroy the necessary customs of the South, we stir up civil strife and racial enmity that could well largely paralyze industrial and commercial development. We will also set the Negro back many years.

I want to call this threatened legislation to the attention of the business interests of the East and North that have plants and capital invested in the South. Relations are good. The Negro is making good wages, more money than he has ever made. This legislation will stir up strife, enmity, and jealousy. It would perhaps stop the wheels of your industry. You and your employees would pay the price.

If we pass laws which the upright, law-abiding people of any substantial area of our Nation cannot obey and properly respect, while retaining their self-respect, then we drive the very best part of our citizenship partly underground. We prepare the hotbed and plant the seed that lead to the eventually destructive methods of secret organizations which, once started, cannot be quickly curbed or controlled. Calmly consider for a long time before you again inflict on the Nation the destructive and

far-reaching influence of such ill-advised and uncontrolled movements and organizations.

I believe, Mr. President, that the South is standing today at the threshold of the greatest era of development it has known for almost a hundred years, and that within the next 25 years it will make definite and far-reaching accomplishments on many fronts. The people have a forward-looking spirit. We have more local capital, and we are friendly to outside capital. Hundreds and hundreds of oil derricks arise amidst our young and growing forests. A cattle and dairy industry is developing rapidly. Smokestacks are dotting the horizon, and we are converting a large portion of our raw materials into finished products. There is new wealth and more wealth being created there. We are building new schools, new roads, and new hospitals in our cities, our small towns, and our rural communities. There is not time to present the facts and figures here now, but all races and groups are sharing in the profits of this development. Factual figures will be presented later.

There is a way to keep our racial relations adjusted in the South to the mutual benefit of the races. But Federal legislation is not the way. It will fail, and the Negro will be the serious victim of that failure. So I speak for all groups and races when I say, let us work out our own problems. We are making progress, and we have fear of only one thing that will disturb those relations, and that is outside interference.

Now, Mr. President, in conclusion, I remind my colleagues that there is more involved here than the mere passage of legislation proposed by pressure groups. We are not dealing in finance, or commerce, or things of the market place. There is involved the pride of a proud and spirited people. Their honor, their political soul, and their way of life, are at stake. They can take only so much and retain their self-respect. They will not take more. They are not indifferent or insensible to the problems of the times. They want to do their part toward solving them, and they are doing their part. Time is the only element needed. Give us time. Do not afflict all of us in our area with the irreparable injury that will come from Federal legislation on these most delicate subjects.

I close now with the theme of thought that will control much of my thinking so long as I am a Member of the United States Senate. Instead of afflicting the people of our great land with more and more bureaus and a greatly extended police power that will pry more and more into the political and private and personal affairs of our people, all operated from a centralized government at Washington, let us start putting the Government back where it belongs—let us put it back in the county courthouses—back in the hands of the people. That may not be the most efficient form of government, but it is the best. [Applause on the floor.]

Mr. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

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

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator wish to make extended remarks?

Mr. RUSSELL. Only a very brief statement.

Mr. SMITH. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to express my congratulations to the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] upon the able and well-reasoned address he has just delivered. I would that every citizen in other areas in this land who is interested sincerely in the grave problems of the South, other than from a political standpoint, might read and pay heed to the words the Senator has uttered.

I was shocked to hear that, regardless of any feeling which might have been engendered, any committee of this body would deny a hearing to a member of the committee on a matter which vitally affected his State. I am not impressed with the specious argument that the matter having been considered by the Senate before, there was no necessity for hearings. The Senate has just finished the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway matter, which has been beating around the Senate since I have been a Member, but in each Congress a hearing on that subject was accorded.

Mr. President, there are many of us who feel that the attempt to remove the poll tax by Federal statute is unconstitutional. My State has no poll tax. I am glad it does not, because, as I have stated on the Senate floor in years past, I think it is outmoded. But article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, and the seventeenth amendment, present the only instances where language is employed in the Constitution in identical terms; in other words, where language is repeated. The Federal Constitution, in specific terms, leaves the matter of fixing qualifications of voters to the several States in both of these provisions. There are seven States which have in their constitutions and laws provision for a poll tax. So I consider the action of this subcommittee in denying a hearing as being a lynching of the Constitution of the United States, of the constitutions and laws of seven States, of the rights of a Member of the Senate, and of the normal procedure of the Senate.

I might say further, if the Senator from New Jersey will indulge me only one moment more, that the door of the subcommittee may be closed, but those of us who are opposed to this high-handed and arbitrary action should not maintain silence on the floor of the Senate of the United States. I propose that those who are interested in this question, and who have been denied a hearing, prepare their briefs, including the statements which have been made by great men in years past, like William E. Borah, pointing out the unconstitutionality of such a measure, and that we read them on the floor of the Senate. We may not

be able to make the committee hear us, but we will at least put in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the views which in normal circumstances would be received by a committee.

Mr. President, I again congratulate the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I intend to address myself today to the unfinished business, Senate bill 2202, but I wish to express to my friend the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] my appreciation of the temperate and thoughtful case he has presented from the southern point of view.

I should first like to correct one statement that was made which implies that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not give a hearing on the bill recently introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. Full hearings were had on the bill, and, so far as I am concerned, I did not know anyone else wished to be heard on it. If that was the bill referred to, I think the RECORD should show that full hearings were held, and the record of the hearing is available to anyone who wishes to read it.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I desire to correct the assumption of the Senator from New Jersey as to what the junior Senator from Mississippi said. The statement made by the Senator from Mississippi was that no hearings were held on the anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. SMITH. I apologize. I thought the reference was made to the FEPC bill. I had sat in the hearings on that bill, and thought I should make clear that hearings had been held on it. I thank the senior Senator from Mississippi for his correction.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only statement made by the junior Senator from Mississippi was in respect to the anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. SMITH. I know nothing about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi for the clear, reasonable, and masterful constitutional speech which he has made on the Senate floor today. The reason why I rise to say these few words is that in 1946 the Senate appointed me, along with other Senators, as a special investigating committee in connection with the elections in Mississippi in that year. I had the opportunity of being there with distinguished Republicans as well as distinguished Democrats. Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], we studied the laws and the constitution. We believed in the rights of the people of Mississippi. We came back and said so. At that time Edgar Brown, colored leader, asked the President of the Senate to expel the Senator from Louisiana and me for our views.

I feel vindicated when I see the type of gentleman which Mississippi has sent to the United States Senate standing on

the Senate floor and making one of the greatest and most statesmanlike speeches that has been made in many a year.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BULWINKLE, and Mr. HARRIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REED, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. MYERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am addressing myself to the unfinished business, which is the European recovery program. In considering what I should say on this matter, it seems to me that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which held 5 weeks of hearings, then 10 consecutive days of careful consideration of the matter, I should express myself from my own personal viewpoint on the impressions made on me by this whole study, and especially to reflect the impressions I received during a trip to Europe last summer, when I had a chance to make some personal observation of conditions in Europe, and the possible impact of those conditions on the legislative proposal which is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, in the light of the masterly presentation by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in outlining the bill, and his elucidation of the points raised by the bill, it is not my purpose to cover that phase of the subject at all. I do hope to cover some of the controversial aspects, and to reflect in my remarks some of my own personal observations and some of the reasons that have brought me to a very deep conviction to support the legislation.

First of all let me state briefly that much of the feeling I have, which is very deep within me, was developed during my trip abroad last summer. I can say that I had an experience that many of the others who went abroad did not have, because I not only was privileged to visit the countries we are discussing now, the 16 countries of western Europe, but the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman visited the curtain countries, the so-called satellite countries, where we saw first-hand the slow growth of the disease which we so much fear may now envelop Europe.

When I arrived home from that trip abroad—and as I said, we covered all the curtain countries, except Russia itself and Albania—I made a statement which I shall read again into the RECORD, because I was charged with being an exaggerationist, if that is a proper word; I was charged with being a warmonger, a scaremonger, of raising ghosts that did not exist. I simply want to reread the statement I then made with the fresh impressions of the things I had seen, and ask my colleagues to compare those fresh expressions of last October with what has happened within a few days in Czechoslovakia and Finland. My statement at that time was very brief. It is as follows:

The United States is facing the most challenging crisis of its entire history. We are the bulwark of freedom to whom the world looks for leadership. Europe is in a state of almost complete economic collapse, with consequent despair. The threat to modern civilization cannot be exaggerated. It is here and now. The Moscow policy is to divide and then absorb. Communism feeds on famine, cold, and despair. And the end is human slavery.

The trip of our committee to the capitals of Europe has revealed the facts of the situation and the issue. We visited the satellite countries and those still struggling to survive. The pattern is the same everywhere. Freedom is being treacherously destroyed. The police state is emerging with a totalitarianism that surpasses the nazism of Hitler. Freedom-loving men who have opposed have been and are being liquidated.

Mr. President, we saw it with our own eyes in those countries while we were there.

America and the remaining free nations of the world must decide and now. Time is running against the fundamental freedoms and the sanctity of the individual man.

If America withdraws now it means the immediate absorption of Europe by communism, controlled and directed by a small well-organized minority in Moscow, which has enslaved the Russian people and now seeks to enslave the entire world.

Our alternative is difficult, but must be faced. We have the responsibility to march

with the United Nations in bringing the world to freedom and peace. We must act with the United Nations and now.

Mr. President, I submit that that was not an exaggerated statement. We have seen what has happened since then—Czechoslovakia and Finland and the other liquidations that occurred both before and since our return. Mihailovich in Yugoslavia, Maniu and now King Mihai in Rumania, Petkov murdered in Bulgaria, Pfeffer in Hungary, Mikolajczyk in Poland, and now the liquidation of Mr. Benes in Czechoslovakia. I cannot express adequately my deep feeling of concern over the terrible issues that face us.

But anyone who has seen this naturally asks himself, What can be done about it? Are there any different forces that we have to choose from? I have tried to sum up merely a few of the possibilities.

The first one that occurs, of course, is that in the light of the experience we have had, in the light of the vast billions of dollars we have spent in an effort to help Europe in her despairing condition, to give relief to Europe, we might withdraw now and say that we have done all we can to help Europe to her feet. I do not think I need to argue that extreme isolationist position. Not one of my colleagues takes that position. Perhaps there may be some who do, but I have not heard of any who do. To take such a position is to my mind simply unthinkable. So I pass on further.

We might suggest that we could help develop private industry by getting the western European nations back on their feet without the need of making any vast commitments ourselves. I have explored such a possibility; our committee explored it. The persons I talked to in England, France, and other countries were thinking in terms of such an alternative. But any superficial examination of the immensity of the problem makes it clear that mere private trade could not possibly handle this job. The dollar issue alone, which has been talked about so much, would come right to the front, and without some stabilizing proceedings, some cooperative proceedings, some attempt to get together, such as contemplated in the pending bill, the problem of dollars could not be solved. I do not think I need to further elaborate that point.

The next thought is that we might use armed force to maintain order in Europe and prevent further Communist aggression. This might take the form either of unilateral action by the United States—and nobody would think of contemplating that, even though we have the resources, the so-called atomic bomb—or some form of joint action by the United Nations. In the last few days that matter has been discussed here on the floor. So far as I am concerned, I have felt that at the present juncture, enthusiastic as I am for the whole United Nations program, and strongly as I support it, this is not the moment of time when we can bring about a reorganization of the United Nations set-up with any hope of action in adequate time to be successful.

The subject is far too large to try and settle it by amendments on the floor of

the Senate. I must say that with due respect to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for whom I have the highest regard. I share many of the feelings he has, and his eagerness to see something more effective done through the United Nations; but that is not within our province here. I have the greatest respect for the views of my colleagues who try to work out such a program as that, but, to use a slang expression, I feel it is not "in the cards."

So the difference I want to bring out is the difference between, on the one hand, a completely isolationist position, and, on the other hand, the use of force, which would bring on world war III at once.

Contrast those two possibilities with what has been the development of the so-called rehabilitation program which is the subject of the pending legislation. I am thinking in terms of an intelligent, positive, forward-looking program to reconstruct the countries of western Europe.

I do not believe my thinking is different from that of anyone else. I have talked to many persons about the matter. I talked to Secretary Marshall shortly after he had made his famous address at Harvard. He reviewed to me, I think, the very grounds I have just tried to go over as to what the alternatives were in this difficult situation. He pointed out that what he meant to say at Harvard—and I hope I am interpreting him correctly—was simply this: "We have spent billions of dollars in trying to help Europe since the end of the war. We cannot go on doing that indefinitely. We shall come to the end of our capacity to feed people and furnish relief. There is only one hope for the world, and that is for the world to get back on its own feet."

Therefore his logical conclusion was that the United States would be definitely interested in any attempt by Europe to get back on its own feet and become self-supporting again. In the process of doing so, we would be interested to talk business with them.

That is all I find in the Marshall statement. I think it is a perfectly natural statement. I feel confident that the Secretary did not feel, when he made it, that it was going to be a "shot heard round the world." It was; and it is an encouraging thing that it was. It meant that those people saw that what Secretary Marshall said was true. They received a "shot in the arm" at that moment from the knowledge that the United States would be there to do something about it, if they were able to get together and present a program which would offer some hope of bringing them out of their difficulties. That was the background of the CEEC plan which was evolved in Paris by the 16 nations.

Secretary Marshall did not limit his proposal to any special nations. It was an over-all proposal for the rehabilitation of Europe. Russia was included. The countries now satellites of Russia were included. He intended to have the whole of Europe together in this plan, in which we would be interested to participate. Unfortunately Russia miscon-

strued the proposal and tried to misrepresent our motives, and withdrew. The satellite countries also withdrew.

But there was a group of countries which did meet in Paris, and courageously presented a program after careful study, in a very brief period of 10 weeks, indicating what the resources of their countries were, and what their needs might be for rehabilitation, and suggesting what kind of aid they felt they must have from us, because we were the only country to which they could look for such a rehabilitation program.

I look upon that accomplishment as a miracle. I was abroad when it happened. I was in Paris when the group was meeting. Before I sailed for America I talked with Ambassador Caffrey and Ambassador Douglas in London. They told me about the conference, and the high spots of the CEEC report. I read the report with the greatest interest. Anyone interested in the subject would receive an enormous lift from the spirit of the report, the evidence of co-operation, the evidence of willingness on the part of those countries to merge their own differences, to give up their own private advantages for the common good, in the expectation and hope that we would work with them to bring about their salvation. So the report came to us.

The logical question, when such a report comes to us, is what to do with it. Not one of us is competent alone—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations would be competent if anyone would be—to make a study of the problem. Yet he would admit that none of us alone is competent to make a complete study. The thing to do was to get the best expert advice we could obtain. Our committee alone was not competent to do it; but through the leadership of the Senator from Michigan we asked that certain committees be set up to study the problem, to determine what our resources were, and to see if the United States could afford to participate in a plan which would at least give promise of doing something to put those nations back on their feet.

First we had the Krug report, by the Secretary of the Interior, whose department has jurisdiction over our natural resources. Then we had the so-called Nourse report, from a committee headed by Dr. Nourse and consisting of a group of economic advisers to the President.

Both those reports might be looked upon as administration reports, and therefore might be subject to some suspicion that because the administration favored this legislation, possibly those reports were tinged in favor of the legislation to be proposed. So it was suggested that a completely impartial committee be created, which had nothing to do with the administration, although it was set up at the invitation of the administration. Secretary Harriman, of the Commerce Department, was asked to set it up. It was composed of businessmen, representatives of labor, and men in the field of economics, who were to make a completely independent report, not in any way influenced by the other reports.

which had been made. The committee was to study the CEEC report, which had come from Paris, and check up on our resources, relying upon its own sources of information. In a moment I shall point out who the members of that committee were.

I think it is significant that this kind of a committee was asked to do the job, in order to give the Foreign Relations Committee the best expert advice we could get anywhere in the country, and advise us as to the practicability of the plan. So we have the Harriman report.

This report has been the keystone of my own study. I have not read it all, because it is too long. However, the way in which the report was made, and the importance of the men who participated in it, carry so much weight in my mind that I feel that every Member of the Senate should realize that we were getting the very best expert advice we could get in order to be on sound ground in advocating such a program.

It is worth taking a little time to point out the approach to this question. Again I wish to thank our chairman, the Senator from Michigan, for having seen the importance of this kind of an approach to the problem, comparing the figures of an independent, objective committee of American citizens, composed of members from all walks of life, with the figures which had been compiled by the Administration under the leadership of the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD the names of some of the members of the committee and the institutions with which they were connected. Later I shall ask that the entire membership list of the committee be printed in the RECORD, in order that it may be available, and so that Senators may see the type of men who studied the problem.

I point out that among the members of that committee were the presidents and heads of various important industries, as well as representatives of both the CIO and the American Federation of Labor. Two of the leading men in those two labor groups were members of the committee, James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, and George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor.

Another member of the committee was Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution of Washington, which has access to a great mass of data and studies over the years relating to economic conditions in this country.

Another member was Owen D. Young, honorary chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co. This was the same Owen D. Young who, after World War I, was so active in the so-called Young plan for reparations from Germany. He is thoroughly familiar with the foreign situation, and was very active in developing the report.

At this point in my remarks I ask that the entire list of names of members of the committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

The members of the President's Committee on Foreign Aid, and their affiliations, are as follows:

Hiland Batcheller, president, Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Robert Earle Buchanan, dean, graduate college, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

W. Randolph Burgess, vice chairman, National City Bank of New York, New York, N. Y.

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO Washington, D. C.

John L. Collyer, president, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

Granville Conway, president, Cosmopolitan Shipping Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

Melville F. Coolbaugh, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.

Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank, St. Louis, Mo.

R. R. Deupree, president, Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind.

Calvin B. Hoover, dean, graduate school, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Robert Koenig, president, Ayshire Collieries Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Edward S. Mason, dean, School of Public Administration, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

George Meany, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Harold G. Moulton, president, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.

William I. Myers, dean, College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Robert Gordon Sprout, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Owen D. Young, honorary chairman of the board of directors, General Electric Co., Van Hornesville, N. Y.

SUBCOMMITTEES AND THEIR CHAIRMEN

Capital and durable goods, Hiland Batcheller.

Consumer goods, John L. Collyer.

Development and administrative and drafting, Robert M. La Follette.

Economic and financial analysis, Owen D. Young.

Food resources, Chester C. Davis.

Manpower, Paul G. Hoffman.

Mineral resources, Robert Koenig.

Transportation, Granville Conway.

EXECUTIVE STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., executive secretary. Max F. Millikan, William W. Remington, Herman W. Liebert, assistant executive secretaries.

John Davenport, Hector Prud'homme, Sam VanHyning, Herbert Hughes, Martha Davis.

SUBCOMMITTEE SECRETARIES

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., economic and financial analysis.

Kenneth R. Davis, consumer goods.

Adrian S. Fisher, development and administration.

Karl A. Fox, food resources.

A. Ford Hinrichs, manpower.

Herman W. Liebert, drafting.

S. Morris Livingston, capital and durable goods.

Max F. Millikan, transportation.

Richard Mote, mineral resources.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in the list was our former colleague, Senator Robert M. La Follette, who was active all the way through. I wish to pay tribute to him for the excellent testimony he gave our committee in reporting to us.

To continue my emphasis of this report and its approach, because I think it is important to our colleagues to understand the way this question was looked into, to show how much more effectively it was studied than if we had tried to do these things ourselves, a group of experts worked for many weeks on this problem. They divided their work among a number of groups, so that every phase could be covered.

I should like to read the opening paragraphs of the report, to point out the approach which was made to the study when the committee undertook it. I quote from page 3 of the summary at the very beginning of the report:

The President's Committee on Foreign Aid was asked to determine the limits within which the United States could safely and wisely extend aid to western Europe. It has approached this assignment in a spirit of realism.

We believe that the future of western Europe lies very much in its own hands. No amount of outside aid, however generous, can by itself restore to health the economies of the 16 nations which met at Paris in July. Except in western Germany, where the United States has direct governmental responsibility, the success of any aid program depends ultimately on hard work and straight thinking by the people and the governments of the European nations themselves. The 16 nations and western Germany comprise over 270,000,000 men and women. They possess great agricultural and industrial resources. Even in its present depressed state the production of this area is vastly greater than any aid which this country can provide. Such aid must be viewed not as a means of supporting Europe, but as a spark which can fire the engine.

Mr. President, I have read that in order to show the spirit of the approach of the so-called Harriman committee, which was reflected very promptly to our Foreign Relations Committee, and which all of us felt. I wish to read the last statement again:

Such aid must be viewed not as a means of supporting Europe—

In other words, Mr. President, this is not a relief program—but as a spark which can fire the engine.

There is another passage which I wish to read from this very interesting and important report. On page 11 of the summary, which is to be found at the beginning of the report, the following statement appears:

VI. SUMMARY

The basic conclusions of the President's Committee on Foreign Aid—

That is, the Harriman committee—may be summarized as follows:

1. The hope of western Europe depends primarily on the industry and straight thinking of its own people.

2. The United States has a vital interest—humanitarian, economic, strategic, and political—in helping the participating countries to achieve economic recovery.

3. The aid which the United States gives will impose definite sacrifices on this country.

Mr. President, the third point is a frank recognition that this program will not amount to a mere giving of largesse out of our surplus, but that probably in

order to bring this about we shall have to tighten our belts.

I read further:

4. The magnitude of western Europe's deficit with the American Continent in 1948 will be of the order of \$7,000,000,000, but when all possibilities of financing are taken into consideration, the approximate need for appropriations, past and future, to cover the calendar year of 1948 may be of the order of \$5,750,000,000.

Mr. President, I may say that in light of the delay in enacting the legislation, I think all of us recognize that the year in question would not be the calendar year 1948—in other words, that would not be the year to which these figures would apply—but, rather, it would be the year beginning April 1, 1948, and running through March 31, 1949.

I read further from the summary:

5. The extension of such aid, now or in the future, calls for anti-inflationary fiscal policies on the part of this country, and a new agency to administer the aid extended.

Mr. President, I mention those points, as covered by the summary of the Harriman committee's basic conclusions, to show the approach they made to the subject and how nearly it coincides with the conclusions of our committee, which of course relied largely on this and other evidence, as so ably presented by the Senator from Michigan in his opening remarks.

I wish to read one other statement from the summary to which I have referred, which I think is so important in connection with the study of the subject before us. On page 35 we find a summary of essential recovery conditions in Europe, which indicates what this committee felt had to be required of these foreign countries in order that they might recover. Beginning at about the middle of page 35, I read the following:

It is the judgment of this committee that European recovery can be rapid provided that the essential conditions determining effective aid are met. In summary these are:

1. The central objective must always be to make Europe not independent of the rest of the world but self-sustaining with relation to the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize that point too strongly, because it had a great bearing on the deliberations of our committee—in other words, that we should not attempt to make Europe independent of the rest of the world, but should attempt to make it self-sustaining with relation to the rest of the world. In short, the committee contemplated cooperation by each beneficiary country not only with the rest of Europe, but with ourselves and the rest of the world.

I read further:

2. American aid should be on a decreasing scale. A permanent underwriting of European deficits by the United States Government cannot be contemplated.

Mr. President, it has been charged many times by those who have questioned the wisdom of this program that by adopting it we would simply be putting ourselves in a position where we would go on indefinitely paying the deficits of foreign countries. But the Har-

iman committee says here, and this was our own view, in the Senate committee:

A permanent underwriting of European deficits by the United States Government cannot be contemplated. It is clear that as the aid program tapers off it will be imperative for the natural forces of private financing to resume their normal function and to restore the long-standing relationships between European and United States enterprises.

The report definitely recognizes, Mr. President, the importance of going back to the normal channels of trade.

I read further:

3. It should be realized that the conditions which the world confronts today are the very reverse of those obtaining in the thirties and call for very different policies.

The participating countries, like most of the rest of the world, are in the grip of major inflation. Every added economic burden raises the pressure. The committee has seen no evidence that the participating countries are seeking too high a standard of living.

Mr. President, it has been charged in some quarters that we are trying to raise the standard of living of the people of the beneficiary countries beyond what they had before the war. That simply is not true. We cannot do it. We are simply trying to help them establish themselves on a self-sustaining basis, generally on the basis of their former standard of living.

I continue to read:

However, it must be emphasized that the attempt to accomplish too much capital formation, public or private, too soon could defeat the purpose of the program.

4. While Europe indubitably needs a large injection of working capital in the form of dollars, the consistent aim should be not only to accomplish recovery but to create the kind of national and international framework wherein such recovery can be sustained by the work and effort of individuals. Monetary and exchange stabilization, allowing for the gradual relaxation of hampering controls, are essentials to this end.

5. If the above conditions can be fulfilled, the United States should contribute generously but wisely to the program set forth at Paris.

Mr. President, those are the observations of the Harriman committee in its very valuable report.

I should like next briefly to point out the scope of this report, because many persons have said to me, "How could you possibly get the necessary information to enable you and the committee to make a favorable report recommending the program?" Mr. President, it can readily be seen merely from the table of contents that the Harriman committee report covers the whole field of the European recovery program, what its nature is, the requirements for and availabilities of specific goods, the magnitude of the program, the financing of European requirements, the economic impact on the United States, and then a chapter on the administration of the program.

In addition to that, there are special reports on individual commodities. I wish the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] were now in the Chamber, because he has raised questions about some

commodities which might be in short supply. Let me point out that part 3 contains a series of special reports on every commodity that will be involved in this entire program. I shall not read the headings of all the special reports, but I point out that they are on such subjects as the special position of the bizon in Germany, and such items as food resources, agricultural machinery, and iron and steel. The last-mentioned subject has been discussed at great length here, Mr. President. So we should note that included in the Harriman report is a special, full report on iron and steel, not only as to Europe, but as to the entire world.

The titles of other of the special reports are as follows: "Petroleum and petroleum equipment"—

Mr. President, I point out that in our committee we had extended discussions in regard to petroleum and whether we should prohibit exports of petroleum, and should require Europe to obtain petroleum from the Near East, for example, so as not to reduce the reserves of petroleum available to our own people. I commend Senators for raising these various questions, but I suggest that every one of them has been carefully studied in the course of the report, and then definite conclusions carefully arrived at.

I simply refer to the report and point out the very careful way in which the subject has been studied from the beginning, starting with General Marshall's proposal, and following through with the report of the Paris meeting, and the reference of the proposal to the United States, and finally the Harriman report, which reflects the judgment of all types and phases of American life—business, labor, the educational field, economic experts, and all those who are best qualified to deal with a matter of this kind.

So, Mr. President, I find myself more and more—I do not like to use the word "enthusiastic," because the situation is too serious to speak quite in that way—but more and more convinced of the soundness of what we are trying to do. I believe that it was proper to try to do as we are doing now, and to submit to the Senate in legislative form the result of months of study, the result of the observation of the creeping paralysis in Europe due to the spread of communism, the result of our thinking on the crisis that faces the world and especially that faces America. I believe it was appropriate to present it in a form whereby we can say practically to the American people, "We have given you the best we have got in studying this problem and we are asking you to have faith and to accept this calculated risk"—that is the expression which has been used—"as the wisest of the many alternatives facing us in the present situation."

Let me say that I agree with those who say we can make no guarantees. I asked a number of the ministry in England when I was there whether, from their knowledge of the Marshall plan, they felt there could be any guaranty, for example, that England could be restored. They said, "No guaranty, but it is the only hope that

she sees ahead." In other quarters we have raised the same question. There can be no guaranty. It would be foolish to say there could be. The chairman of the committee was very careful to say there could be no guaranty. But it is, as has been stated, a calculated risk, which, in my humble judgment, we should be prepared to take.

But that is the material economic side. To my mind, the question goes far deeper than mere economic or material aid. The most serious problem we face in Europe is the rapid moral deterioration of the people. We have a problem affecting some 270,000,000 people who have gone through the agonies of war, the destruction of their property, malnutrition, despair, and complete destruction of what we have come to consider the basic spiritual values of life. I did not see anybody starving to death. I have been asked, "Did you see anybody starving to death?" I have replied, "No, I saw nobody starving to death." But I scarcely went anywhere, and especially in the countries in which we are so profoundly interested at the present time, that I did not see evidences of malnutrition and of something lacking in the snap and vigor that people have when they are on their toes and ready to go ahead with hope as distinguished from despair. They were living in a condition between hope and despair, waiting to see what might be done, what might be the result.

I believe it cannot be denied that the action we took last fall in the special session granting interim aid afforded a great impetus to those people to renew their courage, and, in France and Italy especially, to resist the surge of communism that might have overtaken them if we had not given them temporary aid to tide them over until this more extended program could be considered. With our help they are willing to pool their own resources and to undertake targets of production to put themselves back on their feet and to become self-sustaining once more.

I think all of us realize, as suggested in the report of the committee, and as the Senator from Michigan brought out very clearly, the wonderful progress that has been made by the people themselves, since apparently it was evident that some sort of rehabilitation program would be approved by the United States. What they have received is what the doctors call "a shot in the arm." We are now charged with the whole problem of implementing that "shot in the arm" through practical action.

I need not review the bill, because that has been done in great detail, but the bill contains safeguards which were carefully thought out, carefully discussed with every witness who appeared. I do not think it is any disparagement of the present administration or of the Secretary of State to say that we completely rewrote the bill that came to us from the administration. We completely changed the general approach to the whole subject of rehabilitation from what was first presented to us as the State Department's proposal to what we finally felt was wise, in the light of our conference with various members of the Cabinet and with the various experts

appearing before us who were concerned with the bill, to protect us against the dangers which might attend a matter of this kind. We set up a separate administration. We provided for periodic reviews of progress, so that we need not continue the plan one moment if the conditions are not lived up to and if the progress is not made that the whole program contemplates. We provided for what has been called a congressional watchdog committee, so that Congress will be continuously in touch with the operations of the administrator who is to be appointed under the bill, and can be kept constantly advised. We would be advised well in advance before we are called upon next year for a second appropriation under the bill. Moreover, every protection has been given to the American economy.

I have heard a number of questions raised in the debate on the floor. I shall not deal with them all, because they have all been very well answered. I may mention only a few of them. Some question has been raised about the relationship between the Administrator in the United States and the so-called roving ambassador abroad. I can say in that connection in passing that it was necessary to invent a new type of machinery to take care of this program, and it seemed wise to provide for an independent administrator who would of course cooperate with the State Department, but who, on an economic basis as distinguished from a political basis, would be independent of that Department, and of diplomatic procedures. The bill provides for a roving ambassador abroad, representing both the economic side and the State Department dealing diplomatically with this group of nations.

The question was raised why we provided a 4-year authorization. Speaking for myself, I have never had any difficulty with that problem, because it seemed to me if we were thinking in terms of 4 years in which to accomplish the job, we should give indications at the very beginning that without committing ourselves as to how much we will expend, we are prepared to go through with it, and continue it until the time comes when it should be terminated.

The 4-year authorization seems to be the natural and proper action for the Congress to take. I cannot conceive of our making the proper approach in the matter by saying that we will adopt the program for 1 year and see what will happen. I think we must consider that this is a program looking to putting people back on their feet on a self-sustaining basis. It is going to require more than 1 year—we all know that to be so—and we are simply proposing by this bill to authorize the continuance of the program for the period of time we think will be necessary in order to accomplish what we want to accomplish. It does not, of course, fix an over-all appropriation for the entire period. All agree that we cannot see further ahead than 12 months, and, therefore, so far as appropriations are concerned, it is a 1-year proposition. I intend to discuss that in just a moment.

Other questions have been raised, such as limitations on the exportation of spe-

cific commodities. That question is naturally raised. Are we going to allow commodities to be exported which are in short supply here and which are needed for our own economy? Every safeguard has been provided in the bill to cover conditions of that kind. The export controls will still be maintained by the Department of Commerce, working closely with the Administrator, and the entire relation of the foreign program to our own economy will be constantly kept in sight. Frankly, I do not feel any concern on that phase of the problem.

There has been discussion of the question of dismantling plants in Germany. I think that question was raised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. He raised the question very naturally. I had the same difficulty. In the hearings there was extended discussion of whether, in the light of the adoption of this program, so far as plants which had not been dismantled were concerned, it would not be possible to consider whether it would not be better to leave them in Germany rather than remove them to one of the other countries. That is left to be worked out with the different countries because, under the reparations agreement, they are entitled to have certain of the plants transferred. I think that matter is in splendid hands. I think it is being dealt with in the statesman-like manner that it deserves. I do not share the view that the Government is open to attack on that score, as some have charged. I think I was one of the most critical persons with regard to that particular matter.

Mr. President, I desire now to advert briefly to one of the problems that troubles everybody, and which troubled me. I refer to the amount authorized in the bill for the beginning of the operation of the plan. I think we have all conceded pretty generally that the measure, possibly with some amendments, will be passed and that the debate will be regarding the amount involved.

The original bill provided for a period of 15 months and for \$6,800,000,000 as the ceiling to be expended during that period. For reasons which I believe were eminently sound, the committee, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Michigan, decided that instead of trying a 15-month period we should try a 12-month period, because that would bring us to a check-up period early next year before the question of the next appropriation will come up. So we limited our operations in the first period to 12 months with a ceiling figure of \$5,300,000,000 for that period. That figure corresponds practically with the \$6,800,000,000 suggested for 15 months. We thought it was wiser to terminate the first experiment at the end of 12 months with the smaller figure. The Harriman report contained a corresponding figure of \$5,750,000,000, which I am advised included some of the expense of the German occupation.

The suggestion has been made that the figures are too high and should be reduced. My good friend ex-President Hoover felt we could get larger credits from countries in this hemisphere than were allowed in our estimates, and he

thought there might be a saving in that respect. I checked it up as carefully as I could and discussed it with members of the State Department and members of other departments in Washington. I was especially impressed with the testimony of President McCloy of the International Bank in which he stated that, rather than our figure being too large, it is probably too small. That was an interesting bit of testimony, because the International Bank made an entirely separate study of the resources of all the countries of the world in connection with putting itself in position to extend sound credits to them. We were impressed with the fact that the International Bank had made a study from a different angle because of the situation, and therefore the committee asked Mr. McCloy if he would give a statement as to whether he thought the preliminary figures were too high. In a letter which he addressed to the chairman of the committee, under date of January 27, 1948, he made these two significant statements, after pointing out that, if anything, the Harriman figures were too low:

I believe it is fair to say that, considering the factors discussed in this letter—

And he has gone over the different factors having to do with making up the figures—

considering the factors discussed in this letter and the objectives sought to be achieved—i. e., helping Europe to become self-supporting at a standard of life somewhat higher than that prevailing today though below that of prewar—the amount recommended for appropriation by the administration is conservative.

In another part of the same letter he uses this language, after referring to what he calls annex III, containing detailed figures in arriving at his final estimates:

Analysis of annex III indicates the salient points of differences between the administration's figures and those of the bank, and the reasons why, in the opinion of the bank's staff, the proposed \$6,800,000,000 appropriation recommended by the administration for the first 15 months of the program, far from being extravagant, provides a rather tight fit. A brief discussion of the more important figures in annex III may, therefore, be of value.

I have referred to that because I think no one has anything but the highest respect for the ability of Mr. McCloy and the efficiency with which he is operating the International Bank, and no one can possibly imagine any person being in a better position than he to get the best possible evidence with regard to the economic resources of the countries with which the bank has to deal. So I feel that his statement suggesting that these figures, rather than being too high, are, if anything, too conservative, is of great importance. It would suggest that if we are to revise the figures they should be revised upward rather than downward. The committee has felt that while the figure we have arrived at comes very close to the figures suggested by the studies of the Government, by the studies of the independent Harriman committee, and of Mr. McCloy of the International Bank, they all come so close together that we are on sound

ground in suggesting a ceiling of \$5,300,000,000 for the first period, and that we should not go below that figure. I am not saying that all the money has to be spent, but that is the ceiling which we estimate is the need. If Mr. Hoover is correct, any administrator appointed would have the responsibility of trying to get from the Western Hemisphere countries further credits. I am advised that Canada, because of her dollar position, has gone as far as she can in extending credits. I am advised that while Argentina has had large dollar credits in this country for a number of years, at this time she is down to a point where she is in great difficulty because of her dollar position. But it would not be possible for us arbitrarily to say to those countries, "You must extend further credits if you are to be a part of the plan." Any administrator dealing properly with the problem should be given sufficient leeway so that he will not be handicapped in his work. If we do anything less than that we had better do nothing. If this plan shall fail because we have not provided adequate leeway, it seems to me we are very culpable in connection with the responsibility which we have. We do not have to spend all of this amount. We shall see after the first year what the credit situation is. We shall see what loans may be repayable as distinguished from mere grants.

I urge on my colleagues not to think of cutting down the figure \$5,300,000,000, which we have arrived at so carefully and as to which we have received the best expert advice we could obtain to put the plan on a sound economic basis as a start. Let us gain experience from that.

So, Mr. President, I shall now make a few over-all conclusions from my own observation of the situation. I am speaking now of the kind of considerations which have induced me to become a wholehearted supporter of the plan.

The threatening events in the world have left in my mind some indelible impressions and a challenge, as I see it, to the United States of America, to accept a responsibility that it has never had before in its entire history. That responsibility comes to us because we have emerged from the war as the strongest nation in the world and as the only nation left that can possibly give aid in substantial amounts to help restore what might otherwise be a dying civilization. So I plead for a sound, positive, aggressive foreign-aid policy that must be clearly and constantly explained to the world. It may be definitely related to the very survival of the United Nations organization.

In approaching this matter I see grave danger of mistakes on our part that might well spell disaster. Certainly if we contributed of our wealth to continue in existence an obsolete European structure, which has been the cause of two world wars within 25 years, our contributions would be wasted. Consequently, we are confronted with the fact that the mere giving of dollars or even of commodities is not sufficient to do the creative job that must be done. We must make it clear to the world that what we are trying to do is to help people help

themselves, people who have voluntarily proposed to merge their political and economic differences in order that they may mutually recover from the terrible inertia and chaos that have overcome them. We all know that the small compartments of Europe for hundreds of years have made difficulties that prevented human understanding between people by which they could move forward. We have solved this particular problem in America by our economic unity and our political safeguards. Our experience may suggest an ultimate United States of Europe or at least a Federation of European States which would have the responsibility for the common welfare.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas discussed that point yesterday, and he felt that we should make some suggestions along that line, but our committee felt we could not precipitate that, that we could not make it a condition to our participating in the program.

The problems, of course, are the trade barriers, the currency differences, the racial jealousies and prejudices, and all those things that tend to drive people apart rather than bring them together.

Now we have a gleam of hope in the amazing accomplishment of the Paris Conference, where these divided peoples have adopted goals for their respective accomplishments as conditions of their further aid from us. And let me add here, and emphasize especially, the vital importance of including western Germany, and by this I mean the bizonal areas, and also I hope soon the French zone, as a part of this entire program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator states that western Germany would be united in the program of the 16 countries, does he have in mind the possibility, or even the probability, that the eastern part of Germany may always remain in the hands of the Soviet Government?

Mr. SMITH. I certainly hope not. I hope the time will come when we may organize all of Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. SMITH. My opinion at present is that if Russia and eastern Germany and the satellite countries do not come into the plan, we are going ahead anyway. This is our answer, and is what we are trying to do. We are going to try to organize western Europe in this cooperative movement in order to keep free people on their own feet, taking care of themselves, and building their own civilization.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any thought in the able Senator's mind that the eastern part of Germany, and the land east of the iron curtain, will in any way come into the plan?

Mr. SMITH. I think inevitably the channels of trade will move back and forth, and I do not believe there will be a curtain between the new group I am speaking of, the participating countries,

and the bread basket of Europe, as it has been called, which is behind the iron curtain. It is natural for trade to move back and forth. I believe it will happen, even if there is some friction. Once this plan gets under way and once Russia realizes that we mean business, and that we mean to organize peoples so that civilization can move forward, I think their attitude will change.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will there be trade of such nature as to result in unity?

Mr. SMITH. The countries will not become a unit immediately, probably.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then the able Senator does have some hope that Russia's attitude will be changed?

Mr. SMITH. I do, indeed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that will be in the near future?

Mr. SMITH. I think that if this plan is inaugurated and operates successfully during the first 12 months, the attitude of Russia may well be changed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator suggest the evidence upon which he bases his opinion?

Mr. SMITH. That is very difficult to state, because at the present moment it looks just the other way, but I suppose hope springs eternal, and I have a feeling of optimism within me, and believe that what we need to do is to arouse the spirit of enthusiasm and energy in the area in Europe to which I am pointing on the map, which is the area of the intelligentsia of Europe, the ability of Europe, and get them moving. Hundreds of people in that area would want to see the plan successful, because it would mean their ultimate liberation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's feeling, then, is based more on hope than on evidence?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, it could not be based on evidence, because the evidence at the moment tends to show that that part of the world is being lined up against the plan, but it is our calculated opinion that the plan will succeed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Along the same line, and for my own information, I should like to know what the situation with respect to Austria is. I notice that on the map Austria is shown as one of the recipient nations. Is not part of Austria occupied by the Russian Army?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. There is a Russian zone, an American zone, a British zone, and a French zone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will our relief go to that part of Austria occupied by the Russian Army?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not so understand. I understand it will go to the part occupied by the participating nations—England, France, and the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator know where the line between the Russian occupation and the Allied occupation is drawn?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot point it out on the map. I was there last summer, but I cannot tell where the line is. Our part

is toward the west, and the Russian part toward the east.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Russians probably occupy the greater part of Austria, do they not?

Mr. SMITH. In territory?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In area; yes.

Mr. SMITH. I could not answer that question accurately. I do not know whether they do or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I think we can find that out for the Senator, and I shall be glad to try to do so.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Speaking of Austria, does the Senator believe that if today we did not have an army of occupation in Austria it would become a satellite of Russia?

Mr. SMITH. No doubt. When I was in Austria, I talked to native Austrians, and they said, "We are praying that the Army of the United States will not leave here before the last Russian departs." These countries are militarily occupied because there is no Austrian treaty. If there were a treaty, all troops would withdraw. Because of the absence of a treaty, the Russians keep their hand in the pie.

Mr. FERGUSON. For the record, would the Senator state the countries where the Red Army is located at the present time, where Russia has troops?

Mr. SMITH. Russia has troops in Bulgaria, in Rumania, in Hungary, and, of course, Tito has his troops in Yugoslavia. They are not Russian, they are Serbian, but they are under Russian control. I do not think they have any in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many do they have in Austria?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot recall offhand. We can get that information. It is in the record.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the Red Army is out of Bulgaria, under the terms of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH. That may be correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language of the treaty is "to protect their lines of communication," and the fashion in which they protect them is somewhat fantastic in its magnitude.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do the terms of the agreement specify that we are entitled to know the number of troops the Russians have there protecting their so-called lines of communication?

Mr. SMITH. I shall have to ask the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not recall whether there was anything in the treaty on the subject of information or not. I think the information should be available, however.

Mr. SMITH. I think I have seen the information, but I do not now recall just what it is.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was going to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that on the same trip he made

last fall—and this is in answer to some question about the troops in Austria—I was in southern Austria, outside of Vienna, very close to the Yugoslav border, in the vicinity of the town of Klagenfurt, or just above it. That area is one of the main centers of the Red Army in Austria. So far as I can find, in most of these countries they have concentrated their headquarters and their troops in areas outside of the beaten path. We heard in Budapest and in Bucharest and in Warsaw this statement on a number of occasions made by taxi drivers or other persons, "In the last 2 or 3 days, since the American delegation is in town, we do not see Russian troops on the streets." In other words, they had pulled their troops out of the main centers and had put them in the country. But they had centers of troop concentrations outside the main towns. I especially know that because I was stranded on a trip by automobile for 6 hours in Klagenfurt, which was the headquarters of the Russian Army in that region, but the troops did not appear in that town. They did not make an appearance in Vienna. But they were occupying the entire country of Austria.

I might call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the guise of maintaining the lines of communication between Russia and Austria, the occupied zone, the information I received was that Russia had taken that excuse completely to invest the various countries and had scattered her troops all over them. They did not merely maintain a channel of communication through a country, but they invested the whole country. The troops were scattered around in the small towns. There were thousands of Russian troops scattered throughout the countryside. What they did in maintaining, as they said, their lines of communications, reminds me of the story of the man in the north woods who bought a tract of timberland far back from the main road, but with no road leading to his tract. However, he had inserted in the contract a clause which gave him the right to cut enough timber between the main road and his tract, so as to make an access road to his timber, so he cut off a strip of timber a mile wide in order to get access to his own tract. The Russians have done something similar to that in the maintenance of their lines of communication in all the countries in which they have their troops.

The Senator from Michigan said a moment ago that he understood that under the terms of the treaty the Russian troops were out of Bulgaria. I think the treaty provided that they were to be out of Bulgaria by this time, but I believe the Russians are merely giving lip-service to that provision of the treaty. We were told in Bulgaria that the Russians had not removed their troops in any great numbers. In fact, we were told—how accurate the statement was I do not know—that they were conducting maneuvers in the general direction of the Greek border, and in the general direction of the Turkish border.

When we flew from Sofia to Istanbul the flight pattern we had to follow was down the valley between the two ranges of mountains, one being the Stara Pla-

nina and the other the Rhodope Mountains on the south. We had to fly down that valley corridor and well out to sea above Istanbul, and then turn south. We were not permitted to fly over the land in that area. The excuse which was made, whether accurate or not, was that the Russian Army troops in conjunction with the Bulgarian troops were holding maneuvers and activities of that sort in the general direction of Istanbul, and also near the Greek border.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what that date was, generally speaking?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. About the first day of October of last year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To be exactly accurate, the Bulgarian treaty became effective on September 15, and the Soviets had 90 days from that date totally to withdraw their troops. The 90 days having now expired, I anticipate that the Red Army is out of Bulgaria.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would not dispute that. I do not know. But at that time the Red troops were still reported to be there.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to inquire of either Senator with respect to the withdrawal of Russian troops, if we can pay any credence to the reports we read occasionally that the Russian troops are still in the various countries in question, but they are not in uniform.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I received information when I was in Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria from some of our embassy officials, and also from some local people, that the difference in the situation before a treaty was entered into and the situation after the treaty was entered into was that before the treaty was entered into the Russian troops would be in uniform, and after it was entered into they would be there, but out of uniform.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the information I have received.

Mr. SMITH. That was the information I received. It was hearsay, just as the Senator from Iowa said the information he received was. It was the statement made to us, however, and that that was what they expected. I was told that such a think would happen in Austria. After the Austrian treaty the Russian soldiers would still remain and carry on in civilian clothes.

Let me point out that the presence of troops in these countries has made it possible for the Communists to insist on their representation in what they call the coalition governments. That is the first step in their movement to infiltrate. They get control of the department of the interior first. By having control of the department of the interior they have control of the police, and when they obtain control of the police they control the next election. Then there will be another government. That is the pattern all the way down through every one of these countries. That is the very kind of thing we are talking about now.

Mr. WATKINS. It does not seem to make much difference whether a treaty exists or not.

Mr. SMITH. Apparently it does not make much difference if there is a treaty or not. It seemed to us that that was the pattern straight down the line, in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and, so far as we could observe, in Austria. We did not go to Yugoslavia or Albania. But the same sort of thing was moving down through the various eastern European countries, and, as we read in the newspapers, the Communists are now trying to engulf Greece. We are trying to save Greece at the present moment. Senators can see by looking at the map what dangerous positions Greece and Turkey are in, being right next to this movement. We flew from Bulgaria over to Istanbul and up to Ankara, and back by way of Greece and Italy, so we got the feeling of this whole area behind the curtain, and what was going on there.

Mr. WATKINS. Am I to understand the Senator to say that in Austria the people have the feeling that if the American troops were withdrawn the Russians would take over?

Mr. SMITH. Definitely. That is a very strategic area. Senators can see its relation to Italy and western Germany. If the Communists can move in and take over Austria, the situation will be critical. Austria is a sort of small hub in the whole territory. On the east and to the north are Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Greece, and Turkey, and on the other side are western Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. Senators can readily see how strategic Austria is to the whole program.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of the fact that the Russians have kept their troops there, even though a treaty exists, it would be to the interest of our country and of Austria not to have a treaty for the time being.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I did not feel so badly when that treaty was not signed, because if we moved our troops out of Austria I knew what would happen in that area. That is the personal feeling I had.

Mr. WATKINS. I had the same feeling with respect to Italy when the treaty with Italy was before this body for approval. I felt that we would be put at a disadvantage if we signed the treaty and withdrew our troops, because with Tito across the border in Yugoslavia, and the Russians close by, they would practically have control of Italy, and we would not be there even to protect it in any way.

Mr. SMITH. That danger exists. I saw our troops leave Italy. I voted for the ratification of that treaty. But the Senator has made a good point.

Mr. WATKINS. I voted against the treaty for the reason that by entering into the treaty it would mean we would leave Italy undefended, while trying to stop the advance of communism. We have spent \$400,000,000 in an effort to save Turkey and Greece, and to set up our line of communications, and then we moved our troops out of Italy, thus to that extent disarming Italy, so the Italians could not help themselves.

Mr. SMITH. For the moment I think the Italians are holding the fort. I think

Italy will stay with us until the Marshall plan becomes effective.

Mr. WATKINS. The fact of the matter is that the President of the United States has served notice on the world to keep hands off of Italy.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. That in itself is probably more effective than the use of money.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; and the statement applies also to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, I shall now continue my statement.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the answer the Senator from New Jersey gave to the junior Senator from Michigan relative to what knowledge the Senator from New Jersey had that the economic program would accomplish the purposes for which it is intended. As I understood the answer of the Senator from New Jersey it was that it was only a hope.

Mr. SMITH. No; the Senator misunderstood the question. The question was, What evidence did I have that if this program was put into effect we would establish trade between eastern Europe and western Europe? That is what I said was the hope. I did not know. With respect to the other, I have much more than hope. I admit that it is a calculated risk; but I think we have substantial evidence, from the people with whom we have talked, from the economy of the situation, and from the spirit of the people.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that the 16 countries are to trade with other countries beyond the territorial limits of the 16 countries?

Mr. SMITH. That is what I mean. My hope is that they will reach the point where they will be trading with all the world, as they did before.

Mr. WHERRY. During the life of this agreement, which is proposed to be continuous for 4 years and 3 months, let us assume that one of the 16 countries which we rehabilitate—for example, France—is permitted to reconstruct its factories, and that the output of steel in the third or fourth year is such that it has steel for export. Let us assume that production reaches the point it is intended to reach. Would France be permitted to do business with a satellite country, or with Russia, in exporting its steel?

Mr. SMITH. I think that would be a determination to be made by the joint action of our organization here and the group established in Europe to deal with us.

Mr. WHERRY. The only alternative we have is to terminate our aid to France when that time arrives.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator assume that France suddenly begins to do something that we think is out of line?

Mr. WHERRY. Not suddenly. Suppose the United States should enter into an agreement for a period of 4 years. Suppose that after the end of the third year, when the industry had been built up, France was able to export steel. If France should have export possibilities,

could she sell steel to any country in eastern Europe? Would we build up her plants to that position, and then say to France, "Now that you are doing business with Russia, we will cut you off?" Could that be the situation after we had built up the industries in France?

Mr. SMITH. That is a fair question. I would not expect that to happen.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it contemplated that France can deal with whomever she chooses at any time during the life of this contract?

Mr. SMITH. There are certain controls over exports.

Mr. WHERRY. What controls are there? Do we have anything to say about it?

Mr. SMITH. I shall have to refer the Senator to the provisions of the bill for the details.

Mr. WHERRY. I have looked through the bill, and I can find no restriction on any of the 16 countries which would prevent them from doing business with any other country in the world. If there is a restriction in the bill, I wish the Senator would point it out to me.

Mr. SMITH. We hope that they will be able to do that as soon as they get on their feet.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the hope, does the Senator feel that we should build up the industries of France for 3 years, permitting the output of steel to reach the point where France can export steel, and then permit her to send steel to Russia?

Mr. SMITH. That is a difficult question to answer.

Mr. WHERRY. It is certainly a vital question. It is one of the most vital that I know of. There is no restriction in the bill. That is the point which I tried to make the other day.

Mr. SMITH. I shall try to point out—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has reported this bill unanimously. I am seeking information. We are called upon to vote for this economic rehabilitation. What worries me is this: Is this to be a mutual relationship among the 16 countries only? Are the 16 countries to interchange goods only with friendly countries, to the end that there may be political unification? I dislike to use those words, because they did not meet with too much approval yesterday. If this is simply an economic development which will enable those countries, within the next 3 or 4 years, to export their products and sell them to whomever they please, and we have no way to stop it, we are actually providing the wherewithal to build those industries so that the products can be sold wherever those countries choose to sell them. If that includes Russia, then the very purpose of the bill will be defeated.

Mr. SMITH. I do not agree with the Senator's conclusion.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the Senator's conclusion, if the steel is sold to Russia?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot conceive of selling the steel to Russia when the very program we are promoting is to organize those countries to protect them against the Russian menace.

Mr. WHERRY. We are supposed to be protecting them against Communist aggression. If we should raise the industrial production of France, and her output of steel, to the point where France can interchange goods with other countries, as the Senator hopes she will be able to do, would such interchange of goods extend beyond the limits of the 16 countries? The Senator said it would. He said that goods could be sold wherever those countries chose to sell them, to establish relationships with any other country in the world. Is there any restriction or limitation in the bill which would prevent France from selling her surplus steel to Russia? That is my question; and I understand the Senator to say that there is no such restriction.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I think there is very clear language in the bill which would make it impossible for France or any other country to use the assistance provided for in this bill to aid any country which might be competitive or not in harmony with the United States. I shall try to point out the language in the bill which I think takes care of that situation.

On page 33, line 6, in section 17, the following language occurs:

SEC. 17. The Administrator, in determining the form and measure of assistance provided under this act to any participating country, shall take into account the extent to which such country is complying with its undertakings embodied in its pledges to other participating countries and in its agreement concluded with the United States under section 15. The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this act to any participating country whenever he determines that (1) such country is not adhering to its agreement concluded under section 15, or is diverting from the purposes of this act assistance provided hereunder, and that in the circumstances remedial action other than termination will not more effectively promote the purposes of this act or (2) because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States.

What is section 15? I quote from section 15, on page 27:

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is authorized to conclude, with individual participating countries or any number of such countries or with an organization representing any such countries, agreements in furtherance of the purposes of this act.

What are the purposes of the act? The purposes of the act are stated on pages 2 and 3, and they very clearly indicate that "the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations."

If it is found by the Administrator—as I think he would find, because the Senator has found it already—that the action of Russia endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, that would be contrary to section 15; and under the termini-

nation section on page 33 the Administrator would be clearly within his rights in stopping aid to any country which sought to help Russia. In fact, it would be written into the agreement to begin with, that if any country used the aid in order to help a country which was dedicated to combating the purposes of the bill, such country would not receive aid in the first place. That is an entirely distinct proposition from trying to stimulate wholesome trade with eastern Europe. There is plenty of power in the bill to stop the thing to which the Senator from Nebraska refers.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not answer my question at all. To begin with, the termination section, section 17 on page 33, refers to section 15, which is found on another page, and which in turn refers to the purposes of the act. There is nothing in the purposes of the act which restricts trading of the sort described in the question which I propounded to the Senator from New Jersey. According to this provision, we could terminate aid the next day after negotiating an agreement. The Administrator could say that the other country was not complying with the purposes of the act, and terminate the aid.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator believe that Russia is devoted to "the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence," or that Russia is devoted to "the establishment of sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships, and the achievement by the countries of Europe of a healthy economy independent of extraordinary outside assistance"? No; the Senator does not believe that.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KEM, and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I prefer to complete my remarks, and then answer questions.

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

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly we have a right to propound questions to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senator brings up these points which I think go to the very heart of the bill, if he does not mind having us propound questions in connection with them, I think that is the time for us to discuss these things and to ask the question.

Mr. LODGE. And it is a good question.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly it is a good question. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator if he does not wish to be interrupted. He has a perfect right to decline to yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am willing to yield, but I was trying to say to the Senator that the point he brought up is not one which I was covering at exactly this place in my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. But can the Senator mention a point more salient in the bill than the one I have raised?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think there is one.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the point is most pertinent. The Senator from New Jersey is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he voted to report the bill from the committee.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Massachusetts.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that in his opinion, each of the 16 nations participating in the plan would be under contract not to deal with Russia during the period of the plan?

Mr. LODGE. I said that under the terms of the plan, each of the nations would be under obligation not to do anything contrary to the purposes of the plan, and that obviously at the present time Russia is diametrically opposed to the plan, and therefore, ergo, Q. E. D., they could not deal with Russia.

Mr. KEM. Stripping off all the verbiage, and getting down to brass tacks, I ask this question: Will the Administrator require that each of the 16 countries participating in the plan be placed under contract not to deal with Russia?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot speak for the Administrator, who has not yet been born, legislatively speaking.

Mr. KEM. But I wish to know the Senator's position.

Mr. LODGE. In my view, if Russia then has the administrative personnel she now has if she then continues to take the position she now takes, I would take the position that of course this aid should not be funneled through those nations to help Russia.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the Administrator should be able to coerce those nations into taking that position?

Mr. LODGE. I would not say that; but I think the Administrator is clearly bound, by the language I just read, to see to it that this aid shall not be used to help any country whose purposes are contrary to the purposes of this act. I think that is as plain as plain can be.

Mr. KEM. Let me be specific, so as to avoid any misunderstanding: Does the Senator from Massachusetts understand that under the terms of the bill, in carrying out its provisions the Administrator will be compelled to require that each of the 16 nations shall undertake not to trade with Russia during the period of the plan?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Administrator has in his hands the awful power of picking and choosing between nations, and I believe that under the terms of this bill if the Administrator thinks Russia is acting contrary to the purposes

set forth in this bill and contrary to the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, genuine independence, sound economic conditions, stable international relationships, healthy economy, independence of extraordinary outside assistance, and all the other broad principles of the bill, then of course he will be obliged to include in these agreements a provision that they shall not trade with Russia.

Mr. KEM. Will that be a matter of discretion on the part of the Administrator? In other words, will he have the discretion to determine whether the beneficiary countries shall or shall not trade with Russia? Will that determination be at the mercy of his whim and caprice?

Mr. LODGE. I think it must be bound to depend on his discretion, because he will have to determine the conditions. Of course, we hope present conditions will change.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think it is wise to vest such discretion in any man or woman in the world?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly do. I was in the Senate in 1937 when the Congress enacted the Neutrality Act. I was one of the six Members of the Senate to vote against it. That was an act by which we tied our hands in advance of an unpredictable event in foreign affairs; and there is no more imprudent thing that the Senate could do than to legislate in advance in regard to international affairs without knowing what will happen in that respect.

I think the Congress should lay down the precepts, the philosophy, and the principle, and then should have an efficient man to carry them out.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that they have not been specific as to that.

Mr. LODGE. They have not been specific insofar as individual countries are concerned, but they have been specific insofar as principles are concerned. The countries change. We have seen that happen in the last week. Does the Senator from Missouri want us to write into the bill a requirement to help Czechoslovakia and then find that Czechoslovakia is taken over by Russia? The Senator does not want us to help a country that has gone behind the iron curtain, does he?

Mr. KEM. But, Mr. President, the Senator pointed out only yesterday that there is nothing in the bill which would enable us to help Czechoslovakia or brave little Finland.

Mr. LODGE. But does the Senator from Missouri want this bill to require that we give help to a country that has gone behind the iron curtain?

Mr. KEM. I would oppose having in this bill anything that would vest in the Administrator or in any other citizen such unbridled power. Certainly we have seen mere whim or caprice work tremendous harm, even though sometimes they may work for good.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the alternative to the present provisions of the bill, then, according to the position of the Senator from Missouri, would be to write into the bill, in so many words, the

names of the countries we like and the names of the countries we do not like. Then, next year, when some of the countries we do like may have gone behind the iron curtain, according to the position of the Senator from Missouri, we would still have to send dollars to them, simply because here in Washington, in the month of March 1948, we thought it was a good idea to make such a provision in the bill. To my mind, that is an awful way to run a railroad.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer the Senator from Massachusetts has given to the Senator from Missouri answers the question I propounded to the Senator from New Jersey, in that he has stated now that there are no conditions limiting the trade that France might have with any country outside the 16. That is the way I interpret his answer—in short, that no such limitation is written into the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that he misinterprets my answer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has not the Senator from New Jersey yielded to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey, who has the floor, has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer is that the Administrator has the power. I agree as to that. Of course, he has the power to do it, and he has to handle the administration. The State Department is the agency that negotiates the treaty. The agreement is to be made after the program is authorized, and section 15 gives to the State Department, in conjunction with the Administrator, the right to make agreements for the purpose of doing the very thing the Senator is talking about, namely, laying down the rules as to these countries.

My point is that, if conditions are to be written out, I think the Congress of the United States should have something to say about the ones that are written into this bill, instead of leaving that to the State Department and the Administrator, and especially so in view of the tremendous power given to the Administrator by the bill. No power that is given anywhere is greater than the power that this bill gives to the Administrator.

Obviously, he will be able to dictate the economy of the United States and the economies of the other 16 nations. He would be able to tell a country to which we had committed ourselves for 4 1/4 years that we no longer wanted to assist it, and thus he would break our moral faith with that country. I think such action would do great harm to our relationship with these countries.

Again I ask the question, Is there in this bill any provision of the sort to which I have referred, namely, a provision to enable the Administrator, at the end of 3 years, let us say, to prevent France from selling steel to Russia or to any other country to which France might choose to sell steel, assuming that by that time France had gone ahead at full swing to build up her steel industry?

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean cutting off our aid, or preventing them from selling?

Mr. WHERRY. I mean any provision that would preclude them. There is no political unification involved. All that is proposed is that we give the money with which to build up industry and to furnish aid. We have already done that for 2 years.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to answer, I should be glad of the opportunity, because I think I can answer.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. SMITH. I think it can be answered by section 15 (b) of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been read.

Mr. SMITH. All of it has not been read. It extends over two or three pages. I shall not read it all. The effort has been made to provide for multilateral pledges in the first place and also for bilateral agreements with a contracting country, under which, in the event certain things happen, aid is not to be continued. How is it possible to go further than that?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that. That is the proposal by the Secretary of State, with respect to maintaining relations among the different countries.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is a wise provision, but nothing contained in it directs the Secretary of State or the Administrator what to do in the situation I suggested to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I do not quite understand the Senator's position. Does he ask me the question, Shall we discontinue aid if certain things happen, or shall we say to France, after she has built up her industry, "You cannot sell things to Russia," and try to prevent it by force?

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the question, because the Senator said he hoped there would be inter-relations with respect to trade developed among the 16 countries. I think that is a good thing.

Mr. SMITH. I am speaking of trade, in the spirit of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is all right, but the point I make is respecting trade outside the 16 countries. There are no conditions whatever laid down relative to that.

Mr. SMITH. I do not agree.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is very important. After we shall have contributed to the upbuilding of the industry of France, particularly her steel plants, she may then sell steel to whomever she pleases. She may sell it to Russia, she may sell it to any other country, even to a country having communistic tendencies or employing aggressive tactics or something of that kind against the United States. Am I not correct?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think the Senator is correct. If he will read the entire text of section 15, the provisions for agreements, he will see that France could do it, but it would be in violation of the agreement. It would not be within the spirit of the bill. I think the answer made by the Senator from Massa-

chussets was sound, if I construed his answer aright.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we read, moreover, on page 3, in lines 4 and 5 of the bill:

It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation.

If resistance to dictatorships, resistance to police states, resistance to imperialism, resistance to communism, is not written through every line of the bill, then I do not think I can read the English language.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, suppose the French people say that genuine independence in Europe requires their being able to maintain and continue associations with Russia that have existed for more than 150 years.

Mr. LODGE. The Administrator, I think, who would read this language just as the Senator and I read it, would say to the French people, "Very sorry, I do not agree with you." I do not think the French people would ever say that, but taking the Senator's assumption that they would, I think the Administrator would have the complete backing in refusing aid.

Mr. KEM. Within a year a great deal has been heard about the shipments of grain which have been sent from Russia to France, in accordance with the long-standing feeling of amity between those countries and the business associations which have existed for many years.

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

Mr. LODGE. I should like a second more. The Senator knows that world politics is in a state of flux. We ourselves have been sending machinery to Russia, so far as that is concerned, and nobody has known for the past year where they stand in regard to anything.

Mr. KEM. Exactly; and some of us want that stopped.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much is being sent?

Mr. LODGE. Less and less, I hope.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am now going to yield to the Senator from Illinois, who has been standing for some time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to ask the able Senator from New Jersey if I am correct in my understanding that the purport of the bill is that the 16 nations will have no authority under the bill to trade with Russia or with any of her satellite nations?

Mr. SMITH. No. My answer was just to the contrary. I think they will be able to trade definitely with any country in the world.

Mr. LUCAS. That was my understanding of the bill. But it seemed to me that certain questions that have been asked implied at least that we did not want France at any time to do any trading with any of the satellite nations of Russia, or with Russia itself. If I understand the bill correctly—I am not a member of the committee, and if I am in error I should like the able Senator

from New Jersey and the able Senator from Michigan to correct me—under the Marshall plan we hope, as the Senator says, to rehabilitate the 16 western European countries and to bring about their economic recovery. Unless the 16 nations can do some trading and carry on commerce with certain of the satellite nations of Russia, it will be somewhat difficult, as I understand their economy, for them to get along. So we are attempting through this program ultimately to encourage trade at least with some of the satellite nations that are now under Russian domination.

If we take steel as an example, as my able friend from Nebraska did a moment ago, if it came about in 3 years from now that France sold steel, for instance, to Yugoslavia, I take it that France at that particular time would believe it to be in her interests and would help her restore herself economically to sell the steel. She would have the right to do it, in my humble opinion, under the pending bill. But the position must be taken now that if we do not want France to do that, either we have no faith in the ability of France to recover, or we have no faith in the future of France, and that France at the end of 3 years is going to sell out to Russia. I have faith in France. One of the nations over there in which I have faith, when it comes to carrying out the recovery program, is France. I merely rose for the purpose of trying to satisfy myself on this question, because certainly some of the questions asked by the able Senator from Missouri of the Senator from Massachusetts, as I understood them, indicated that he was attempting to have the Senator from Massachusetts admit that we were not going to permit trade at all with certain of the satellite nations. That is not the purpose of the bill, at all.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have the floor.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say that I was merely trying to clarify the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator was attempting to clarify it, and it may be because of my own inability to understand him, but he muddied the waters for me, and that is the reason I rose to make this explanation.

Mr. KEM. I may say that the waters were already muddied.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if I may, I want to make a statement myself. I have the floor. I wish to make a statement in answer to what the Senator from Illinois said, because it helped to clarify the situation, and I should like to take the time to make my own position clear. I think the whole purpose is to put the recipient nations back on their feet and in a position where they will be able to trade with the other nations of the world. We do not all agree that should be done, but that is my understanding. I should be glad to see France trade with Russia tomorrow, if she has to trade with Russia. But bear in mind that the 16 nations jointly will have to make an agreement in accordance with the spirit of the program to carry out the aims of the program. The

distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has read passages which indicate the spirit and purpose of the program.

Furthermore, an agreement is to be made with each of the participating countries by which terms are laid down providing what each country shall do for its own rehabilitation and to carry out the purpose of the program. If steel is made or if business is done with certain countries contrary to the spirit of the program, if, for example, something were done to strengthen Yugoslavia by supplying steel, or something which the Administrator felt was contrary to the spirit of the program, I insist that under the bilateral agreement to be made carrying out the spirit of the program, he would have a right to call a halt on France. But so far as freedom of trade is concerned, we are trying to encourage it all the way through, not only among participating countries, but with every other country in the world.

I think that is the only sound position we can take. I do not think it is possible to anticipate in advance what they may or may not do, but we have the two essentials: one is the encouragement of world trade, because that means the promotion of world peace and getting normal trade established again; the second is the making of arrangements whereby each country will do its part to carry out the program, according to the spirit of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So that we may understand the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, in which the Senator from New Jersey acquiesced, as I interpret the bill, it is the intention that the countries to whom aid is given shall enter into agreements according to section 16, to carry out the purposes laid down in the declaration of policy, and that the agreements shall include the right to do business with satellite countries or with any other nation in the world with whom they want to do business. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. With the limitation that they are bound by their agreement to carry out the spirit of the act in everything they do during the life of this arrangement.

Mr. WHERRY. The only restriction is that we can cut off the money in the event the Administrator feels that the terms of the act might be violated. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. That, and the additional point that they have an agreement with the countries as a whole.

Mr. WHERRY. But if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is correct, we are providing money to build up industry so they can have that relationship, and we now know that is what they will do.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know what the Senator's implication is.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Illinois to say that it was the intention to help to restore the 16 countries with the hope, of course, that they will not only build their trade for themselves but will have the right to sell their exports to the satellite countries.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield now to the Senator from Missouri. He has been waiting for a long time.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the Senator's understanding of the situation as it now exists?

Mr. SMITH. I do not understand the implication which I think I read into the Senator's question. We want to help those countries to get back on their feet, but we have imposed limitations and safeguards, so far as we could, by providing for an agreement with the countries as a whole, and that each separate country shall carry out the spirit of the plan and advance the objectives of the whole plan, which are certainly not communistic objectives.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to say that under his interpretation of the spirit or genius of the plan, the Administrator would forbid any trade between France and Russia during the period covered by the plan. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he agrees with that interpretation of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I may be mistaken in what the Senator from Massachusetts said, but I do not think that is what he said. I should like to ask the Senator to answer that question for himself.

Mr. LODGE. I think we are getting a very simple thing confused. It is obvious that we shall never get western Europe on its feet and off our necks unless it receives from eastern Europe some of the things it needs. If we can develop trade with eastern Europe, if we can wean a part of it away from communism and enlarge the borders of the non-Communist world, that is one proposition.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. The second proposition is that we must not sell a nickel's worth of anything behind the iron curtain if it would strengthen and help communism. As I understand the bill, the Administrator, in view of Russia's present frame of mind, would interpret the provisions to prevent France trading with Russia. But if conditions should change and it should appear that trade between France and Russia could be carried on in a way which would be advantageous to the purposes of the plan, it could be done. To me, the idea which is implied in the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that under no circumstances must there be any trade between eastern and western Europe, means that we shall have to support western Europe for the rest of our lives.

Mr. KEM. May I answer the Senator from Massachusetts by saying that the bill distinguishes between trade with Russia which will strengthen the forces behind the iron curtain, and trade which will not.

Mr. LODGE. I think in a broad sense it does. It refers to trade which will strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, genuine independence in Europe, and so forth.

Mr. KEM. Let us be specific. It is difficult for me to think in generalities. Would the Senator say that under present conditions the sale of steel by France

to Russia would be inconsistent with the principles of the pending legislation?

Mr. LODGE. If I were the Administrator I certainly should not look with a very kindly eye on that, myself.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator say that the Administrator would be in any way compelled to do that?

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be very clear that he would not.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator say as to the sale of wheat or other foods?

Mr. LODGE. With the imperialistic and dominating attitude of Russia, I should think that any aid to Russia under this bill would not be possible.

Mr. KEM. Then I was incorrect when I interpreted what the Senator said to mean that under the spirit or genius of the legislation the Administrator would be compelled, under present conditions, to forbid any trade between France and Russia.

Mr. LODGE. "Under present conditions." The Senator did not have that phrase in his question the first time.

Mr. KEM. During the period of the plan?

Mr. LODGE. If there were a complete change of government in Russia or a complete change of outlook, the moral thing to do, perhaps, would be to send them wheat. I would not want to tie the hands of the Secretary of State or of the Administrator 10 months from now.

I apologize to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri, in answer to his question, if I may have his attention for a moment, that a careful study of the plan and of the testimony before the committee indicates very clearly that the whole program is being operated primarily to put western European countries back on their feet. I cannot conceive of France being able tomorrow to sell a pound of steel to Russia. We are not compelled to let steel go to other countries of the world. All I am saying is that when we get the program operating it is our purpose to have those countries trade with other countries of the world. If there is any suspicion that Russia is moving in on them, the Administrator has ample power to control it. The Administrator may confer with the Secretary of State or the President. It is not as though one man were an autocrat. The Department of Commerce controls exports. Checks and safeguards are placed in the proposed legislation to build up a group of participating countries, hoping as soon as possible to have them, with other countries of the world, on a normal basis.

Mr. KEM. In order that we may not be unfair to our French friends, let me ask this question: What would the Senator say as to trade relations between the Socialist Government of England and the Socialist Government of Russia? Would that be permitted under the terms of the legislation?

Mr. SMITH. England would be one of the participating countries. As the Senator realizes, England is part of the whole program of trying to bring about restoration and self-recovery.

Mr. KEM. We read in the press that it is the purpose and intention of the present Government of England to stimulate and advance trade with Russia.

Mr. SMITH. We are trading with Russia today.

Mr. KEM. Yes, I know. I should like to remind the Senator that many Members of this body are very much outdone on that question.

Mr. SMITH. But it is a question of fact. At the moment we are not trying to head off any country in dealing with any other country in the world.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator understand that it is the present policy of the Socialist regime in England to stimulate and advance business relations with Russia, a country which has somewhat the same ideology as that of the Socialist regime in England?

Mr. SMITH. I should be very much discouraged if I thought the Socialist regime in England had the ideology of the Communist regime in Russia.

Mr. KEM. They are somewhat the same, are they not?

Mr. SMITH. I think there is a great difference between socialism and communism.

Mr. KEM. The ideology is very much the same, is it not? It is all predicated on the doctrines of Karl Marx.

Mr. SMITH. I do not care to enter upon a long, extended discussion on that question at this time, and the Senator would not want me to. But when I was abroad the thing that "burned me up," to use a slang expression, was the destruction of human liberty. England has not reached such a point as that. Merely because she has moved to socialism and may be moving toward the nationalization of industry, I do not think it would be fair to England to put it into the same classification as Russia, which is a police state.

Mr. KEM. Certainly not. Is this a fair question to the Senator from New Jersey: Is it a sound policy of the United States to undertake to curb the spread of socialism throughout the world by financing the Socialist regime in England? Is that a sound approach to our objective?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think so. I do not think that in the consideration of our program we are dealing with the politics of the particular countries. I realize what the Senator has in mind, and what has been said by those who have stated we should not give a cent to England until she takes up free enterprise again and gets rid of socialism; but I do not think we are in a position to dictate her policy.

Mr. KEM. Does not this whole plan contemplate a transaction on an intergovernmental basis between the Government of the United States, on the one hand, and the Government of England on the other?

Mr. SMITH. Initially, but not ultimately, because we are working in the direction of operations by private enterprise just as rapidly as we can.

Mr. KEM. Is it not proper, under those conditions, for us to inquire as to what is the existing regime in each of the countries with which we are going to enter into executory contracts extending over a period of 4 years?

Mr. SMITH. I could not agree with the Senator if his implication is that we should deal simply with those countries with whose governments we are in accord and will not deal with those who have a little different ideology than ours.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question he desires to ask.

Mr. WHERRY. Summing up the part of the colloquy I engaged in with the Senator, is there anywhere in the report any evidence on the subject, or does the Senator know whether or not there would be an opportunity for the State Department or the Administrator to negotiate trade agreements with the countries, without having difficulty with agreements which have already been made between the 16 countries and the countries of eastern Europe? Let me explain. Let us say that Great Britain has a trade agreement today with Russia, or that Great Britain has a trade agreement with a satellite country. Would not the Administrator be handicapped? Might it not be in direct contradiction to what the Administrator could put into an agreement afterward, so that it would be impossible to write agreements based upon the broad general provisions of the policy, and still meet the trade relations under agreements with these countries which have already been made by the satellite countries?

Mr. SMITH. That is a possibility, but that matter would come up before the bilateral agreements were made, and we could decide about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to single out France as trading with Russia, and to say anything disrespectful of France. I have been in France, and I am just as anxious to see France recover as that any other country shall recover. I merely gave that as an illustration. England has a trade agreement with Russia now; has it not?

Mr. SMITH. I think it has.

Mr. WHERRY. If we vote these appropriations, is England to continue that trade agreement with Russia?

Mr. SMITH. I think she very possibly might. It could not interfere with the program we are setting up with England, and she could not use the material she gets from us for export.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean we would be enough of a watchdog so that we could go down all the way through the industries that fabricate in England, to find out whether or not the goods we furnished them were going to Russia?

Mr. SMITH. I think we would be in pretty close touch with the program.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Utah, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. But I should like to suggest that I still have unfinished part of what I prepared as an address. It has been interfered with, and I am afraid the continuity is lost.

I should like very much to reach my peroration presently.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to ask with respect to the trade agreement between Great Britain and Russia. Is it not a fact that a part of that agreement contemplates the shipping of steel products from Great Britain to Russia, in the way of tractors, and other vehicles and instruments into which steel enters?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WATKINS. There is an account in the newspapers of a treaty which has already been entered into. Under the terms of the act, will the Administrator be required to ask Great Britain to abrogate that agreement, if they have already entered into one?

Mr. SMITH. We may have to do that. If we find in existence an agreement of that kind, which would upset an agreement worked out under the proposed program, we would have to say, "You will have to wipe that out." If I were the Administrator, I would not have any hesitation in doing that.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the bill, as I understand from the proponents, it has been considered all the time that a part of the policy is that the 16 nations shall obtain a portion of their necessary supplies, such as wheat and other commodities, from the satellite nations in eastern Europe, which will help the 16 nations to get along; but in order to obtain products from those nations, the 16 nations will, of necessity, be required to ship to them and exchange goods with them.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think there is very much prospect of getting supplies from the satellite countries in the immediate future.

Mr. WATKINS. Is not that a part of the program and a part of the plan itself?

Mr. SMITH. As I said before, we hope that ultimately there will be trade between all these countries.

Mr. WATKINS. It is understood the 16 nations are to get a part of their supplies from the satellite nations in eastern Europe, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator is referring to the probability of the normal trade relations they had before, a survey is being made, and it is figured that a certain amount of goods will come from eastern Europe. I do not think that any considerable amount is relied on.

Mr. WATKINS. It may not be relied on, but it is a part of the program under the pending bill, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. I think it would be expected they would get foodstuffs from eastern Europe. I do not see why that should not be so. The Senator is suggesting that products may go from the 16 countries in exchange. Bear in mind, it has to fit into the handling of the overall program, and we are not going to sacrifice any of the participating countries to any of the other countries.

Mr. WATKINS. With relation to France, as I remember the report, it states that the steel industry of France is to be encouraged to increase production 20 percent more than it was in pre-war times. Questions have been asked with respect to what France will do with

the steel. Is there anything in the bill which would prevent France from shipping that increased supply of steel to Russia, even though the United States might not be on good terms with Russia?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think there is anything specific, but if we knew that the plan was to ship to Russia, under conditions that would sabotage the whole recovery program, certainly we would object, and would not go into the program.

Mr. WATKINS. When they are increasing production 20 percent over that of prewar times?

Mr. SMITH. Let me remind the Senator that those targets of production were set by the countries themselves, representing what they are aiming at, but primarily the allocation of the commodities produced is going to be governed by the over-all plan for the participating countries in the first place. There is no provision requiring them to do that, except so far as the Administrator can control it from this end. They will not be shipping to other parts of the world large quantities, especially of materials which are in short supply, such as steel, if steel is still needed in the area we are trying to build up. I cannot anticipate every possible contingency that may arise, but it seems to me the pattern is clear with respect to what we are proposing to do.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me the pattern is clear that we expect these nations to do business with the satellite nations, and that we do not mean to tell them what they can sell or what they can buy. But if I understood clearly what the Senator from Massachusetts is contending for, that is what we are going to do.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Massachusetts will answer for himself, but what he has in mind is that we want to go along with the program of dealing with countries that are on friendly terms with this group. With respect to those who are not we will say, we are sorry, but that is not in line with the purposes of the bill. It is not in line with the purposes set forth on pages 1 to 3 of the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I have read that language. I know the general objectives. It is easy to state the general objectives, but when one comes to apply them one sometimes finds he is fighting against the very thing he wants to accomplish by permitting certain things to be done. I call attention to the case of Great Britain.

Mr. SMITH. I concede that all kinds of possibilities can arise that could not be covered by any legislation. The point is whether we are going to have faith in what we are undertaking to do which will be done under an Administrator appointed to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. WATKINS. Should we not amend the bill so as to make certain that the Administrator cannot mistake the guidelines?

Mr. SMITH. We tried to do that so far as practicable within the limits of having the plan operate. The committee spent hours over that very thing, and if the Senator will read the bill carefully

he will see the care we took in placing limits in the right place, and yet not go so far that the Administrator's hands would be bound so he could not operate under the plan.

Mr. WATKINS. I have read the bill, and I find that the bill and the report do not seem to be in harmony with each other. Apparently the interpretation now being given to the bill is that the 16 nations are not to trade with other nations if such trade will in any way help Russia. On the other hand, the report says that we contemplate urging these nations to enter into commerce with the satellites of Russia, nations which we might just as well contemplate as being a part of Russia. It makes no difference whether it is the satellites or Russia itself. Under those circumstances it seems to me we have a duty to clarify the proposed legislation if we are to pass a bill about whose terms there can be no mistake.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators that there seems to be a misconception respecting the purpose of the bill. It is not the purpose of the bill to have an administrator over there to supervise every commercial transaction with other nations and say, "You cannot ship anything to this nation and you cannot ship so and so to the other nations." It is proposed to make a unilateral agreement with all of them as a group. We cannot go into details, but we do set out general principles which shall actuate them in undertaking to meet the program. Then we have individual agreements with each country setting out again the general principles. If at some time one of the contracting parties, one of the recipient countries, should do something which the Administrator regarded as being violative of its agreement, or as being violative of the spirit of the whole program, the Administrator could cancel and terminate the contract. He could quit giving money to them.

But, Mr. President, what is the purpose of the bill? The purpose of the bill is to restore these countries, to rehabilitate them, to help them resume their normal business transactions. We could not afford to write into the bill a prohibition that goods or foodstuffs cannot be sold to this country or to that country. The supposition is that even if something were sold to Russia, terrible as that might be—although we ourselves have been doing it for a long while—the country which makes the sale would get something back from Russia which it needed, which would tend to that country's economic rehabilitation and restoration. So I cannot see a great deal of point to many of the objections which have been leveled in the direction of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me to ask a question of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us assume that the unilateral agreements entered into

by this country, through the Administrator, with the 16 countries, provide that certain allocations or shipments of steel to all the 16 countries shall be made, and then, for the sake of the argument let us assume further that there is an agreement between Great Britain and Russia, and in that trade relation there is the sale of goods manufactured from the steel which is furnished to Great Britain by the United States. Do I interpret the Senator correctly when I say that it would be his feeling that in carrying out the unilateral agreement Great Britain would be permitted to fabricate that steel and sell the goods made from it to Russia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think that would be contrary to the spirit of the whole plan. The Senator's question was based on the assumption that Great Britain already has a contract with Russia?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. We could not contemplate anything she is going to get from the United States in the way of steel; we could not cover that.

Mr. WHERRY. I am speaking about trade relations which would be entered into by a contract which would permit the sale and fabrication of steel goods for the future. I am trying to get the Senator's reaction to this one point: Should we provide the money to buy steel which is to be sent to Great Britain under the unilateral agreements which will be entered into between the Administrator and the 16 countries, with the full understanding that when we enter into the agreement under which we are to put up the money only Great Britain, through a trade arrangement, will sell fabricated goods to Russia during the lifetime of the unilateral agreement and the trade agreement between them? Is it the Senator's position that if we enter into such a unilateral agreement we are to furnish the steel which is to be fabricated, made into finished products, and sold by Great Britain to Russia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator's question is a strained one. He talks about the United States entering into a contract with Great Britain. I do not know what provisions such a contract would contain. But let me suggest to the Senator that if Great Britain received steel from us on the theory that her own economy needed the steel, and then she turned around and sold it to some other country, that would be violative of the spirit of the plan and of the agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And of the letter of the plan also.

Mr. CONNALLY. And probably the letter of the plan as well. If Great Britain should receive the steel on the pretense that she needed it in her own economy and then began to divert it and ship it to other countries for a profit, that would be a classic case in which the Administrator could say "You do not get any more of anything, Mr. England," if the Administrator should so decide.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator did not understand the force of my question. I am talking about the raw steel which we export to Great Britain

under a unilateral agreement which certainly will be entered into, because the allocations of steel are based upon it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The same rule would apply whether it were raw steel or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I am talking about the raw steel we would send to Great Britain. Great Britain would fabricate that steel. The steel would lose its identity for when it is fabricated it cannot be identified. I am talking about goods which are fabricated, finished products from steel which Great Britain obtains from us, raw steel. What I ask, and I think it is a practical question, is on the assumption that allocations to Great Britain are made upon that basis, and the fabrication is made, and then, under the trade agreement between Great Britain and Russia, those goods are sold to Russia. Does the Senator think that we should furnish raw steel for that purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall try to answer the Senator. I think the Senator ought to be answered. I think the more he is answered the better off he will be, and the better off we shall be.

The Senator from Nebraska agrees with my original proposition, that the steel we send to England cannot be sent to Russia in that form.

Mr. WHERRY. I should not think so.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be difficult to follow the processing of steel and pick out this nail, which was made in America, and that nail, which was made in Russia. But if England's purpose—either immediately or ultimately—were to divert steel in any considerable volume to Russia, the Administrator would have a right to stop it, and he ought to stop it.

Mr. WHERRY. We know from past experience that such an agreement might exist—

Mr. CONNALLY. We cannot supervise the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. We cannot police the steel.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; we cannot police the agreement. If one agreement is in existence, and Great Britain makes another agreement, if there is any conflict between the agreements, they must be tested by their terms. We are a party to one of them, and if the terms of the agreement are violated, we can break it.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to make one remark, which is suggested to me by what the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Nebraska have said.

First of all, a very elaborate system is established so far as shipments of goods from this country abroad are concerned. So if it is a question of diverting the actual raw steel, I do not think we need to worry about that. The Senator from Nebraska admits that.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not admitting anything.

Mr. LODGE. Then, the Senator does not admit it.

Mr. WHERRY. My question does not relate to the diversion of raw steel. I will not subscribe to any appropriation

which would permit steel to be fabricated into an implement of war to be sold to Russia, any more than I would subscribe to sending to Russia under lend-lease a high-octane refinery plant.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, we all agree that we must not send any arms, munitions, or implements of war to Russia. We have no argument on that score.

This proposition is so simple that it surprises me that we can whip it around as much as we have done this afternoon. Under certain conditions trade with eastern Europe is desirable, and in the interest of the United States. Under certain other conditions trade with eastern Europe is not in the interest of the United States. We would be the greatest fools in the world if we were to write language into the bill prohibiting trade with eastern Europe, just as we would be the greatest fools in the world if we were to write language into the bill requiring trade with eastern Europe.

If the British were to take steel and convert it into forks and spoons, and if it were deemed by the Administrator, by the Senator from Nebraska, and by nearly everyone else—as it might be—that it would be very advantageous to send forks and spoons to the Russians in exchange for wheat which Europe needs because we have a bad crop here, and because the cost of living is going up here, the Senator from Nebraska might be the first to say that it would be a good thing to send English-manufactured forks and spoons, made from American steel, to the Russians. In fact, there might be fewer Communists if they began to use those particular implements. It would be a very silly thing for us to tie our hands simply because there is a bad possibility.

If the Administrator is a fool and a knave, then it makes no difference what we write into the bill. The administration of the law is to a great extent dependent upon the caliber of the Administrator.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. But if the Administrator is an intelligent man, and if he is a patriot, I do not think the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Utah, or the Senator from Missouri will have anything to worry about.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me answer the observation of the Senator from Massachusetts. It all gets back to two things. One is the ability of the Administrator, as to which we all agree. If we have the right kind of an Administrator anywhere we need not worry. If we had had the right kind of administration and the right kind of foreign policy for the past two and a half years, we would not be in the trouble which we are in today.

But when we come to the question of foreign policy, we really have no foreign policy. The only way in the world in which this plan can work is by policing Great Britain. We cannot even police our own country. After an exhaustive research we found the transfer and shipment of the high-octane plants.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Nebraska mean to say that we cannot get an agreement that there shall be no shipment of weapons to Russia? Of course we can.

Mr. WHERRY. I say that we cannot police Great Britain.

Mr. LODGE. We do not have to police Great Britain.

Mr. WHERRY. Then how are we going to find out whether the fabricated goods are exported, and who gets them?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield further until I finish my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry, but I cannot yield further.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not ask the Senator if that is his attitude, but I have had very little opportunity to participate in this discussion.

Mr. SMITH. I am always glad to do anything I can for my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not quite finish what I was trying to say a while ago. I really believe that it would be helpful to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. In rebuilding and restoring these countries we are supposed to make it possible for them to trade. Where have they traded all their lives? Western Europe has traded with eastern Europe. It has obtained its foodstuffs from eastern Europe. In return, it has sent manufactured goods to eastern Europe. In the future, under these agreements, if western Europe needs food, do we want to send it from the United States, and raise the prices which our people must pay for food? Or would we prefer to let western Europe get food from eastern Europe?

Mr. WHERRY. It costs dollars just the same.

Mr. LODGE. It would not cost any more dollars than are provided for in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course we cannot send food anywhere without its costing something. But how much better it would be for western Europe to trade with eastern Europe, and buy the things which eastern Europe can provide, sending in return manufactured goods, and leaving our economy more nearly self-contained than it would otherwise be.

We talk about the iron curtain. One pretty good way of infiltrating the iron curtain and making it less powerful is to trade across the iron curtain. The people over there are human beings. They have a sense of economy. They know what is good for them. If they have a market across the iron curtain that is profitable, they are going to trade across the iron curtain. When they trade across the iron curtain, a little of the iron curtain will be worn off. There will be an abrasive effect, it will be whittled down.

Most of the people of the world are not concerned with high politics. They are concerned with their bodies, their health, their comforts, and conveniences. So I think it is a good thing to let western Europe trade with eastern Europe. We cannot carry on all the commerce with western Europe. If we should try to do so the Senator from Nebraska would be here demanding that we impose a tariff to shut out imports from France, Great Britain, and other nations.

Where else can western Europe trade, if not with eastern Europe and with other countries? We want to restore the economy of those countries. We want to make their normal activities come alive again. We cannot do that by shutting them off, putting them in a strait-jacket, handcuffing them, and saying "You shall sell a dollar's worth of goods to So and So."

I am willing to leave it to the sense of the Administrator under his contracts. If any of these dangers are lurking around, let him put provisions in the contracts prohibiting them—either in the unilateral contracts or the multilateral contracts. Then if any country violates those provisions, if it pursues a policy which is against the interests of the United States, it can be cut off from aid, and remain cut off.

A little later, probably next week, I expect to submit some further remarks on the bill. One of the things which I expect to stress is the heavy responsibility upon the European nations themselves. Unless they are determined to come out of their misfortunes, unless they have a mind to resurrect themselves, the United States will not continue with such a program as this. We cannot continue forever to be an eleemosynary institution. The European nations must get up and do their eternal damnedest if they want the United States to support them with this program or any other program. We are trying to enable them to help themselves. Let them manufacture; let them produce; let them sell; let them exchange, so long as they do not do any act contrary to the principles of the bill and of this system or contrary to the interests of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is necessary to obtain the consent of the Senator from New Jersey, who has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Then I shall stop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have but one sentence to my question: Is it not true that if this bill works out 100 percent successfully and according to our high expectations for it, there will be a complete, flowing, abundant trade between eastern and western Europe, and that is how we would know it had been successful?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly, and that is how the situation was formerly, in large part.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. LODGE. I also thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been waiting to be enlightened by his speech and to be stirred by the peroration to which he has referred. I appreciate his courtesy in permitting Senators to ask questions, and I particularly appreciate the high value of his speech.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in reply to a question previously asked about the number of Russian soldiers in Austria. The figure given to me is that 45,000 Russian soldiers are in Austria at the present time, and the United States has between 10,000 and 15,000 there. I am also informed that there are no official Russian soldiers in Bulgaria today. I make that statement in reply to a question which was asked earlier.

Let me say here that I am grateful to the Senators who have asked questions. I think the questions which have been asked by the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators have been very helpful in bringing out the situation in regard to the various points which have been mentioned.

I was discussing the difficulties in various countries of Europe, and I started to say, when the inquiries began, that now we have a gleam of hope in the amazing accomplishment of the Paris conference where these divided peoples have adopted goals for their respective accomplishments as conditions of their further aid from us. Let me add here, and emphasize especially, the vital importance of including western Germany, and by this I mean the bizonal area, and also I hope soon the French zone, as a part of this entire program. We and Great Britain at the moment are the existing government of the so-called bizonal area. We can determine the future of this important part of the world, and we have the distinct responsibility to do so. It must be part of this rehabilitation plan. We should use the Ruhr and its industries, not alone to put Germany on a self-sustaining basis again, but also, and more especially, to make the German resources a part of the entire western European rehabilitation program.

So I want to suggest that in this program of aid for Europe, we are not dealing with a charity problem, but we are dealing with a problem that concerns the morale, not only of Europe, but of the entire world. The program brings out in bold relief hope versus despair. It suggests an over-all vision of a united world of mutual aid, as opposed to a divided world of selfish national pressure groups. To bring this about, the movement can and should be spearheaded by an enlarged vision of America's foreign-aid policy, which as I visualize it, would have, as I think this program does, the following characteristics:

First. It should be bipartisan and all-American.

The great majority of people today accept the fact of the interdependence of nations and the threat of communism. The extreme sacrifices in the late war made by our own boys have brought home to us again the values of our human freedoms. There can be no dis-

tinction between Republicans and Democrats when we are thinking in these terms. If we can have an American bipartisan foreign policy which is understood by the world—the sort of American bipartisan foreign policy which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has been urging for so many years—we can remove the fear for the future that other nations might have if they felt that a change of administration might mean a change in that policy. In other words, I am pleading that no matter what the outcome of the election this fall may be, we should adopt now a program that will be carried out regardless of what party is in power next year.

Second. It should be positive and creative and not grudging.

We must move into our responsibility with enthusiasm, not with reluctance or suspicion or grudgingly. We must have care in our giving and in our lending; but in our relationships with other countries in dealing with this aid program, let us use the opportunity to raise the level of international understanding.

Third. It should help nations to help themselves. I have been emphasizing this point all through my remarks.

Our help must be designed to strengthen in the economy and life of other nations, rather than to make them dependent. This means that they must have the primary responsibility to work out their own self-imposed programs of productivity. There must, of course, be adequate supervision to see that these programs are being carried out while we continue our aid, but fundamentally we must respect and support the spirit of independence and pride of accomplishment that is inherent in any free people. I think that is most important, and I believe that much will be lost if we try to impose too many shackles on these people, and if we do not encourage self-expression.

Fourth. It should be administered by the nations themselves under proper observation.

Technical help and professional advice should certainly be offered, and we should have observers to see that the aid is used as intended. Of course, we have the controls provided by the agreements for which provision is being made. But it is my judgment that ordinarily the workings of a free press, with its free criticism, should be our main reliance in connection with checking on the results. The extent to which we refuse responsibility to the Nation concerned to put its own house in order is the extent to which we invite suspicion and failure. I mean that they should work this out under the terms of the agreements made with us. If we do not find that the necessary progress is being made, we can cut off our aid, of course. But we should not put too many shackles upon them.

Fifth. It should be carried out, so far as possible, within the framework of the United Nations.

This "town meeting of the world," as John Foster Dulles termed the General Assembly, has amply demonstrated its usefulness in the uniting of public opinion of the free nations against the resolute imperialism of the rebel nations.

Let us move with the conscience of the world in all that we do in this matter.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me emphasize that we must relate our living at home to these international responsibilities. This crisis in world affairs is a crisis for America in more ways than one. It is our way of life that is on trial, and not merely our ability to furnish material aid in dollars and commodities. The intensity of the existing world struggle will test our character of living.

We must prepare ourselves in every possible way. I am strongly in favor of keeping our armed strength at a readiness that will serve as a warning to potential aggressors and will support the objectives of the United Nations. But let us ever bear in mind that this is a war of ideas, and that the democratic system is on trial. Communism waits for our economic system to break down. Our inability, through selfish divisions at home, to aid in the rehabilitation of Europe at this critical moment will be the signal for communism to move in and take over. This is a direct challenge to each one of us.

But I will not close on a negative note. Under God, the people of America will not betray their destiny; rather, we will courageously overcome the negative defeatism of communism by saying to those nations of the world which are still free to listen: "We are embarking on the greatest venture in history—the building of true democracy. We do not have all the answers. We have made many mistakes. But we are on an upward pilgrimage. Let us battle together and make our distinctive contributions to a united world built on a true sharing of the material and spiritual benefits which are the heritage of the ages."

This, Mr. President, as I understand it, is the spirit and purpose of the so-called Marshall plan, which now has been translated into the pending legislation. This conception of our foreign-aid policy will proclaim to the world the dedication of America and its resources to creative, inspiring, and lasting peace.

Mr. President, I shall support the pending legislation with confidence and with enthusiasm.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What I am about to say fits in with what has just been said, though I do not want to continue interruptions of the able Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me the able senior Senator from Texas put his finger on a situation which is worthy of further consideration. It is with respect to dealings with the satellite powers by the 17 European beneficiary nations. If, for instance, Britain in her agreements presently in force had agreed to send tractors to Russia, and if, at the same time, she were asking for tractors from the United States, I should think the Administrator would have a right to take a very dim view of that type of situation. On the other hand, consider the situation in Poland. I was in Poland, as was the able Senator from New Jersey. It is true Poland is a satel-

lite power. However, if Poland showed some inclination to trade with the western zone in Germany, if a quid pro quo agreement could be entered into whereby, in consideration of certain modern coal mining machinery being shipped to Poland, they in turn would agree to ship coal into western Germany or into western Europe to help implement the European Recovery Act, I should think that would be a satisfactory quid pro quo agreement that might well be encouraged in trade between the east and the west. But, as in so many other instances, it is going to depend on a matter of judgment. The Senator from Massachusetts has very ably pointed out that we cannot today, on the 4th of March, know what the conditions are going to be in October or November, when perhaps Congress will not be in session. The chief criticism I had in mind in the remarks I made on both the 2d and 3d of March, and on the 2d of March when I put into the RECORD the exports to Russia from the United States and the imports from Russia to the United States, was that it was not on a strictly quid pro quo basis. It is true that we receive from Russia certain basic materials, manganese, and chrome. Had we on a strictly quid pro quo basis traded certain things that they needed, for example \$1,000,000 worth of what they need, for a million dollars' worth of what we need, I should not have had so much objection to it. But as I pointed out and as will be found at page 1922 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, we are exporting to Russia a long list of basic materials and important industrial equipment, including generators, which are in short supply in this country and railroad cars, of which we do not have a sufficient number to move from the Pacific coast to the east coast our crops with which to help feed Europe. Three-quarters of what we get from Russia is not made up of items such as manganese and chrome, which add to our stock piles and would add to our own industrial strength, but three-fourths of our imports from that country in exchange for basic materials, the industrial equipment to which I have referred, has been furs and fur products. That simply does not make sense. We are importing, and as I say three-quarters of our imports are furs and fur products, at the very time when in the other House of Congress there is a bill to subsidize fur farmers in this country because they no longer can continue in business.

That is the type of situation in which I think judgment should be used on our part, but I do not think judgment has always been used. I am hopeful, as the able Senator from Texas has suggested, that the Administrator will use judgment in negotiating the agreements.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement, which I think is very accurate. I agree with what he says. I think it brings out the nature of the problems the Administrator will have to face. It also suggests to me that the able Senator from California might be in line for the position of Administrator, in view of his capacity and his apparently extensive study of the matter. I yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this colloquy, I think, has shown that all depends on the nature of the trade. If we, or the recipient nations, are sending something overseas to Russia that we do not need or if we are sending something that they think we need but that we know we do not need, and if the recipient nations are receiving in return something very essential, then possibly it is a good thing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point paragraph 32 of the report on the European recovery program by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The paragraph is entitled "The Role of Eastern Europe and East-West Trading." I think it should be placed in the RECORD at this point in view of the discussion.

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

32. THE ROLE OF EASTERN EUROPE AND EAST-WEST TRADING

The Soviet Union and Communist Parties elsewhere in Europe are in a position either to make substantial contributions to European recovery or to imperil its success. Recent developments indicate that the latter course might be taken. Through the Cominform, established in October 1947, the Communist Party has waged a "cold war" on the United States and has continuously distorted American motives behind the program initiated by the European countries themselves. Communist-inspired strikes and disturbances have already taken place in a number of ERP countries and might occur again, thereby greatly impeding the production effort of western Europe.

The Soviet Union, furthermore, is in an effective position to hinder the restoration of trade between eastern and western Europe. At present the over-all volume of trade between eastern and western Europe is about 30 percent of the prewar volume. The CEEC report, however, assumes that the westward flow of cereals from eastern Europe will reach prewar levels and timber will reach 75 percent of the prewar level in 1951. The restoration of this trade, which traditionally has consisted of food supplies, timber, and coal from the east and manufactured goods from the west, is one of the basic assumptions on which the participating countries predicated their import requirements from the Western Hemisphere.

The number of bilateral trading agreements concluded or being negotiated between eastern and western Europe is encouraging. On the other hand, Russia and her satellite states likewise have entered into a number of agreements which may have the effect of retarding the normal flow of trade. This web of trade agreements, together with the Russian grain and barter arrangements, constitute the Molotov plan which has the effect of tightening Russian control over the exports of the satellite countries and diverting their products from the west, where they normally flowed, to the east.

In the light of the Molotov plan and the attitude of the Cominform toward the European recovery program, there can be no certainty that the assumed restoration of trade will actually occur. Healthy trade relations within the European Continent will greatly aid the objective of ERP and the door is left open to the participation of eastern European countries in the program. If restoration of trade between the east and west of Europe does not occur, it is the opinion of the State Department that "recovery in the west of Europe will be much slower and more difficult, but not impossible of achievement."

The committee accepts and approves the assumption concerning the desirability of

restoring east-west trading. This is another clear indication which should destroy the misconception, ceaselessly propagated, that the economic cooperation bill is designed to split Europe into two economic camps.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I believe the correct procedure now is the recognition of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Dworschak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RESTRICTED LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1317, relating to restricted lands of the Crow Tribe, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the last proviso of the first section of the Act of May 26, 1926, entitled 'An Act to amend sections 1, 5, 6, 8, and 18 of an Act approved June 20, 1920, 'an Act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and for other purposes,' approved May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658, 659), be amended to read as follows: 'Provided further, That any Crow Indian classified as competent may lease his or her trust lands or any part thereof and the trust lands of their minor children for farming and grazing purposes: Provided, That any Crow Indian classified as competent shall have the full responsibility of obtaining compliance with the terms of any lease made: And provided further, That leases on inherited or devised trust lands having more than five competent devisees or heirs shall be made only with the approval of the Superintendent. Any adult incompetent Indian with the approval of the Superintendent may lease his or her trust lands or any part thereof and the inherited or trust lands of their minor children for farming and grazing purposes. The trust lands of orphan minors shall be leased by the Superintendent. Moneys received for and on behalf of all incompetent Indians and minor children shall be paid to the Superintendent by the lessee for the benefit of said Indians. No lease shall be made for a period longer than five years, except irrigable lands under the Big Horn Canal, which may be leased for periods of ten years. All leases made under this Act shall be recorded at the Crow Agency.'"

And the House agree to the same.

GUY CORDON,
ZALES N. ECTON,
CARL A. HATCH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am wondering if, on this memorable day in Poland's history, the people of that nation are paying public tribute to that heroic Polish patriot and revolutionary soldier, Casimir Pulaski.

I am wondering about that tribute because 20 years after his birth in Podolia, Poland—200 years ago today—young Pulaski joined his father in open revolt against the foreign domination of Poland by Stanislaus II. Temporarily success-

ful in his mission, Pulaski's forces for freedom were finally crushed, and he fled to Turkey in 1772. His spirit of freedom was not crushed, however, and he urged Turkey to fight Russian domination.

After his efforts failed there, Mr. President, freedom-loving Pulaski found his way to American shores, where he was welcomed into another fight for freedom.

Always anxious to do battle with the forces of imperialism, Pulaski rose to the rank of general, and fought courageously to make of America what he had hoped to make of his native Poland—a nation free of foreign domination. On October 9, 1779, he fell mortally wounded during the siege of Savannah and died 2 days later.

On this, the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski, we in America count it a duty and a privilege to pay our respects to a man whose own native land is today under the domination which he so completely abhorred.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the peace and safety of this Nation are seriously threatened at this moment through the complete absence of a definite foreign policy telling our own people and the nations of the world what we consider will threaten our ultimate peace and safety—and the complete absence of a military organization spearheaded by an air corps to enforce our pronouncement.

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

We have no basic international policy, having definitely ignored the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine under which we had announced to the world in 1823 that we intended to protect the integrity of the nations, which we at that time considered necessary for our own ultimate safety—naming the areas to be protected.

In its place has been substituted a hodge-podge of executive orders and gifts of large sums of money to foreign nations, founded upon no principle at all and with no consistent thought as to where such actions might lead us in foreign entanglements.

BASIC SUBJECT NEVER DISCUSSED WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The basic subject of international policy has never been discussed with the American people, through two world wars and now the Marshall plan.

The basic subject at issue is now—and was in 1823 when the Monroe Doctrine was established—what nations in the European and Middle East areas including Asia and the South Seas is it necessary for us to currently protect for our own ultimate safety. Until this decision is made no plan to make it effective can be intelligently discussed.

When that issue is decided and the nations named whose integrity we must

currently protect for our own ultimate safety—then we have the 125-year-old precedent for announcing to the world and to our own people that if the integrity of these nations is threatened in a manner to disturb the friendly and established trade relations, through infiltration or military attack, it will be considered an overt act against the United States.

This pronouncement by President Monroe 125 years ago, later became known as the Monroe Doctrine.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the statement just made that we have no foreign policy. I do not know whether the Senator expects to develop that point in his speech or not. I have noticed in the press reports that we have marines in the Mediterranean, perhaps in connection with the question of the shipment of oil from Saudi Arabia to the continent, and the present situation existing in Palestine. Does the Senator know any reason for that in connection with a possible foreign policy on our part, or what does the Senator mean by his statement, in the face of the press reports we read every day?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his question. I mean simply that we have no definite foreign policy in this regard. In other words, no one knows, least of all the American people and the United States Senate, what nations the State Department and the President of the United States feel it necessary for us to protect for our own ultimate safety, and no one has ever named the areas or the nations.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. It was said in the debate this afternoon that the President of the United States has indicated to other nations of the world that they must keep hands off Italy. Does that mean that he has extended the Monroe Doctrine in effect to Italy?

Mr. MALONE. The President did say that. He has said many things. He said, for example, early last year when we passed the bill giving \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, that the purpose was to stop communism at the Greek border. At that very moment we were sending high-octane gasoline, machinery, power machinery, and tool steel to Russia to help her cross the Greek border, if she so desired. Therefore, there has been no consistent policy, not with respect to Italy or Greece, or anywhere else.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if we have no foreign policy, what is the Marshall plan?

Mr. MALONE. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. If we have no foreign policy, then why do we need the Marshall plan?

Can the Senator reconcile the two things?

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly what we are trying to find out—what the Marshall plan is supposed to do. It is said we are giving the money to the 16 Marshall plan countries in the hope that it will stop Russia. Stop Russia where? And what will we do if we do not stop Russia at the designated place? That is what I want to find out if I can, for my own information.

In 1823 the empire-minded nations, including Spain, France, the Netherlands, and England, were looking toward South America for new areas to take over under the guise of protection—and to siphon the trade to the "mother" countries through imposing the well known "empire preferential rate" system. The Monroe Doctrine effectively stopped this trend and the South American nations are still free.

At that time we told the American people and the world frankly and specifically, through the Monroe Doctrine, what we considered would threaten the ultimate safety of the United States and what would cause us to fight, and as a result we were not involved in a major foreign war for more than 75 years.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—125-YEAR-OLD
INTERNATIONAL POLICY

We have, or rather had, an international policy, established in 1823 by President James Monroe, 125 years ago, known as the Monroe Doctrine. However, this important and well-established doctrine, which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years was discarded 15 years ago, probably as being too simple and direct—certainly too effective to be successfully manipulated in plain sight of the American people.

This Nation has since had no clear-cut international or national policy.

We backed into the two world wars unprepared and protesting that we would not fight, evidently under the impression that the American people and the Congress of the United States could not be trusted to understand the necessity of protecting the integrity of the European countries for our own ultimate safety, or to judge the necessity of such protection. Certainly that assumption can no longer be held with 18,000,000 veterans in this country, including one-third of the Membership of Congress.

Unfortunately, two leaders of a major world power believed us during the past 30 years, the Kaiser and Mr. Hitler—and in addition each time they decided that in any case we could not prepare for war in time to influence its outcome. Therefore, we found ourselves each time in a bitter all-out world war.

If the decision should be, after a full review of the modern methods of warfare, that it is not necessary to protect the integrity of other areas, then we should come home and cease all interference with other nations' affairs, and build a military force spearheaded by an air corps that no nation or combination of nations dare attack, and tell our people frankly that this must be done until the United Nations takes over.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Montana.

Mr. ECTON. I am very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has to say respecting the Monroe Doctrine. I would very much appreciate if he would explain in a little more detail whether he is in favor of extending the Monroe Doctrine, or reinstating it, in view of the fact that he said the Monroe Doctrine was done away with about 15 years ago.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his question. My answer to it is simply that the Monroe Doctrine policy should be continued. There should be a frank discussion about it with the American people. We should frankly tell our own people and the world exactly what areas, and name the nations, which we consider we should protect currently for our own ultimate safety in the same manner as President Monroe handled a similar situation in 1823.

In other words, let us not back into another war as we have backed into two world wars. The Senator from Montana is as old as I am, and he remembers that in 1916 we reelected a President on the theory that he had kept us out of war. We were in war at that moment, and everyone knew it the day after election, and the President knew it at that moment. The same thing happened in 1940; we reelected a President when he was at that moment in war and knew it, but denied it. In answer to my distinguished friend and colleague from Montana I will say that I am in favor of telling our own people and the world the truth, and giving them the chance to conform.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is touching on a very vital problem in foreign relations development of an American policy today. I wonder if he would tell us whether he thinks if the Government of the United States decides that the integrity and independence of certain nations in Europe, let us say, are essential to our ultimate security, it would be sounder policy to make a declaration to that effect unilaterally through a new Monroe Doctrine, a doctrine which was, after all, an American pronouncement in which the other nations in the Americas did not participate, or to work out some mutual declaration of some sort.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, I would say that it would be a very fine thing to enter into bilateral treaties with each of the nations, as we have finally been able to do with the countries of South America. But that might take more time than we have available now. If, as we see in press reports, and as we hear whisperings going through the colleges, prompted by the State Department and whisperings in Rotary clubs and in various places, we are seriously threatened with war, and that, therefore, we must not delay the establishment of the great Marshall plan, then we must make up our minds

as to what area it is necessary for us to protect now, and announce that we will protect that area and name the nations—giving possible violators a chance to change their minds.

Further, it seems to me that this is a two-edged proposal. The first two world wars were started by people who thought we would not fight. On investigation they thought we could not fight. Therefore we ought not to give a probable opponent an opportunity to start a fight, without knowing what we will do—knowing our intentions.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator fought in both world wars. Is it his opinion that the security of the United States would immediately be dangerously threatened—so dangerously as to justify immediate armed action—if Soviet Russia, either through the establishment of Communist governments in various countries or by outright aggression, took over all of western Europe and effectively controlled it and its resources?

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that I am not in a position to answer the question, because I do not have all the information which the Secretary of National Defense should have, which the State Department should have, and which the President of the United States should have. Such information should be furnished to the Committee on Armed Services of the House and Senate. This is the decision of our generation. Whoever has such information—and if those to whom I have referred do not have it they are not fit persons to hold such positions—should make the decision, and make it now, if we are threatened to as great an extent as they claim. They should make the decision and inform the American people and the world.

What is it that is proposed under the Marshall plan, and what is the propaganda which is going out over this Nation? Tons of it are going out almost every day from every department of government.

It is proposed under the Marshall plan to discuss in one breath the feeding of hungry people, the stopping of communism, and the rehabilitation of industry. The result is that we mix our emotions with the facts and become unwilling victims of the greatest propaganda machine ever set up in Washington. Any intelligent discussion is impossible unless we consider these subjects one at a time.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much impressed with the break-down of thought expressed by the Senator and the triple-barreled appeal which is being made under the Marshall plan, first, for the feeding of hungry people; second, for stopping the spread of communism from Russia; and, third, rehabilitation of the governments of the countries which would be helped.

I believe it to be the natural impulse of the heart of America to go to the aid of people who are hungry and in

need of shelter and medicine. That is a problem which we have always met. As I see it, meeting communism today is more or less a matter of meeting force with force.

The rehabilitation of industry is an entirely different question. It is a matter of business. Certainly there is a vast difference, both in the nature of the help and in the objective, between looking after needy people and rehabilitating the industry of a country. One involves an appeal because of immediate need to prevent starvation and physical suffering. As I say, the other is a matter of business. I shall be glad, indeed, to hear the Senator upon that question, particularly with respect to rehabilitation of industry, and whether or not this country can afford to give away its wealth to rehabilitate the industry of another country. Is not the building up of industry a subject which should be placed upon a business basis, upon some level which would call for a return, just as we deal with business problems in this country?

Mr. MALONE. I agree with the Senator entirely.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if it is not true that the Marshall plan contemplates raising the production of various countries under the plan above any level heretofore attained in the history of those countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know what level would be reached, but it would be at the expense of the American people if industries in other countries were built up. I say that it is all right to assist, if need be, but let the assistance be upon a businesslike basis, rather than as a gift.

Mr. KEM. To be more specific, I have heard it stated that production in England in certain lines today has already attained prewar levels.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. The recovery of England upon a basis of the 1937 industrial index is 115 percent.

Mr. KEM. Is it true that the plans contemplate levels much above that?

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Commenting upon what the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from West Virginia have said, I think it is noteworthy that it is expected that between 20 and 40 percent of the amount provided in the bill shall be used for loans. That means bankers' loans, and not the sort of "fuzzy" loans which have been made in connection with some past transactions, and which could not be distinguished from grants. I believe that such loans will probably cover most of the plans for construction of plants, and things of that kind. We shall get all our "bacon" back.

The Senator from West Virginia has stated that the only way to meet communism is by armed force. I should like to ask him how we can deal with communism by armed force when what we are afraid of is the Communists winning an

election in a country, and thereby putting it at the mercy of the Russian fifth column. How can we deal with such a situation by force? I do not believe that weapons are very effective in that kind of a situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If weapons are not effective, certainly the method which has been used is not effective, because after spending some \$22,000,000,000 in Europe, within the past few days we witnessed a bloodless coup in Czechoslovakia. The people of Czechoslovakia themselves adopted communism without force of arms. That is correct in that instance; but if we are going to prevent communism from moving in, if the Communists are going to move in and take those countries over by force, they should be met by force. However, if the people of those countries desire communism, nothing can stop them. We could not have stopped them in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. LODGE. It occurs to me that if we had not expended all the food, fuel, and medical aid which we have given since the war, there would be a great deal more communism in Europe today than there is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, that is a surmise.

Mr. LODGE. That is a surmise; but if this bill were entirely restricted to food and immediate relief, it would seem to me to involve much too much money to give for that purpose. Unless the bill could achieve some permanent change for the better, unless at the expiration of operations under the bill there could be a better condition existing in Europe than we have today, unless we do more than go back to the level of 1938, unless we have real rehabilitation instead of relief, I do not think this program is worth carrying out.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Several times during the course of this debate he has referred to the possibility of our getting back a substantial portion of the money which we are advancing under the Marshall plan. He has also referred to a certain class of loans or advances which he characterizes as "fuzzy." I should like to ask him about some of the past transactions.

A number of years ago a delegation came here from Britain, headed by Mr. Arthur James Balfour. After considerable negotiation they entered into a settlement of the debts of Great Britain to this country. Those debts were evidenced by documents as binding as any known to the Anglo-American system of law. So far as I know, those obligations have passed into the limbo. They have never been paid. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he would characterize them as "fuzzy" or "unfuzzy"?

Mr. LODGE. In the light of experience, it seems to me that they were extremely "fuzzy." I should like to say to the Senator that in this bill we have tried as hard as men can try to avoid the mistakes of the past. I know there have been a great many mistakes in the past. My able friend, the Senator from Nevada, who is yielding so generously, showed us one day a can of olives that he

found being sold on the streets of Athens, in a country where olives are raised.

We have tried to set up this program in such a way that we shall avoid the mistakes of the past, and we have tried to get into this bill language which will result in returning to us something tangible—not merely to provide for the payment of these loans, but to provide that we shall get strategic raw materials by barter, in exchange for our aid, thus giving us something we need.

Of course, Mr. President, I consider the intangibles which we shall get as the result of the program under the bill to be even more significant. I think the bill will buy us some time; and if we have the vision to use wisely the time we buy, that will be worth more than all the tangible things in the world.

But the bill is set up so that all that can be done.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, can the Senator from Massachusetts suggest to us a standard by which we can determine whether the undertaking is "fuzzy" or not so "fuzzy"?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. We spent a month, recently, on the St. Lawrence seaway, as the Senator recalls. If it is decided to set up a great international power project in four or five of these European nations, binding them together and getting the maximum benefit out of the natural resources of those regions, and if that project is in truth a self-liquidating project as to which there is set up an ironclad system for paying back everyone, I think that would not be a "fuzzy" project; and if we have an administrator who believes firmly that we should have loans that are loans and gifts that are gifts, I do not think that will be a "fuzzy" project.

I do not think there will be any "fuzzy" projects under this bill, Mr. President.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several years ago our British friends got from us \$3,750,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. I was not responsible for that.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Massachusetts characterize that as fuzzy or unfuzzy?

Mr. LODGE. I was not a Member of Congress at that time; but I would not characterize it as a banker's loan or as the kind of loan that will be repaid.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a further question—

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to answer, if the Senator from Nevada does not object to further interruptions.

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Some years ago we put some billions of dollars into a pot known as the Bank of International Settlements, or something of that sort. Would the Senator from Massachusetts characterize it as a fuzzy or an unfuzzy undertaking?

Mr. LODGE. I do not happen to know much about that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to address an inquiry to the Senator from Massachusetts. I know he is an able member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has brought out the point that some of

this money is to be in the nature of bankers' loans. I believe he said 30 or 40 percent would be. I wish to ask the Senator whether the terms of this bill require that that be done, or would not it be left largely to the discretion of the Administrator to determine just what shall be done in that respect and when it may be done?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; it is to be discretionary with the Administrator. But we have had the testimony of all the responsible Government witnesses that they will try to do it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. In other words, there is no requirement whatsoever on the part of the Congress that these loans shall be sound loans; is there?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is simply the statement that the Administrator, if he sees fit to do so, may do it. To use the term that has been used so descriptively, when we deal with administrators those loans might be quite fuzzy; might they not?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator's statement is quite correct when he says that in this bill there is nothing which stipulates how much of the money shall be expended in the form of loans. But I sincerely think the Senator need not worry whether the loans will be fuzzy loans. I do not think they will be fuzzy loans.

Just what percentage of the total amount the loans will be, is another matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no requirement in the bill as to how much of these funds shall be loans; is there?

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So the Administrator may in his own discretion give all of it away; may he not?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true.

I repeat that I think the program under this bill will either rise or fall on the question of whether we have a really top man as the Administrator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask a further question, and I thank the Senator from Nevada for permitting me to interrupt at this point.

First, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is one way to give protection, and that is by requiring in the bill what shall be loans and what shall be gifts. The Congress has that power.

Mr. LODGE. The Congress certainly has that power, but it is extremely difficult to write into the bill language that will not hamper the national interest of our country 10 or 11 months from now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has not one of the great difficulties, not only in our international relations, but in respect to our domestic laws, been too much vagueness in legislation? Should not the bill specify how much of the aid shall be in the form of loans and how much of it shall be in the form of gifts?

Mr. LODGE. Of course we could specify that 30 or 40 percent should be in the form of loans, and we could spell out what the loans should be for. In general, I am in sympathy with what the Senator from West Virginia says about legislating in a definite way and spelling out everything. But all of us

have seen the European situation develop, just since January, in the most surprising and unpredictable way. Every time we try to legislate on the international situation, we get into trouble. After we passed the Neutrality Act, as we did in 1937, thinking it was a foolproof way to keep out of war, there was not a Member of the Senate who, 2 years later, did not sincerely wish we had not done it.

So I think it is impossible to shackle ourselves and prevent ourselves, in advance, from having freedom of action in regard to the foreign field.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, is the Senator suggesting dictatorship?

Mr. LODGE. No; and I do not think I have said anything that could be interpreted as suggesting it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to go a little further than the Senator from Massachusetts has gone, and to make the point-blank statement on the floor of the Senate that every international scheme we have entered into during the past 30 years has been an outright failure. I agree with the Senator that in a few years after we enter into such a scheme, we are sorry we have done so. I also state that I am entirely in agreement with the Senator's statement with respect to rehabilitation and the long-range aspects of this bill.

Mr. President, within the next 48 or 72 hours I shall introduce a bill which will take the fuzziness out of these loans, and will put them on a sound basis, and will spell out exactly what is to be used for long-range loans and exactly what is to be used for gifts. I, for one, think the time has arrived.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the bill the Senator from Indiana proposes to introduce be based upon the factual study of any commission or committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. It will be based upon the common horse sense of an American individual, and on the policy this Nation has used for the past 15 years, and it will be based on a premise and on law, a tried and proven formula which we have used in our own Nation for the same thing we are proposing to do for these foreign countries.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is the agency or committee or commission which has provided the figures on which the Senator's proposal will be based?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is the whole study made by the Herter committee, which has been used by all the committees which have taken action on this subject.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut would like to stay on the subject we have been discussing, I shall be glad to yield further; but I think we are going too far afield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I simply wish to make this comment: As I understand it, the estimate of from 20 percent to 40 percent repayment of loans is not only based on the studies made by some branches of the Government, which are in fact arms of this very Congress, but also is based in part upon representations which these people in Europe made when

they got together at the Paris Conference. I think there is some virtue in the fact that in their representations they did not say, as some might have said, "We will be able to pay back all these loans, or 90 percent of them, or 75 percent of them, or 50 percent of them." I think the fact that they indicated they might be able to pay back so little is good evidence of their earnestness and their truthfulness. In my opinion, in order to be realistic we might better be advised as we consider the question whether or not we shall pass this legislation that, after all, the representation is that probably not more than 20 to 40 percent will be repaid. That is based upon not only their representations but upon our own figures. I thank my distinguished friend for permitting me to make that statement.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my friend the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say first to my friend the Senator from Nevada that it is very likely I shall disagree with the conclusions which he may draw in his speech, but a point has been raised as to which I think there should be a clear understanding. The point was raised by the junior Senator from Massachusetts. He says we may expect a large part of the money to come back to us in the form of raw materials and thus to be repaid for our expenditures. As I look at the map I am wondering how much hope there is in that direction, what raw materials we may expect to receive from Italy, France, Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands, or Greece.

Mr. LODGE. The map, I may say to the Senator from Vermont, does not show the empires of the various countries. The bill covers the French Empire, the Dutch Empire, and the British Empire which possess vast quantities of materials which would be useful to us.

Mr. AIKEN. That is just what I feared. The only conclusion to draw is that the Senator thinks the future welfare of the world will depend on the European countries keeping vast areas and vast populations under control as colonies.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think that. I, personally having been in those countries, should like to see them develop independence, dominion status, and so on. Under those conditions there, I think there would probably be an even better chance of developing the raw materials than there is now, because we would have the good will and the desire of the people there to supply these resources. I do not think the bill in any way promotes imperialism in the empires. If it did, I should not be for that.

Mr. AIKEN. The point I should like to make is that if repayment is expected, we must expect it largely in the form of manufactured goods. We should face that fact.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think that is true at all, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think we should expect the Javanese to work for 8 cents a day for the Dutch in order to enable them to repay our loan. I should rather give the Dutch the help.

Mr. LODGE. The bill is very specific on that point, I may say to the Senator. It does not say manufactured goods. It says strategic materials.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should they not pay in manufactured goods as well as in raw materials and agricultural products, which will cut into another segment of our economy?

Mr. LODGE. It does not say agricultural products, either, if the Senator will bear with me. It merely says strategic raw materials. That, of course, is a well-known term developed by the Army and the Navy, and it applies to certain minerals and materials which we do not have in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Would that include wool and rubber, the two largest agricultural products?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think wool is listed as a strategic raw material.

Mr. AIKEN. It should be.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is found on page 29, line 21, which says:

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It has been said by the Senator from Connecticut that the CEEC countries estimated they would be able to pay us from 20 to 40 percent of the amount we are asked to advance them. With that in mind I looked at the report of the Paris Conference, and the only thing I found under the index of repayment was the statement that "the problem of repayment is beyond the scope of this report."

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but if the Senator from Nevada will permit one more interruption, we have gone beyond that; we have written this language into the bill, and any nation that signs an agreement under the bill agrees to it. For the benefit of Senators who have taken part in this debate, and particularly the Senator from Vermont, I should like to call his attention to page 162 of volume 1 of the hearings, in which are listed the possible production increases and stock-pile acquisitions of selected strategic materials. I asked the executive branch of the Government for the information, and it is in this volume. It might be of interest to Members of the Senate to examine it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I have one more question. Do our business transactions with any of the European nations with the exception of Finland indicate the possibility that we can deal with them otherwise than on a "fuzzy" basis?

Mr. LODGE. I think Ireland did pay her debt to us after World War I just as Finland did and that they were the only nations to do so.

Mr. KEM. With the exception of those two countries, we are on notice that the engagement may deteriorate into a "fuzzy" one; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is true that we have gone through a long period in which a number of other countries did not pay their debts, but history does not always repeat itself. There is such a thing as optimism, there is such a thing as a silver lining, and there is such a thing as a real, capable financial administration of this program which will see to it that the loans are really loans. I personally think we are going to get it.

Mr. KEM. There is such a thing as patience ceasing to be a virtue, too, is there not?

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps so.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think some of the problems about which the debate has centered will be answered from my standpoint by a continuation of the address. I would say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, however, while the subject is under discussion, that he referred to the St. Lawrence waterway. That bill was not passed; therefore, we do have something to say about it. The same thing applies here. I should like to see included in the bill some specific rules which I shall describe later, that would apply to a percentage of the loans for the rehabilitation of industry in the same manner that I desired a Chief of Army Engineers report on the St. Lawrence waterway project before I was forced to a decision; we sent it back to committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to read one short paragraph from the committee report, which I think is pertinent:

While recognizing that a definitive answer cannot now be given to the question as to what percentage of assistance will be financed by loans and what percentage by grants, the committee believes it desirable to obtain an estimate. In response to its inquiry the National Advisory Council has estimated that, roughly, 20 to 40 percent of assistance will be in the form of loans, while 60 to 80 percent will be grants. Without attempting to make a determination, it is probable that in the early stages of the program the countries will be divided into four classes: (1) Countries such as Switzerland and Portugal, which will pay cash for commodities received—

In other words, they will pay dollars—(2) countries to which assistance will be furnished by loans; (3) countries, like Austria and Greece, where assistance will be entirely by grants; and (4) countries, like France and Great Britain, where assistance will be partly by loans and partly by grants.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would just say in passing that we have a perfect 30-year record in reference to England and France, and right in the record proof that England and France made no repayment of any loan they have ever received over that period that equaled the interest on that loan.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall not take any more of the Senator's time, if he

will permit me to make one inquiry, which is based upon a statement by my friend the junior Senator from Massachusetts about his belief that the moneys expended and to be expended would help prevent the spread of communism in certain countries. I am very much interested in that subject, and I am interested in it generally in connection with reaching a conclusion on the pending measure. The Senator expressed the belief, to which I referred in passing as perhaps a surmise, that the money already advanced and loaned to certain countries had kept out communism. Certainly the Senator would not apply that to moneys advanced to the United Kingdom, would he? We do not believe for a minute that communism would have swept the United Kingdom in the British Isles.

I will say that among those countries which are to be helped I notice Iceland, Ireland, the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, and Portugal are to receive moneys. The argument is being made that the purpose is to prevent communism from taking possession of those countries. I say to the able Senator from Nevada that I am impressed at this time with the fact—and I wish that someone would throw some further light on it—that the countries which I have named are not in danger of communism. I have seen no indication of communism taking over the United Kingdom, Iceland, Ireland, or Portugal.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Nevada permit me to answer that statement?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If money is to be loaned for that purpose, why is it that they are to receive such large grants, particularly the United Kingdom?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to my friend from West Virginia two things. First, some of the countries he has mentioned will not receive any loans or any grants, but will be required to pay cash for everything they receive. Some of the other countries will receive loans but will receive no grants at all.

Secondly, if we hope to see the economic integration of Europe, the creation of a joint organization, and the development of that area into a single unit which is strong and rich, where the present subdivided small units are weak and poor, we must in our plan include all of the countries in that area, whether they took part in the war and whether they were our allies. That is why some of those countries are included. I do not think we can merely spend money and stop communism. I do not think it is as simple as that. But I do think that one of the things that make men turn to the Communist doctrine is the fact that they have no hope for the future. Therefore, if we are trying to prevent the advance of communism by political means—I am not speaking of force—it stands to reason that one of the effective ways to do it is to give them some hope for the future. It is in that respect that I think this bill, if enacted, and if it is intelligently administered, will tend to prevent the advance of communism, because people will feel that it gives them some hope for the future, some chance to de-

velop themselves, some chance to turn the crank and get the engine going again. Of course, if there is no engine, it does no good to turn the crank.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Massachusetts made the statement that some of the countries which I have mentioned will not receive relief under the proposed legislation. With the possible exception of Ireland, I want to go over the list of those countries, so that the Senator may advise me. Of course, I am following the report as to which countries I name will not receive relief. Certainly the United Kingdom and dependencies will receive some relief.

Mr. LODGE. They will receive some grants and some loans.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether or not he wishes to conclude his remarks this afternoon. It is now 3 minutes to 5. We have had a long session this afternoon. I am wondering if it would meet with his approval to take a recess, with the understanding that he may proceed tomorrow and be permitted to finish his remarks at that time.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to finish the subject which is now under discussion, which will require about 5 or 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was addressing a question, with the permission of the Senator from Nevada, to the Senator from Massachusetts, with reference to the countries I had named which will receive relief, and the Senator expressed the view that some of them would not receive relief. We talked about the United Kingdom, which will receive relief. As it is set forth in the report, that relief will amount to perhaps a fourth of the total amount to be appropriated.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is quite an accurate statement. The matter of which countries shall receive loans and grants, and the proportion of loans and the proportion of grants with respect to each country, cannot be foretold at this time with mathematical accuracy. It will be a matter for the Administrator to decide in each case. He will have to make up his mind how much a country can repay. It is obvious that in the case of certain countries they can repay all the money which has been loaned them, and it is obvious that in the case of other countries they will have to pay for everything they receive. In the case of most of the countries it is not possible to say how much of the amount will be loans and how much will be grants.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator will further yield, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to page 47 of the report, referring particularly to table 2, which is a recapitulation of illustrative distribution between relief-type and recovery-type commodities and services financed with new United States Treasury funds and imported by the participating countries

from the western Hemisphere, April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. Is not that an estimate?

Mr. LODGE. That is an illustration. I do not consider that it binds the Administrator.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There has been evidence before the committee as to what will probably be sent to each of the countries involved, and it appears in the report of the committee. I note that the United Kingdom and its dependencies, out of the total amount of \$4,899,100,000, is to receive \$1,490,900,000.

Let us turn to the other countries mentioned a while ago which will receive relief. In looking at that table, does it not appear that Belgium will receive relief?

Mr. MALONE. Two hundred and fifty-two million for that country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And Denmark?

Mr. LODGE. They are to get some relief-type commodities, but I do not think it could be called relief. The purpose of the bill is recovery, and not relief. Obviously people cannot start working unless they eat and unless they have heat, but the purpose of the bill is not relief, it is a recovery bill, and I personally regard the use of the word "relief" as not entirely accurate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I want to clear up the little exchange, and a very pleasant one, between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself when I mentioned countries that were not beset with communism, which would receive the contemplated help. I mentioned Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

I find that, according to the report, it is contemplated that all of them will receive relief under the pending measure, and I call attention to page 47 of the report.

Mr. LODGE. They will receive relief-type commodities, but that is not at all the same thing as receiving relief, in my opinion. We have to decide whether we are going to embark on a program which includes all these nations of western Europe in an over-all recovery effort out of which we hope will come a new integration of Europe, something strong and better than we have had before, or whether we are just going to take certain countries and give them piecemeal soup-kitchen treatment, so that at the end of the program they will be no better off than they were at the beginning. If we are to do something comprehensive, which will get us up out of the rut and onto the high ground, then I think we have to have a plan which will include the whole of Europe, because one European country's economy is dovetailed into the economy of another. For centuries one country has been dependent on the economy of the other, and there cannot be any kind of European recovery without treating all the countries as a unit.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, to throw a little light on the debate just concluded between my distinguished colleagues from West Virginia and Massa-

chusetts, the best estimate we can get from the references shows that France is to get \$1,119,000,000 from the \$5,360,000,000, and the United Kingdom is to receive \$1,378,000,000. That is the estimate for the first 12 months, and it speaks for itself. It is roughly \$2,500,000,000 out of this \$5,360,000,000 or about 50 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the Senator mind putting into the RECORD the names of the other countries, in view of the exchange and discussion which has just preceded the Senator's last statement?

Mr. MALONE. I submit for the RECORD, Mr. President, a table showing 16 nations benefiting under the Marshall plan. It shows their population, their area in square miles, and their allocation

under the Marshall plan. That is the best estimate I can get from the Foreign Relations Committee hearings and other reliable documents. It also shows the Index of Industrial Recovery, 1937 being considered 100 percent, and the financial aid per capita.

As long as I have mentioned France and England, I may say that this table shows that the United Kingdom is now 115 percent recovered, compared to the industrial index of 1937. It shows that France is 106 percent recovered on the same basis.

I submit the table for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Country	Population	Area	Allocation under Marshall plan (12-month period)	Index of industrial production (1937=100 unless otherwise noted)	Financial aid per capita
Austria	7,000,000	32,369	\$142,000,000	150	\$20.3
Belgium and Luxembourg	8,687,000	12,774	252,000,000	84	29.0
Denmark	4,024,000	16,575	128,000,000	117	30.9
France	39,700,000	212,659	1,119,000,000	106	28.2
Greece	7,788,000	50,257	145,000,000	75	18.7
Iceland	127,800	39,709	10,000,000	(*)	78.0
Ireland	2,089,700	27,137	119,000,000	109	40.0
Italy	45,800,000	119,800	680,000,000	80	14.8
Netherlands	9,090,000	12,862	550,000,000	90	61.0
Norway	2,937,000	124,556	27,000,000	122	9.2
Portugal	8,132,200	35,466	None	(*)	
Sweden	6,674,000	173,347	26,600,000	107	3.9
Switzerland	4,265,700	15,737	None		
Export				12 13 101	
Import				13 13 105	
Turkey	18,971,300	294,416	None	(*)	
United Kingdom	47,889,000	94,279	1,378,000,000	115	20.8
Western Germany (United States, United Kingdom, French zones)	45,417,200	96,300	1,784,600,000	142	17.3
Total	259,495,600	1,348,243	5,360,000,000		

¹ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Austria. Estimate, 1947.

² Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (United Nations, January 1948 issue): September 1947.

³ International Financial Statistics, January 1948: p. 63.

⁴ International Financial Statistics, September 1947.

⁵ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Greece (1939=100).

⁶ No data.

⁷ Hearings, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pt. 3, p. 1222. (Figures: End of 1947.)

⁸ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Italy.

⁹ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Netherlands (second quarter, 1947).

¹⁰ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies. (No general industrial index available.)

¹¹ Full capacity.

¹² House Committee on Foreign Affairs Publication, entitled "Background Information on European Countries." (Restricted.) Aug. 21, 1947.

¹³ 1938=100.

¹⁴ State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Turkey.

¹⁵ Above prewar.

¹⁶ Including Saar.

¹⁷ United States zone, 48; United Kingdom zone, 37.

Mr. MALONE. As long as the Senator from Massachusetts has brought up the matter of strategic minerals, I should like to say that I happen to have worked on the matter of strategic minerals for about 25 years. I believe I was the first one to go to the Secretary of War in 1936 and 1937, Harry Woodring then being Secretary, and propose a definite program for purchase and stock-piling of those materials, and I have worked on the program almost continuously since that time.

In all the proposals which have been made at random, it has never been proposed, to my knowledge, that nations pay their debts through the production and turning over to the United States of strategic materials without cost, that they give them to the United States. We are always to buy these materials. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to this fact. I know that the suggestion has been made from time

to time that we are going to be given these materials, but we have always bought for the stock pile and paid cash for them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that in the early stages of the program we would buy these minerals, but I think that if it were not for this bill we probably would not be able to buy them, for two reasons. First of all, we would not get the priorities; the nations would keep the materials for themselves. Secondly, if it were not for this bill, there would not be the exploitation and the development of the materials. So, even if the bill provided only for the sale, I think it would be advantageous. In addition, it provides for barter, and I think the barter provision is going to be very effective over the years, but I agree not in the first 2 or 3 years.

Mr. MALONE. Then the Senator agrees with me that it will not be effective the first 2 or 3 years, and this is only a 4-year program.

Mr. LODGE. I think the barter provision probably will not be effective the first year. I think the sale provision will come into effect right away, and I think it is very advantageous to us. It is very easy to say, "All this bill provides is that they will sell us the raw materials," and at first blush that does not look like much, but from the talks I have had with men like the Senator from Nevada, who have spent their lives in this field, I think it means a great deal. It means we will get priority in obtaining these things, and it means they will develop natural resources, which they would not otherwise do.

Mr. MALONE. Just further to clarify the atmosphere, we have had provisions in other loans. Many of the Senators present remember about the loan to Britain of \$3,750,000,000. I was not a Member of the Senate at that time, but there were many provisions in the loan, such as the Empire preferential rates provision, and other conditions which vitally affected this country, and which never have been thoroughly discussed on the Senate floor since I have been a Member of this distinguished body.

It will be remembered that, following the loan, English representatives went to the State Department for relief from carrying out the provisions of the act and were then and there relieved from the provisions of the loan that did not fit into their plans, without again submitting the matter to Congress in any way whatsoever.

No conversation has ever developed which would prove to anyone that we would be given these materials under the Marshall plan bill for the simple reason that the producers of these materials, just as producers in the United States, have to pay their help, they have to pay their workers, and if they make 5 percent as a net profit that is a good net profit, perhaps, as it is in the United States. How many of these strategic and critical materials and minerals must we consume in this country to get back any reasonable portion of the debt? If we got the entire profit of 5 percent, it would take \$120,000,000,000 worth of strategic and critical minerals and materials to pay one-third of the debt, or \$6,000,000,000. Therefore, it is not practical, and it would not be done under any conditions that can now be projected. It is simply a pleasant dream. It has been my ambition to answer this often prodded question on the Senate floor for many years. I thank the Senator for the opportunity.

When it comes to priorities, we have learned from sad experience that nothing written in a bill means anything when the parties come to the State Department and complain. They write it off without coming to Congress. In the case of the British loan they did write it off without coming to Congress, and if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has any information otherwise on the British loan, I should be very much obliged if he would tell us about it.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield further to my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I have no information otherwise on the British loan, but I will say that I agree with the Senator that we have made many mistakes in the past. We have gone into many things in a sort of left-handed, half-baked way, but I think the proposal before us is much more carefully worked out than anything I have seen in the years I have been a Member of the Senate, and that it has the benefit of the study of men of standing to an extent that I have never seen before.

Insofar as the possible acquisitions of materials and stock piling under the bill are concerned, the Senator will see on pages 162 and 163 that we expect to get 3,000,000 pounds of tungsten from Portugal—I am skipping around at random; we expect to get 2,000,000 pounds of nickel from New Caledonia and the Netherlands East Indies; we expect to get from two to three million pounds of industrial diamonds from the Belgian Congo, Angola, the Gold Coast, and Sierra Leone; we expect to get 50,000 pounds of copper from the Belgian Congo and Northern Rhodesia, and so forth and so on. I will not read them all, but we expect to get, according to official testimony which was given at my request, substantial amounts of things we need.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts expect that we shall get those materials in exchange, or shall we have to pay for it as usual?

Mr. LODGE. I think in the first year or so we will pay for it in dollars. In fact this whole computation of \$5,300,000,000, in view of the unfavorable trade balances of these countries, is based on the assumption that they will sell us some of these materials, and if we stipulated that they had to give us these materials, then the unfavorable trade balances would go up that much greater, and add that much more by way of aid, or it would have to be furnished from outside. So I think in the initial stages we will pay for it. Under the bill it is possible to make agreements extending for a number of years, under which we will get substantial amounts of these materials without paying cash for them. Of course, we will pay something for them. We will extend our aid in exchange for it.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts sincerely for his contribution. Now, since he has raised the question, I refer him to the European recovery plan committee hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Part I, to pages 116 and 117. There are two tables there which are very interesting to me. Since the Senator has brought up the fact that if we did take these minerals without pay it would further unbalance their trade balances, I want to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that it just happens—no doubt it is a coincidence—that the money which has been asked for under the bill, \$6,800,000,000 for 15 months, corresponding exactly to \$5,300,000,000 for 12 months, adds up to the unfavorable trade balances.

In other words, the \$6,800,000,000 asked for by the President for 15 months under the Marshall plan corresponds exactly in proportion to the \$5,300,000,000 for 12 months so the trade balance shortage of the 16 countries from all trade sources in the world for the 12 months exactly balances by the same coincidence the amount of the loan or gift—I hope that no one is so naive as to believe that any of it will be repaid.

Now the exact shortage in the trade balances of all these nations with all the countries of the world with which they trade adds up, as a mere coincidence, to \$6,860,000,000 for 15 months, which is the exact amount asked for during that period. That, in the Senator's own words, is sufficient reason that we should never take these minerals without pay. I submit to the Senator that there could be a grave accusation made that this country has now established a certain policy with respect to loaning—and we mean by that gifts, because there is no one naive enough I hope in the Senate, and I think there are very few in the United States, who believe that we will get any money return out of this at all. The loan just adds up to their deficit in trade balances for the time that the loan is supposed to last, and it is an illustration of the policy we have adopted under the present administration, in the last 5 years. It is a dangerous policy, I submit and one that has already put us on the road to bankruptcy—how long would a business last with a policy like that—the board of directors would change the president of the company and quick.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to my able friend from Nevada that I am not going to defend the policies adopted during this administration—during the last 5 years.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is defending them if he backs the present legislation.

Mr. LODGE. No, sir; I am not. I insist that I am not defending the policies of the administration in the last 5 years. In fact, I do not consider I am defending the policies of the administration at any time. I am defending the policy which was adopted by the unanimous vote of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is a very different matter, indeed. The bill which the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out is a far different bill than the bill sent up from the executive branch.

Mr. MALONE. Let me interrupt the Senator at that point to say that the amount is just the same and the principle is the same—some of the words may have been changed.

Mr. LODGE. No matter how hard the Senator tries, and no matter how eloquent he is—and he is very eloquent—he cannot tie me up with this administration. I refuse to be tied up with it. The fact that the unfavorable trade balance is \$6,800,000,000, as shown on pages 116 and 117 of the hearings—

Mr. MALONE. Six billion eight hundred and sixty million dollars.

Mr. LODGE. And the fact that the total amount requested for the Marshall plan is \$6,800,000,000 is not a coincidence. It is deliberately arrived at. What we are trying to do is to bridge

that gap in foreign exchange which has been caused in large part by the war. There is not any mystery about it. We have not uncovered a corpse here. It is exactly what we are trying to do. The Senator is quite right that if we were to insist on getting these strategic raw materials without paying for them in the first year, it would further upset the unfavorable trade balance of those countries, which is exactly why we are not going to do it. But when the time comes when these countries develop an export surplus—and I think some of them have great recuperative powers, and they will develop export surpluses—when that time comes, then we can get these materials by barter, and I think we should. I thank the Senator for yielding to me so liberally.

Mr. MALONE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts. He has had longer experience in the Senate and has had a longer time to observe the actions of this administration. Therefore he would know more about it. I would like to withdraw the remarks I made that he is siding with the administration purposely so long as he is so vehement in stating that he does not like to have that said. I now believe that his agreement with them in principle is a coincidence.

The Senator said that when the various countries recover then we will collect these minerals without paying for them. I say to the Senator that the United Kingdom is now 115 percent recovered compared to the 1937 industrial index. I want to quote at this point what Sir Stafford Cripps said to me. I had a long interview with him. I intended to go into that later, but now seems opportune. He was very frank with me. He did not say or claim that Great Britain needed this money very badly. As a matter of fact he said they did not need it very badly for the recovery of Great Britain. What they needed was not money for recovery, but for the building up of industry in their colonies, notably in Africa. I asked him in a conversational tone of voice if it would not be all right if Americans, persons in the United States who have money to invest, should not invest it in Africa—since they are ready to invest it anywhere in the world where capital is safe from confiscation, where they just take the business risk. There is more private capital for such investment in the United States now than at any other time in the history of the world. Why not let private capital go in and do these things? "Oh, no," he said, "that will not do. We need the Marshall plan money so that the Government of the United States will give the Government of Great Britain the money to build up industry," not to rehabilitate it to the point at which it was prior to the war, not 25 percent above that, but double it and triple it. That is where Great Britain intends to come into market domination again. That is what this money is going for really, and it is, of course, in the British Empire where most of strategic and critical materials are found.

Let me make one more remark in that connection. I had a long discussion with Sir Ben Smith just before I went down in one of the British coal mines, and be-

fore I had visited the steel mills in Birmingham. Sir Ben Smith said several things. One thing was that we should continue lending them money on the lend-lease principle and expect no repayment at all. I do not remember the exact language he used, but he said it was way out of line for us to expect repayment; that we should continue loaning them money on the same lend-lease basis. I did not say anything. I was obtaining the information which I wanted. He said further: "You must remember"—I was a long way from home, and perhaps looked a little timid—"you must remember that we control in the British Empire three-fourths of the raw materials in this world, and if we have to we will close down on them." Those are his exact words, presumably in the nature of a threat if we refused such aid on that basis—if we were rash enough to expect any dealings on a business basis.

Mr. President, there is no time further this afternoon to continue the debate, but I should like to obtain unanimous consent to continue my address the first thing tomorrow after the Senate reconvenes. I intend to show at that time that by taking these measures into account separately it is possible to feed hungry people, to stop communism, and it is possible to loan money on a business basis for the rehabilitation of sound industrial enterprises.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] may be recognized.

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

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 2, I made a talk at Chicago before the North Park College forum. I ask unanimous consent to insert that talk in the RECORD, not in the Appendix, but in the body of the RECORD, for the reason that my talk dealt almost exclusively with the Marshall plan and related matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

To provide a subject for this address, my sponsors have assigned me the intriguing topic "If I Were President." The Monday noon quarterback has obvious advantages over the Saturday afternoon coach as do I. So tonight I shall let my imagination run riot with respect to the conduct of the most powerful and most respected office in all the world, and take you with me on a flight into the stratosphere of political speculation and hindsight.

Each year the President appears before Congress and delivers an historic address on the state of the Union. In this modern time, where a pin-drop is heard across every sea, there are no limits to the scope of this traditional address. For today the state of the Union is the state of the world. On January 7, 1948, President Truman, the world's foremost optimist, as well as its leading political figure, delivered a most reassuring state of the Union résumé.

I thought the President painted too bright a picture on January 7. As I view it, he might well have said bluntly the "state of

the Union is bad, very bad, and the state of the world is positively terrifying." I am not an alarmist, but it is dangerous to not face the stern realities of these uneasy times. The people of the United States are tough and they can take a "blood, sweat, and tears" jolt when that is the medicine the doctor has ordered.

President Harry Truman is a patriot of the highest order. He is a devout man of deep religious convictions. No one loves his country more. There is not one dishonest hair on his head. He is a man of great courage, almost foolhardy courage. He has a warm, understanding, unselfish love for the people. He is a good man in every sense of the word. But if he had taken his hair down on January 7 and called a spade a spade, his words would have thrilled and inspired his people.

Had he said to the Congress, "There will be no political maneuvering at the White House, so stop thinking only of November the second, complete your difficult tasks without fanfare, and without playing politics, and get out of Washington!" Congress would have recognized the master's voice, and the country would have smiled its approval.

Had he said to industry, as General Eisenhower is reported to have observed, "Cut profits, lower prices," tumultuous applause in and out of Congress would have lifted his words to the stratosphere, and the other day steel would not have poured oil on the flames of inflation by its stupid and wicked action in advancing prices.

Had he said to organized labor, "The economic structure of our country is tottering. The vicious spiral of higher prices and higher wages must cease, and quick. For 12 months I demand freedom from wage increases." Had he added, "Gentlemen, inflation can be overcome only through the constant, unselfish, enlightened efforts of all of us. Only by high, uninterrupted production can your take-home dollar ever approximate 100 cents again;" organized labor in my opinion would have fallen in line and the confidence of the country would have been restored.

Had he said to American merchants, "Merchants, do your part to restore the integrity of the dollar. Slash prices, put on bargain sales, clear your shelves, reduce your inventory, get your house in order for a period of lower prices;" all of America would have rejoiced.

Had he said to all the people, "Europe is suffering its worst famine since the 1860's; eat less, waste less, and dispatch more to the starving children across the sea;" a new spirit of consecrated sacrifice would have swept these United States.

In his state of the Union speech our beloved President missed a great opportunity because he spoke neither the language nor the thoughts of Harry S. Truman.

The world is on fire. Extraneous matters which divide our people and glittering generalities far beyond the President's own budget had no place in that speech. Recommendations of economic changes based on tough, cold facts would not have inspired incriminating debate and far-reaching political revolts. The American people are not little children who must be told that the Federal Government will fill their stockings with every good thing, including social and political preference, without any effort on their part. This is a time for concerted action, not fussing and feuding; a time of peril, not plenty; a time for hard work, not day-dreaming; a time for sacrifice, not mooching.

Today, if we will get November 2 out of our eyes, two very grave dangers may be seen sticking out like two very sore thumbs. I refer first to the constant and dangerous advance in the cost of living, and secondly, to the growing threat of World War III. We dare not relax for one split second until the

general outlook on these two perilous fronts is greatly improved.

Gradually, in the United States, inflation has been gaining momentum day by day, month by month, and year by year. Like a thief in the night it has been creeping upon us. Inflation is not a new disease. It is as old as civilization. Its pattern and its causes are well understood by economists everywhere. It has been the source of more misery than any other phenomenon of the capitalistic system. It is the father of totalitarianism. It gave the world Napoleon, and it gave the world the unspeakable Adolf Hitler. Capitalistic democracy and uncontrolled inflation cannot live in the same house. One or the other must get out. The burning question in the United States is, which goes? It is as simple as that.

Today every country the world over is suffering in some degree from this virulent malady. In China, one cannot haul enough printing-press money in a wheelbarrow to pay for a meal. France and Italy, too, have an aggravated case of this economic plague. All of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere are desperate because of it. The rich and the poor, the high and the low alike are ruined. It creates Communists faster than Joseph Stalin can drink vodka.

At no period in world history has any nation shown more capacity to wage total war than did the people of the United States during World War II. Our human and natural resources were mobilized to the nth degree to crush our cruel, relentless foes. Now we are nearly 3 years in the postwar era. In place of the perfect coordination and splendid cooperation among all groups which were so evident during the war, we see our leaders appeasing pressure groups and special privilege gangs; we see petty political maneuvering, and the selfish promotion of personal political ambition. Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo put the fear of God in us, and we moved as one man to destroy these monsters. If we could only realize it, the impending ruination of inflation and the threat of World War III are far more dangerous enemies today than those three vile creatures of yesterday. Hitler, like the foolish rattle, proclaimed his own perfidy, but inflation is slipping up on us like a snake in the grass.

If I were President, I would summon my economists and set them to work to list all of the direct and indirect causes of our march of inflation. After they had diagnosed and analyzed the situation thoroughly, I would give the Congress and the people a full, complete, and hard-boiled statement, and I would demand corrections all along the line, regardless of whom it might hurt. Furthermore, I would pound away on this theme day and night until I got results. For until we stop the spiral of inflation which is sweeping the United States over the precipice, our vaunted prosperity is but a house of cards built upon the quicksands of illusion. Manufacturers, merchants, farmers, consumers, bankers, management, organized labor, government, and many other elements of our society have contributed to the raging fires of inflation. Each of them faces ruin unless these fires are extinguished. Nothing short of Herculean coordinated effort with full and united cooperation among all segments will put that fire out. It is up to the President of the United States to provide the leadership in that kind of crusade.

The Federal budget for this year is two thousand million dollars larger than last year, and more than four times larger than the 1939 total. Right there would be an excellent spot for an inflation-fighting President to make his start. He might well contemplate the Government's whole fiscal policy. From 1940 to 1946 we expended \$400,000,000 for war. Two hundred and fifty-seven billion of that vast sum is represented by outstanding interest-bearing bonds which under the law can be converted into credit

or currency any hour of the day. For all purposes and effects this vast bond issue is but one step removed from printing-press money. During the war period currency in circulation (printing-press money) increased \$20,000,000,000. Deficit spending quite necessary during the war and the totalitarian device of printing-press currency have combined to debase our monetary system to the breaking point. There was dire necessity during the war to travel this dangerous road, but now that the war is over stupidity and political cowardice must not keep us traveling that tempting easy-come, easy-go highway to disaster.

Price control obviously is not the answer. This police-state method promises security but delivers confusion. It is true that it did work briefly during the war, but only briefly, for soon the laws of supply and demand, which no Congress and no government can repeal, asserted themselves through the black market, and the price controls had to be abandoned. They deal with symptoms anyway, and not the disease. Sitting on the lid of the volcano of inflation must eventually result in a violent explosion. If we are to build effective bulwarks against inflation something more fundamental is required. Federal fiscal policies, curtailed production through high taxes and labor disputes, loose credits, profiteering, exhaustion from public charity and foreign loans, and deterioration of money are its well-understood causes, and they must receive our united action to effect a cure. The danger which we face is that each of the elements in our economy will blame the other for the present wicked spiral and that inflation will continue unchecked and end as inflation everywhere has always ended, in economic collapse.

The State Department has a remedy for our inflation which I fear will be worse than the disease so far as we are concerned. They would stimulate production abroad with our capital; then they would lower our tariff wall and let cheaper goods flow in unrestrained. It would reduce prices here all right, but it would close our workshops and our factories.

In the early thirties the United States suffered the worst depression in history. The Federal Treasury had to pour out billions to get the wheels of industry turning. It was called pump-priming. The State Department is pouring twice that many dollars into Europe. Once European industry gets under way it will give American industry a run for its money. The cry will be for markets, and we cannot furnish them without creating idle smokestacks and devastating unemployment here at home. Thus we push ourselves along from one crisis to another. Lincoln was in error—you can fool all the people all the time.

I am convinced that some of the men occupying high places in our Government, while publicly complaining very bitterly about inflation, to more easily balance the budget privately desire it. But these men are living in a fool's paradise. Inflation, like alcohol and other narcotics, must be increased to register effect.

While our Government is ballyhooing about inflation, Sweden does something constructive about it. Industrial and business houses in Sweden will be required to deposit with the Central Bank 17 percent of the dividends paid last year and 27 percent of their undistributed earnings. These deposits will be blocked until 1950. By this arbitrary and drastic procedure the amount of money in circulation in Sweden will be reduced.

Keeping the United States out of world war III would be my other great passion if I were President. Since there is no possibility for keeping us out once a world war is started, world war III must be stopped before it starts.

Marcus Cato in ancient Rome ended every speech, every letter, and every conversation

with these words, "Carthage must be destroyed." If I were President, every statement which I issued, every document which I signed, and every speech which I made would close with these words, "The world must not be destroyed."

Keeping such an objective ever before us might modify and change every short-range and every long-range domestic and foreign policy of this great country. But if that were so, then they would be changed. All ideas of "let's try this out" futility, all ideas of frenzied frustration, and all ideas of stupid appeasement and sloppy wishful thinking, which have characterized our dealings with Russia over the past 10 years, would most certainly have to go. That we would be required to remain strong and powerful all along the line goes without saying.

Modern war is total war. World war III will kill more women and babies than men in uniform. For mass destruction of civilians is the accepted technique of modern war. War will henceforth be directed toward civilians. They will be the first objects of death and destruction both by us and by our enemies.

To win such a diabolical war, we must remain strong in every phase of life, and especially so in its moral, spiritual, economic, industrial, and physical phases. If we are strong in these attributes, we will have attained the first potential of military strength. If we are lacking in any of these particulars, America cannot achieve military greatness.

In World Wars I and II the United States demonstrated that it was the mightiest military power of all time. How could a nation with an overwhelming passion for peace attain such an exalted military status? It was no accident, my friends. American churches, Sunday schools, public and private schools, fraternities, luncheon clubs, labor unions, productive capacity, and our devotion to the free-enterprise system made this a great military power. For these things young American patriots from every cross roads and hamlet fought, bled, and died. True, Annapolis and West Point and the ROTC and the National Guard made their vital contribution, but without the first-named fundamentals we could not have won these last two brutal wars. The armed forces, the usual yardstick, is only the token of our military strength.

Nevertheless, today the United States, forgetting this truth, is making the grievous mistake of spending three times as much money on its armed forces as all of its agencies—private and public—spend on all education from the kindergarten through its highest colleges and universities. There is something wrong with the head and the heart of a nation in these modern times that does that. The dangers of military fascism are very great in the United States today. The blatant insistence that our huge and swollen military appropriations be doubled at once is made without apology by our bloated militarists. One more victorious war and militarism will be in full bloom in the United States.

Radar, the proximity fuze, the guided missiles, and the other phenomena of electronics, the technique of mass production, aerodynamics and supersonic speeds, bacteriological warfare and chemical warfare, and even the atomic bomb itself are the product of the schoolroom. How foolish it would be to try to fight a modern war without regiments of chemical and civil engineers and chaplains. In the last war, we refused enlistment to all men who had not passed through the fourth grade, and until an extreme shortage developed in aviators, we required that all pilots have 2 years of college work. In the next war, we will not be able to use very many men outside of the labor battalions who do not have the equivalent of a high-school education.

Today, and for the foreseeable future, we have but one potential military opponent. Russia is the only other country on this

earth with the capacity to engage successfully in total and modern warfare. Behind her iron curtain, she has twice our manpower. If we are to cope with her on an equal basis, our manpower must be equipped and trained until it is twice as effective as her manpower. We must have better guns, ships, electronics, planes, and pilots than Russia. We must have more devastating and deadly munitions and more machines of mass destruction. Some atomic scientists state that the radioactivity generated by the detonation of a thousand atomic bombs on this continent in a given time would destroy all life—plant and animal. Likewise, according to these scientists, a thousand atomic bombs dropped on Russia would destroy all life there. The only insurance against world war III getting under way is to have under our control those thousand bombs, more or less, plus the necessary bases and the planes to deliver them to the target. However, we would pray most earnestly never to be compelled to drop atomic bombs on anyone. Prevention of war is as simple and as horrible as that.

Many of our hysterical panic-stricken citizens and many of our professional militarists, doubtless with the best of intentions, have been whooping it up for universal military training. I wish we might rely on so simple an expedient as the conscription of our 18-year-old boys for our security, but the facts of modern war eloquently deny the adequacy of such a simple expedient. I am opposed to universal military training primarily because it would add nothing whatever either to our military strength or to our security. If we should be compelled to wage war against Russia, we would not dare have an American within hundreds of miles of that doomed land. Universal military training does not give immunity to radioactivity. They say we must have conscription to acquire occupation troops, but occupation troops have no business in a land sizzling with deadly radioactivity or sprayed with plague-producing bacteria.

When last year we announced the Truman doctrine of military intervention in Greece and Turkey, in so many words we challenged Russia in her own backyard to go to war. Outwardly she ignored our direct challenge, thus demonstrating that she was not ready for war with us.

Personally, I do not believe she will be ready for a hot war for 10 to 20 years, if then. Meantime, her cold war is being accelerated with a considerable element of success. Yesterday Czechoslovakia fell; tomorrow it will be Finland. Two years ago we should have known that these heart-breaking developments were inevitable.

However, Russia is caught between the two horns of the dilemma of education. She is 20 years or more behind the United States in educational facilities and attainment. When she catches up with us in these things her people will be too well informed to stand for her tyrannical and totalitarian system of war government. It is encouraging in this modern world that an ignorant nation cannot fight a modern war of aggression successfully, and that an educated people can find ways to avoid such a war. Thus the school plays the paradoxical role of preparing a people for war and at the same time filling people's hearts with the realization of the wickedness and futility of war. So our schools, the best bulwark of our defense, must press forward with increased vigor. I say again, it is short-sighted for any nation in peacetime to spend three times as much on the uniform as it spends on education.

War is caused primarily by hate and fear. These two complexes quite naturally develop the necessary military preparations to wage war. There you have the complete vicious cycle of destruction. Christ taught love instead of hate, and confidence instead of fear, and He said, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

"To insure peace, prepare for war," must give way to "To ensure peace remove the causes of war," or to make war so revolting that no people will countenance it. Generally speaking, a way should be sought to substitute love for hate and confidence for fear. That is oversimplification perhaps, but it does put the finger on an idealistic goal which must be attained if civilization is to endure.

The very last words penned by Franklin D. Roosevelt were, "Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the abilities of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, and work together, in the same world, at peace."

Walter Lippmann points out that "our greatest danger is that we accept a false estimate of the European situation * * * and are frightened and violent when we should be confident, constructive, and magnanimous," and he goes on to suggest that our efforts in Europe should be directed toward "relaxing the tension, subduing the anxiety, and ending the panic."

Brooks Atkinson, the able representative of the New York Times, who resided many years in Moscow, sums up the present situation in these understanding words:

"We are afraid of Soviet Russia, which is afraid of us * * * two powerful nations shaking in their boots at each other and competing with each other in a tempest of rancor. * * * Russia is a large country populated by an admirable people with infinite potentialities, but led by a handful of fanatical doctrinaires who are scared. * * * Russia cannot fight an aggressive war now, nor can she risk provoking war, for she has hardly begun to recover from the appalling losses of the last war."

David Lawrence, an astute and popular American writer, observes:

"We must be ready to debunk our own course whenever it is palpably wrong. We deplore Russia's intervention in the Balkans, but we do not consider our own intervention in Greece as violative. We blame Russia for helping the Communists in China, but we help the side which the Russians call Fascist."

A well-known, well-informed American pacifist, Frederick J. Libby, recently suggested that our military forces are using Russia as a bugaboo to wheedle the American taxpayer out of \$11,000,000,000 annually. And that the Russian politburo plays up the United States as a "warmongering, imperialistic enemy of the plain people of the world" to persuade her war-weary millions to accept meekly their present misery after winning a great victory.

Pearl Buck, who has spent most of her life in Asia and knows the oriental mind, comments:

"Every time an American talks about fighting Russia he hands a gun to the politburo. They run shouting with it to their people, 'See? I told you the Americans want to fight us!' " "I do not believe in appeasement," says Pearl, "but certainly I do not believe in helping the Communist leaders of Russia by saying what they want us to say."

In this age of anxiety, the rivalry for power between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has engendered a poisonous climate in which helpless humanity is drifting toward world war III. Whatever may be its causes, no one can deny that the present world climate is a war climate. But it is a man-made war climate. Man made it, and man can change it. The President of the United States has both the responsibility and the duty of leading a vigorous crusade for such a change. The world must not be destroyed.

Sixty-nine-year-old Stalin has been in poor health for 2 or 3 years. Robust and hard-boiled in his youth he has not grown old gracefully. Now he is old and lonely, with a weak heart, and periodically an invalid,

and he spends most of his time in the health resorts of southern Russia.

The politburo, which has taken over more and more as his activity has subsided, still has confidence in the integrity and loyalty of Molotov to fulfill its precise orders with painstaking and faithful care, but it knows all too well that he is petty, dull, and uninspired, with an ambition greater than his ability. When Stalin goes to his everlasting reward, which may be soon, Molotov is not likely to succeed.

General Zhdanov and his crowd of Russian fanatical imperialists are in the saddle. They are dedicated to expansion through piece-meal aggression and the waging of a cold war. General Zhdanov, the favorite of the politicians, is well regarded also by Russian military leaders.

Marshal Beria, in charge of atomic research, is another very popular strong man of Russia who may succeed Stalin. Although General Zhdanov and Marshal Beria are political rivals, yet they work closely together.

Still another political leader of Russia who should be kept in mind is Andreyevich Andreyev, the Deputy Prime Minister. He is a cool-headed planner, shrewd, and solid.

Many observers believe that when Stalin passes on, the struggle for power in Russia will break wide open. I disagree. It will be a fierce struggle all right, but it will take place behind the closed doors of the politburo. Outwardly, all will be calm and decisive. Inwardly, smoldering fires may rage to be followed in time by purges, but the fatal movement toward world domination will go forward unimpeded. The cold war will progress on schedule without interruption.

No, Stalin's death will not herald communistic disintegration. It may even give impetus to the phenomenal growth of the Colossus of the North. Nothing indicates the slightest hint of a new spirit of conciliation toward the capitalistic democracies. Everything points to accelerated pressure on every neighboring country in Europe and Asia. Communism is on the march.

However, important and fundamental changes in the governmental structure of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are impending. Her tremendous postwar territorial expansion makes that positive. The problems of governing her vast empire are straining the old order and the old technique to the breaking point. Her utter lack of experience in governing diverse peoples having strange economics is revealing. Her contradictory policies in Germany are evidence of what I mean. The Communists want a strong, dominating alliance with Germany. This is the heart and soul of their present foreign policy. The Communists are positive that with a close alliance of Russia and Germany, nothing can stop them. Fortunately, they don't know how to proceed. The incredible clashes of brutality and flattery in her relations with the German people and the intermittent spasms of rehabilitation clashing with pillaging are the top international puzzles today and can only be explained by classing them as additional evidence of the well-known Russian inferiority complex.

Nevertheless, the chances that Russia eventually will make a success of her tremendous undertaking of consolidating eastern Europe are favorable. What she lacks in finesse she makes up in stubborn determination and ruthlessness. She can produce more food in her new empire than she can consume. Her manufacturing possibilities have no limits and her natural resources are adequate for all her present needs. Her economy is not only self-contained, but shortly she will have vast supplies of surplus food and other natural resources to offer western Europe. Russia can live and prosper without western Europe, but western Europe cannot live without her unless Africa is immediately and thoroughly developed. The overwhelming significance of that solemn truth

needs to be hammered home to every Russian hater.

Germany, thanks to Hitler, is the saddest land in all the world. The mighty have fallen far and hard. Before the war the economy of Europe was based on German industries and German science. With her collapse, Europe is floundering. Most unfortunately, they can neither live with her nor without her. Our war policy of unconditional surrender and no separate peace, followed by the wicked, stupid, and indefensible Potsdam Agreement, has turned Germany, and perhaps all of Europe, over to Russia, lock, stock, and barrel. Arbitrarily dividing Germany into four zones was an evil day for the world. In the area of Tiflis, with the help of German technicians, is going up the reconverted Essen Krupp factory. Undernourished, frightfully abused, and discouraged, German slave labor is doing the heartbreaking job of dismantling, transporting to Russia, and there rebuilding war plants and other industrial plants. That is what goes on. Peacetime German factories are destroyed under the pretext that they might be used at some future date for wartime production. Fertilizer is Germany's and Europe's most crucial need. Nitrogen is the chief element in fertilizers. Nevertheless, the huge synthetic nitrogen plant at Oppau, Germany, is marked for dismantling. German wood and coal, the main natural resources left to her, are being recklessly exploited and exported both by Russia and Britain.

One-third of her agricultural land has been lost, and yet her total population in this reduced area is well over 65,000,000. The population of Greater Germany before the war was only 69,000,000 people. Forcibly expatriated Germans is the explanation. The diminished land area cannot support them. Big land holdings in the Russian zone have been split up into peasant properties much too small to permit a farmer's family to gain a livelihood. Starvation and certain failure will force these peasants eventually to accept the collective system.

The opposition to Hitler in Germany came largely from the landed classes, but the landed classes receive no consideration from either the Russians or the British and very little from the United States. Many former landowners have been deported to Siberia or pressed into slave labor. France, strangely enough, has committed less violence against them than the other powers.

Unemployment, starvation, and degradation have reached an unbelievable low. Lack of food, poor housing, and little or no heating have resulted in widespread epidemics. Tuberculosis is raging, syphilis has risen 250 percent over 1945, skin diseases have increased 10 times, and the general death rate is 30 percent above 1933. Medical supplies are very low and for political reasons many desperately needed doctors are not permitted to practice. Eighty percent of German cattle have tuberculosis. The decline in religious influence, plus the pervading hopelessness, is driving all classes and all age groups to immorality and crime. The ghastly decadence of Germany manifests itself in the sad, bewildered little children, with their big eyes set in their thin, starved faces. At a terrible cost to our Treasury, the Allies have made a flop of Germany, and Russia is cashing in on our tragic incompetence.

Prisoners of war, returning to Germany from Russian slave camps, are completely broken and unable to work; that is, unless they adopt communism, whereupon they enter the Russian Intelligence Service and are delegated to convert their fellow citizens in Germany to communism, or they may be assigned minor administrative duties in the Russian Government, or they may join the Russian-sponsored German Army.

Now, may we take a look at London? We like to believe that the United Kingdom's

precarious condition—just one step removed from total economic collapse—is a war casualty. It is nothing of the sort. True, it has been aggravated by the war and by the world-wide postwar currency debacle, but for 37 years straight, the balances between retained imports and exports of the United Kingdom have shown a huge deficit. In 1911 this deficit amounted to over \$1,000,000,000, and each year thereafter it has steadily increased until now it has reached the dizzy height of \$2,382,700,000.

For almost four decades the United Kingdom's adverse trade balance has been growing larger and larger. In one gulp the last war swallowed her last capital reserves and destroyed her numerous invisible exports, such as insurance and banking services as well as her income from foreign investments, and thus precipitated her present economic crisis. Britain is swapping a railway system she owns in Argentina, which cost her \$1,000,000,000, for \$600,000,000 worth of food. It is an act of desperation, but a nation must eat. During the war she lived on Canadian mutual aid and our lend-lease. Since the war she has survived on Canadian and American hand-outs.

The British people are bewildered. One day their politicians feed them statistics so bad that no one has the slightest hope. Then, for political purposes, without any basic change in her fundamental economic picture, the people are assured recovery is just around the corner. The truth is, recovery is not even around the next century. On the present basis, there will be no recovery.

Canadian and American aid have been nothing more than an opiate. The ghastly fact is, Britain has been and will be on charity for the foreseeable future. So long as our statesmen and her political leaders bury their heads in the sand and refuse to face cold facts, the United Kingdom is doomed to a permanent status of dependency on foreign charity. Her vast empire is being liquidated, her proud Navy is disappearing, and her once powerful air and land force is being reduced to a modest police status. Austerity for Britain is not for a day. It is for a century, yea, 10 centuries. There will always be an England we hope. I fear that it will not only be a tight little island, but a cold, hungry, more or less depopulated, little island as well. It is to be hoped that the United States will always have a soft heart, but it is too much to expect that she will always have a soft head. If I were President I would warn the United Kingdom to get her house in order without further delay, and come forth with a sound, constructive program that will click.

England's one escape is to build a new colonial empire in the undeveloped continent of Africa and closely integrate it into her economic system. Such an overseas expansion must, of course, be coupled with a drastic reduction in her home population. I am not talking about the exploitation of the native people of an African colony. I am suggesting a wholesale migration of her population to Africa. Africa has a tremendous undeveloped potential of production of food and other vital natural resources.

In fact, if Germany cannot be restored and trade resumed with eastern Europe, Africa offers the only way out for all of western Europe. Britain, France, Spain, and Belgium are already established there. Italian colonies, not including Abyssinia, of course, should be restored to her. The Dark Continent has plenty of room for the overflow population of western Europe. Multiplied millions of acres of idle, fertile soil, with semi-tropical and temperate climates, make Africa's agricultural potential supreme among the continents. Huge deposits of iron and coal are another happy combination. The possibility of hydroelectric power developments has no equal anywhere. Uranium, bauxite, manganese, chrome, diamonds, and precious

metals are only some of the rich natural resources which abound in Africa.

When the United Kingdom and all of western Europe stop being sorry for themselves, snap out of their doldrums and take advantage of the most stupendous opportunities ever open to mankind, then and only then will world recovery be in sight.

The situation in Italy is downright disturbing. The Communists have a well-organized army of 100,000 men in Italy, armed and equipped with American and British automatic weapons and ammunition. Its military commander is Pietro Cecchia, and his chief of staff is Luigi Longo. The political leader of the Communist Party in Italy, which is very strong, is Palmiro Togliatti. He is perhaps the smartest, the ablest, and the most resourceful and most ruthless political leader in western Europe. Do not be surprised if violence gets under way in northern Italy prior to or just following the general elections which have been proclaimed to be held in April.

Each guerrilla roaming the hills of Greece last year cost the taxpayers of the United States \$10,000. The cost per guerrilla goes up this year and very few guerrillas have been liquidated. In fact the reactionary Greek Government by its cruel economic policies has been creating guerrillas faster than our Treasury can destroy them. Heroic Greece is suffering from a combination of bad crops and bad government. The men who resisted the Nazi and Fascist invaders during the war are being hunted down in the hills like wild animals with our finances by the very royal family that fled Greece well ahead of the Nazi invaders. Our military mission there is the most contradictory venture of modern times. Why we should direct our money and our military efforts toward keeping a corrupt, imposed foreign monarch on the throne of Greece is the \$64 question.

Yesterday the Senate started debate on the so-called Marshall plan. This plan is a grandiose scheme for the commendable and worthy objective of rehabilitating and restoring the 16 nations of western Europe to productivity and normal life. Five of the 16, Ireland, Portugal, Turkey, Switzerland, and Sweden, were not in the war. Denmark was not destroyed. Iceland was occupied by the United States and fully compensated for that contribution. Sweden and Switzerland are not asking for anything from the Marshall plan.

The three billion three hundred and seventy-five million so-called loan we gave Britain last year, which was to last her 5 years and put her back on her feet, will be expended by July 1. On that date she hopes to have a billion and a half drawing account against the Marshall plan available for her vital importations for the year. She receives one-third of our total Marshall plan contribution. Two years ago, when the original British loan was being considered, I pointed out to the Senate and the administration that this loan would cure nothing and that it would need to be followed year after year with additional gifts. The British allocation under the Marshall plan proves I was correct. And I am correct when I say that unless radical changes are made in the United Kingdom economics, the day will not come when they can live without a dole.

A few months ago, the London Evening Standard said: "This great country is in danger of being beaten down and impoverished by loans. * * * Living on ticks is bound to sap not only the will of the people to work but the initiative and grasp of their rulers."

The same bitter words will be repeated by a thousand tongues from all of western Europe 4 years from now unless the Marshall plan is made permanent. To anticipate anything else is silly and unrealistic.

Of course, the food famine in Europe should be relieved to the fullest extent of our ability, and for free. Also, it would be

to our advantage and in the interests of the peace and prosperity of the world to get the wheels of industry in Europe turning again. But I beg the people of the United States to not try to move a mountain with a wheelbarrow. Ten times the seventeen billions set up in the present Marshall plan will not be enough money to rebuild the economy of the 270,000,000 people of western Europe. Their money is debased until trade at home and abroad is at a standstill. Workers there are not paid enough of this current worthless printing-press money to buy food for their families. Local farmers refuse to sell food for this worthless money and impossible exchange rates and exchange systems halt foreign trade.

The best help we can give them is to stabilize their currency through the International Monetary Fund, which now has a capital of \$8,800,000,000. We should direct this agency to issue them a new international currency good anywhere, including the United States. For until their currencies are stabilized, and exchange between them simplified, trade cannot be revived nor a sound economy restored regardless of 10,000 Marshall plans. First things must be done first.

Next, I should like to see thought given and action taken on Senator CAPEHART's constructive suggestion to apply a simple expedient to Europe's industrial problem which already has proved effective in financing business and industry in the United States. In the early thirties, during our own severe depression, we created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to get our stalled industry off dead center and started again. The RFC worked like magic here and it would work like magic in Europe. Senator CAPEHART suggests we create an international division in our RFC and that any of the 16 European nations seeking help likewise create a Reconstruction Finance Corporation of their own. Our RFC would be authorized to purchase 50 percent of the stock in the foreign RFC and extend additional credits. Equipped with these dollar credits, each European RFC would be prepared to aid in financing their domestic industry on a plant-by-plant basis. Senator CAPEHART points out we can do more with less money under this plan because interest and principal payments are used as a revolving fund to make additional loans. It is a plan not set up for a day, but for a century. The RFC worked so perfectly in our own great economic crisis and contributed so much toward whipping the late depression and preparing America for war, that it could not help but succeed abroad. The American Committee for the Marshall Plan says, " * * * self-respecting peoples, who believe in a free, democratic process, will not accept foreign dictation." One of my objections to the Marshall plan is that it is political and contemplates foreign political dictation. There would be no foreign dictation in Senator CAPEHART's proposal. It would be handled in a businesslike way by local businessmen, and it could not fail unless they proved unworthy. The RFC was good medicine for America when we hit our all-time low in 1932, and it would be equally effective across the Atlantic. It is a flexible arrangement which could be adapted to almost any nation's economy.

There has been a lot of silly hoopla about the Marshall plan. It has been pictured as all things to all men. It contains a lot of sucker bait. American farmers favor it because it will push up the price of wheat, cotton, and tobacco; American humanitarians are for it because it will feed the hungry and clothe the naked; and American anti-Communists are for it because they think it will frustrate Russia—it is more apt to frustrate us; American militarists favor it because it is understood to be part of the Truman doctrine (which is a war doctrine) and they couple with it a tremendous in-

crease in our military machine; American pacifists are for it because they think it is a peace policy and in spite of the fact its proponents haven't faith enough in its peace possibilities to call for reduced military expenditures. Others favor it because it scratches their backs where they itch the most. The combination of all of this divergent support insures its passage. Outside of its humanitarian aspects and its possible tendency to draw the 16 nations of western Europe more closely together, I see very little merit in it. Most emphatically it is too puny to restore and rehabilitate the economy of western Europe and it is violently inflationary.

I have passed over scores of political controversies, not because they are not important, but until we win a victory over high prices and the threat of world war III, we should not permit any political thing to distract us. All else is secondary. The world must not be destroyed.

RESTRICTIONS ON EXPORT TRADE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Today, the Handcuffs," published in the Omaha World-Herald of March 1, 1948. The editorial deals with licensing under the Office of International Trade, and its effect upon American businessmen and suppliers.

We have had so many complaints relative to these licenses that within the past week the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has been appointed chairman of a subcommittee to investigate the impact upon small business. That investigation is already under way. If there are any Senators on either side of the aisle who have objections or complaints, we shall be very glad to receive them, because such objections are beginning to come in very rapidly on the policy now being pursued by the administration. This editorial is timely. What is said in the editorial is the situation as it now exists. Something will have to be done to eliminate the impact which this administration has caused upon small business, under the orders of the Office of International Trade.

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

TODAY, THE HANDCUFFS

Today, March 1, the Government in Washington is scheduled to put handcuffs on an important segment of American business—the export trade.

Henceforth, if the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce has its way, no American businessman will be able to sell goods to customers in Europe, and certain other sections of the world, unless he has a Government license.

And as a prerequisite to the issuance of licenses, the OIT will require that foreign purchasers take sealed bids from American suppliers on every desired item. Copies of the specifications and bids must be filed with the OIT.

In other words, the American Government is treating the foreign buyers (usually they are foreign government missions) as if they were complete imbeciles. They are saying to these visitors, in effect: "You can't buy in our American stores unless we, the bureaucrats in Washington, are convinced that you are getting a good deal."

Thus, foreign buyers will not be able to buy trade-marked goods of their own choice. They will have to buy what the OIT says they may buy, or go without. This, obviously,

is a triumph for the bureaucratic mentality which, during the war, fought so tenaciously for grade labeling.

In explanation of its arbitrary action the OIT declares that control of exports has been authorized by Congress, and that it (the OIT) is simply trying to conserve the dwindling dollar supply of European nations.

All of which, no doubt, sounds convincing enough to the bureaucratic ear.

But it fails to take into account the undeniable fact that the European buyer of American goods—the Swiss businessman, for example, or the Swedish buying official—is just as anxious as anybody in Washington possibly could be to pick up bargains. Naturally, he will buy what he wants at the lowest price at which it can be obtained. Why, then, should he be harassed by moronic regulations? Why should he be told that he can't go shopping in the United States unless accompanied by a guardian?

A move is on foot in Congress to amend the export-control resolution in such a way as to outlaw the regulations referred to above. Hearings are scheduled to begin today.

Those who believe in the American competitive system will hope that Congress will act quickly and effectively.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before moving a recess, I wish to announce that it is not the intention to have a session of the Senate on Saturday. I feel that that announcement should be made so that Senators may make their plans accordingly. I can give no assurance as to a session on the Saturday following. The plans will depend upon the situation of the debate at that time.

With that announcement, I now move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, whose blessings are exceedingly abundant, we pray to be made keenly aware of Thy purposes as we invoke Thy presence.

In the conviction of our God-given rights—namely, the right of choice, the right to work, and the rights of men as individuals—set us firmly against any group that would ultimately turn the course of human freedom into a pitiless struggle. We rejoice that whatever sinister teaching may try to engulf the American spirit, it cannot destroy nor swallow up the heart of the true patriot. We bless Thee that in our fair land Thy throne is no further from a poor man's cottage than from a king's palace.

O God of wisdom and Father of us all, be in the deliberations of this day; teach us the wise thing to do, and Thine shall be the glory. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 203) entitled "An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by him before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the subject of H. R. 4727 and H. R. 4773; also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made today before a Senate committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from Plain Talk.

OUR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we talk about our American foreign policy as if we had one.

How can we have such a foreign policy when we insist upon carrying out commitments made by one man at Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and all way stations, the full import of which we do not yet know; when we have turned over an unknown quantity of control over our foreign affairs to the United Nations, subject to the vote of about 53 other nations and the veto of 1; when the rest of this control seems to be distributed between the State Department, the Army, the Navy, the Treasury, and other departments? Henry Wallace resigned because the President pulled his finger out of the pie.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the State Department itself recent investigations have shown there are so many individuals who are against an American foreign policy and in favor of some kind of foreign policy for Americans.

It is no wonder we have no American foreign policy. Under the circumstances it would be a miracle if we had one.

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

OLEOMARGARINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from the great State of Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE], took it upon himself to discuss the oleo situation. I think my friend should check up a little on the oleo situation in Connecticut. I am sorry for the lady up in Connecticut who cannot get an Easter hat because of the quarter-cent a pound tax on oleo. This 4-cent yearly tax will not buy much of a hat. The passage of the proposed oleo bill might result in higher milk prices as well as higher oleo prices. That just shows the extent to which the oleo group has gone in selling their imitation product to the American people. No one in the world wants to keep anyone from eating oleomargarine if he wants to deceive himself and do it. All we are trying to do is to have them sell it to the people for what it is. With all the money that is being poured into this propaganda now, I am not surprised that the gentleman makes the statement he makes. It is ridiculous, because in this speech he made yesterday he said that if more is produced it will not influence dairy cow numbers in the United States.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I cannot yield now. The gentleman's party was in power for 16 straight years. His party had complete control of both Houses of Congress, as well as the White House. Your party has been in power for 16 years, yet you did not bring out legislation to repeal this tax. Why all the interest so suddenly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a cablegram received from General MacArthur yesterday on the China-aid situation.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the script of a radio broadcast entitled "Home Is What You Make It," dramatized in connection with the World Day of Prayer and entitled "Abide With Me."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the script may and does exceed the limit prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing, but I ask that the script may be included in my extension of remarks notwithstanding the excess.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include

an article entitled "What Is the Administration Policy?"—and it is not the Republican administration I am talking about.

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

There was no objection.

AID TO BRITAIN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked an article out of the March 3 Star entitled "Britain Exhausts American Loan in 19½ Months."

You will remember that Congress in 1945 gave Britain \$4,400,000,000. That was to put them on their feet and start them out so that they would be able to get along and aid and assist in every way in their own economy. Notwithstanding that, in 19½ months they have spent all that money, although it was to last them 5 years. They have spent already \$4,400,000,000 which the American Congress voted to give Great Britain. I did not vote for that loan, thank goodness. Now you are asked to give Great Britain under the Marshall plan \$5,348,000,000 more. That makes \$9,748,000,000. Some gift! The trouble with it is, it is so large very few people understand what it means. Watch for my later statements on this Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show the Members of the House just what \$10,000,000,000 really mean. None of the Members knows what \$10,000,000,000 is. I am going to show you by a statement how many farms of this country would be covered by \$10,000,000,000 and how many of our farms would be given away. Why, when you talk about \$10,000,000,000 you are going to give away more than half of our farmland as a gift in order to pull these people out over there. Until Great Britain gets a different kind of a government than they have over there which is a socialistic government, we will just be pouring money down the rat hole by sending further money to them. I never heard of such nerve in my life as they have asking for it and I never have seen such recklessness on our part if you give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, these people who are giving this country away better wake up pretty soon or we will not have any country left, because it will all be gone, and there will be nothing left for the people of America. It is a fact. You know it as well as I do. So be wise, economize, and save our country from bankruptcy.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fis-

cal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the above bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a summary on the Holloway plan by Admiral James L. Holloway, Jr., with a preface by Admiral C. W. Nimitz. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNDULANT FEVER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting tirade here a while ago against the virtues of oleomargarine. Yesterday in reading the newspaper I was attracted to an article on the problem of undulant fever. Now, you do not get undulant fever from oleomargarine. You can only get it from cow's milk.

This article states:

The malady is an even greater problem to the veterinarian and farmer. In Michigan, for example, Huddleson estimates that 10 percent of the 1,080,000 cows are suffering from its animal equivalent—Bang's disease. Since the milk production of each infected cow is decreased by 2,000 pounds, the annual loss in milk to the State amounts to 222,904,000 pounds, enough to supply 557,000 persons. In terms of butter, this could be translated into 11,140,200 pounds per year, which at today's prices is a young fortune.

I am glad to see that we have so many converts from the Republican side of the aisle. I stated the other day that the oleo tax is going to be repealed, and you can bet your bottom dollar that it is going to be repealed. The Committee on Agri-

culture will report it out this coming week; we will see to that. We are glad to have all of you converts. We are not overcrowded, and I am taking applications from any of you gentlemen who want to join us. We will be glad to have you.

DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES FROM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that 10,000 employees are to be dismissed from the Veterans' Administration. I have also learned that veterans offices are being closed all over the country. In New York City over 1,000 employees will be dismissed. One office adjoining my own district has just been closed down.

This means a serious loss in service to the veterans. It means also a serious impairment in much-needed facilities for the veterans.

At the time we had up the appropriation bill for the Veterans' Administration last year I voted against the cuts, and what we predicted at that time would happen has happened. I do hope that the Committee on Appropriations will take notice of this very serious, in fact, this most disastrous situation which is occurring; the closing down of offices, the dismissal of employees, 10,000 of them, in the Veterans' Administration, and the consequent damage to the interests of American veterans. What is needed here is an appropriation bill to make up the money required to keep these offices going and to keep these people employed in order to give the American veterans the services for which the Congress has provided by legislation so many times.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a statement by Harold L. Ickes and in the other a letter from a constituent.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a report.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a letter.

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

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

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called attention to the erroneous remarks that have been made heretofore on the floor by various Members with reference to the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to do that again at this time. Ample funds were provided by the Committee on Appropriations for the continuance of veterans' activities for this year. The cut in the Veterans' Administration has come entirely as the result of a letter which was sent out by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to all his branch and district offices on January 16, reducing the force down to the level of the budget estimate of President Truman for the fiscal year 1949, next year. Now, I simply desire to call attention to that so that the membership may know what the facts are and not be deceived any further with reference to that subject.

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think that what is important now is not as to who is to blame, whether it is the President's budget or whether it is the Committee on Appropriations not having met the budget request with reference to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TABER. The cut is not because they have not the money. It is because of cutting down the force to the level of the President's estimate for next year.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, irrespective of that, the need is there, and I think we should meet the need.

Mr. TABER. You do not have to appropriate money to meet the need when the money has already been appropriated. You just have to have administrative operation, building up the force to the point where the need is met.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We want those offices opened and these 10,000 employees retained.

Mr. TABER. Go after the Veterans' Administration.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York failed to state that in connection with the appropriation for this year there was a very sharp cut made by the Committee on Appropriations, and that we fought that cut on the floor of the House.

I am talking about the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948. The hearings held by the gentlewoman from Massa-

chusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] last December will confirm the fact. As a result of the reduction made in the appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the President for the fiscal year 1948, 10,000 employees were let go shortly after the 1st of July last year.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. They cut \$30,000,000 off the administrative fund for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. We fought it here on the floor and tried to have it restored. The vote will show that practically all if not all the Democratic Members voted to restore the cut that was made at that time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the leader on the Democratic side, fought against a cut of \$25,000,000 in the veterans' bill last year. He has fought against every cut in the cost of Government when we were trying to bring about some semblance of economy in the interest of all the people, and the veterans, because the veterans are a large part of the American people and we need a soundly financed Government for them as well in this country. Governor Green's veteran service officers in every county, in cooperation with the Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and other service organizations are the ones who are really helping to service the veterans in Illinois.

I yield to no one in my interest in the veterans, but the facts are that I received a letter from the Veterans' Administration in Chicago this past week, as well as one the week before, announcing that they had done away with some 16 veterans' contact offices in the State of Illinois, and that they still had plenty of field contact offices in connection with veterans' service organizations to service the veterans properly. The facts are that in the decentralization program under the able leadership of General Bradley and General Hawley they decentralized too far. I complained to them more than once that there were veterans' contact offices all over the Nation many of which were not needed, were not earning their salt and were giving the veterans no service; in fact, were doing them a disservice by the expenditure of money that ought to be kept in the United States Treasury in order to make this country financially sound for the veterans and their posterity.

There is nothing wrong with last year's cut and no one is to blame. On the other hand, the Republicans and the Democrats who were for this cut should be complimented by the Members of the House and by the veterans' leaders of the Nation.

CANDIDATE WANTED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is that has gotten the Democratic Party in this country into such disrepute unless it is the fact that they fight every budget cut and ridicule us when we try to save a dollar, but they are in a tough spot. Let me read what appeared this morning in a local paper of 40,000 circulation in one of the Democratic strongholds of Pennsylvania, in my county, where last year the Democrats routed every Republican except one in the election:

Wanted: A candidate for Congress. Ambitious applicant with fortitude to lead a dubious cause please contact Chairman George M. Leader of the York County Democratic Committee. Will entertain any reasonable offer.

Desperate Democrats today are looking for someone—they're not particular at this late date—to run against Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS this fall, assuming of course that the latter is the Republican nominee.

That is one of their strongholds in Pennsylvania. That is typical of the whole country, and they are not getting after the Democratic Party because they did not remove the oleo tax, but it is because of their spending and thriftlessness and recklessness with constitutional government and public funds.

They have broken faith with the country and the world. Hence the revolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

SERGEI RUBENSTEIN

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a veterans' post in my congressional district, which requests that a full investigation be made of the forces and the individuals which assisted in obtaining the numerous deferments from military service of the notorious Sergei Rubenstein.

It is my belief that all of the shameful details of this story should be exposed. We owe it to the American people, and particularly to the veterans, to identify those who assisted in this wholly un-American activity.

I request that the letter referred to be set forth in the RECORD following my remarks:

SACRED HEART POST, NO. 239,
CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, INC.,
Glendale, N. Y., February 23, 1948.
Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LATHAM: In perusing the facts relating to the Sergei Rubenstein case, our interest has been aroused concerning the forces which assisted in obtaining his numerous deferments from military service.

Our post has gone on record to ask our Congressman, HENRY J. LATHAM, to attempt, if at all possible, to cause an investigation into the behind-the-scenes activity of this group of men in influential positions, who used such positions for such unwholesome and un-American purposes.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely,

VINCENT J. FERRARI,
Commander.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, at long last, the people have become conscious of the necessity of soil and water conservation. They have come to realize the extent to which we have already depleted our natural soil resources. They have become conscious of the possibility of utilizing the water of this Nation at its source—first, in utilizing it for irrigation and domestic purposes, and second, in preventing it from destroying crops, livestock, and human life in its mad rush to the ocean.

There is a serious question as how best to conserve our soil and utilize our water. I wish to include in my remarks an article by B. Ashton Keith, A.B., B.Sc., director, the Institutes of Sciences, Kansas City, and Washington. Here is the article by Mr. Keith:

Soil and water constitute the main natural resources of this Nation, but the soils rapidly are being washed away; and development of our water resources constantly is being hampered by persistent use of antiquated, inefficient, and increasingly dangerous methods of flood control.

In colonial days many settlers were drawn to the Eastern States by the rich soils which then were thought to be inexhaustible. But the 1940 census showed that in the Appalachian States alone, more than 40,000 of the farms which, as late as the year 1900, were not only supporting farm families but also were producing foods and fibers for the Nation, now are idle and have been abandoned. So much of the topsoil has been carried away that even the best of farmers cannot make a living on that land. And each year the nonproducing areas are increasing in size.

In our much-vaunted Midwest, Milton Eisenhower, president of Kansas State Agricultural College, has stated that topsoil is being carried away at an alarming rate. One valley in one State lost 115,000,000 tons in a single recent flood. Calculations made by the writer in 1940 showed that the value of

soils that have been carried down the Missouri River since 1850 must far exceed the total value of the gold that was mined in all the Rocky Mountains since that date. And another authority recently stated that the Mississippi River alone carries into the Gulf more than \$495,000,000 worth of soil each year. Topsoil carried into the sea is lost forever.

Under the present system of stream management, the rivers alone slowly but surely are bleeding our Nation to death. But only a comparative few have, as yet, become aware of the true conditions, and the cause.

Intensive investigation of the official reports and other authoritative publications of our own and 11 other nations through a period of 3 years have uncovered numerous data which indicate conclusively that the primary cause of the growing evils of several kinds must spring from use of an erroneous system of stream management and water use. Officially and repeatedly this has been recognized in each of the other nations that long have employed these same methods.

These methods were developed long ago in Italy, and were spread into the Germanic countries, Spain, and for a time also France. Our democracy continues to permit the use of flood-control methods which gradually brought increased flood violence, increased expenses, increased soil erosion, and other increasing evils to each and every nation using them.

But a sound remedy has been found in the records of two other nations that for many decades have employed methods that were devised by men of science. These methods have the basic purpose of serving all the industries and all the people rather than mainly just a few. The scientific methods officially have been shown to be more economical and vastly more efficient in controlling floods and improving the living conditions generally. Yet this is being accomplished on a basis of complete refunding in 50 years with liberal interest steadily being paid on the entire amount expended. This paper is a brief summation of the information, gained from the reliable sources above-mentioned, on which a second report has been requested for use in the United States Congress. Nearly all these sources may be studied in the Library of Congress. Our earlier report¹ cited 123 authorities.

"SONG OF THE PLOW

"It was I who built Chaldea and the cities
of the plain;
I was Greece and Rome and Carthage and
the opulence of Spain.
When the courtiers walked in scarlet and
the queens wore chains of gold,
And forgot 'twas I that made them, grow-
ing godless folk and bold,
I went over them in judgment and again
my cornfields stood.
Where empty courts bowed homage in ob-
sequious multitude.
For the nation that forgets me, in that hour
her doom is sealed,
By a judgment as from Heaven that can
never be repealed."

—Harry Kemp.

RAPID LOSS OF TOPSOILS IN THE EASTERN STATES
DUE TO CONTINUED USE OF ERRONEOUS METH-
ODS OF STREAM MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD
CONTROL

It was George Washington who wrote
"With reference either to the individual or

¹ Floodwaters: Our Second Greatest Natural Resource. A report on our investigations on the official reports and other authoritative publications of this and 11 other nations. Prepared in compliance with the written requests of the chairmen of three committees, and included as an appendix (pp. 13-43, H. R. 4795, December 1944).

to the national welfare, agriculture is of primary importance."

But, since the Father of Our Country penned those words, many thousands of the early farms have become utterly unprofitable, because of the loss of much of their soils. In Pennsylvania alone more than 9,000 farms which in the year 1900, were supporting farm families and also were helping to supply the Nation with foods and fibers, now stand idle and deserted. In the Old Dominion also several thousand farms have been abandoned. And in another State, production has fallen off so seriously on 50,000 other farms that even the best workers can no longer make a living without outside income.

It is time for everyone to face some hard, cold facts. Soil erosion is one of our Nation's most dangerous enemies. The really threatening enemies are not political but natural. Due to persistent use of the antiquated and undemocratic, Italo-German methods of flood control, which never in any country yet have proven to be effective on an economic basis, we have increasing soil erosion and increasing expenses, just as all the European nations that use these methods. These and other evils as well, were experienced in Italy, Germany, Austria, and Spain, and also by France until that nation carefully investigated, denounced, and discarded these dredging, diking, and sandbag methods in 1855 to adopt methods that had been devised by scientists. Comparison of the results secured since 1900, and especially since 1920, show vast superiority over the military methods.¹ This is especially true of results attained in certain parts of India, for the past 50 years, as elsewhere has been explained, by aid of data derived from numerous official reports from several nations.

OTHER RECENT STARTLING FACTS ON SOIL EROSION AND REMOVAL OF SOIL FERTILITY BY CROPS

The soils of Nebraska recently were reported as being exploited so badly that the formation of another Dust Bowl in that State may be expected during the next dry cycle.

A single river basin in central Iowa lost 115,000,000 tons of topsoil during one flood last spring. Yet despite the general need to plant few row crops, the agricultural college at Ames, Iowa, has reported that there was an increase of 28 percent in the acreage of row crops in the past 5 years.

Another State reports that in addition to losing 3,000,000 tons of topsoil by erosion, there also is a loss of 2,500,000 tons of phosphates from its soils by sale and removal of crops. But only 2,500,000 tons of these losses are being replaced by application of fertilizers, a considerable portion of which also is lost as far as new crop production is concerned.

These conditions largely must remain, or even grow worse, as long as we continue to use the Italo-German or military methods of stream management, for it is becoming well known that their principal aims² and purposes do not fit in a democratic nation. Instead of serving all the industries and all the people, the primary purpose here, even as in the old countries, is to aid navigation and power. The recorded long-time effects in all the Fascist countries, as well as in

¹ Floodwaters: Our Second Greatest Natural Resource. A report on our investigations on the official reports and other authoritative publications of this and 11 other nations. Prepared in compliance with the written requests of the chairmen of three committees, and included as an appendix (pp. 13-43, H. R. 4795, December 1944).

² Comparison of the Records of Two Very Different Kinds of Stream Management, Flood Control, and Water Use. (Bulletin 291, Institute of Sciences, Washington, D. C. (December 1947).)

America, decade by decade, is increased flood violence, increased soil erosion, increased filling of stream channels with mud, increased expenses, and increased flood damages. Officially, these truths have been stated by J. Dumas, of France, 1856; by Government reports of Spain, Italy, Austria, and Germany; by G. Wex, imperial counsellor on streams; and by the United States Congress after a special investigation in 1936, as well as by numerous other authorities. Such are the results of fighting the floods by speed-up of the run-off, dredging, diking, and sand-bagging the streams. There is almost complete indifference to widespread water retention by means which would benefit every citizen. The latter is needed, with modern methods of water use which promote the general welfare.

DECREASE OF SOIL FERTILITY ALSO BY THE LEACHING ACTION OF GROUND WATERS

Measurements made recently by the department of geology of Alma White College at Zarephath, N. J., demonstrated that soil minerals, in surprising amounts, constantly are being dissolved by ground water, and are being carried away to the sea by the average clear-water flow of Millstone River. It was determined that the annual sum total of the materials transported in solution equals a trainload of 51 cars of 35 tons each. Although local people thought at first that this amount was too high, higher authority soon confirmed these figures, and even stated that they probably are too conservative; for larger amounts in proportion were determined in making similar measurements on another stream somewhat farther north.

Thus it may be seen why so few people understand how fast the farms must become nonproductive, unless something is done soon to meet the grave need to replenish the soils after nearly every crop is removed.

Nearly every citizen long has been aware that by far the larger part of the price that consumers pay the grocers for foods that originate on farms, does not go to the farmer—the man who has to stand nine-tenths of the risks as well as expense in growing crops and raising cattle and poultry—but to the middlemen.

Under the set-up that has existed in our democratic America for many years, the share of the farmers, taken on the average for 50 years, as shown by the records, has been so small, as compared with the share of middlemen, that little or nothing has been left each year with which to replenish the soils by purchase of fertilizers.

Ben Franklin made a statement that soon must be appreciated in a different and tragic way:

"Always taking out, and never putting back, means we soon must begin to scrape the bottom of the (soil fertility) barrel."

We may as well face the fact that if we are not to become hungrier and hungrier every year, as in several of the old countries, we must include enough extra per bushel or per pound on every farm product to pay for the fertilizer required to grow just as good a crop next year.

ANOTHER DANGER TO THE SOURCE OF OUR FOOD SUPPLY: "COMMERCIALIZED FARMING"

The widespread seizures of farms through foreclosures by mortgage companies, banks, and insurance companies during the hard times, started another influence that ultimately must hit another hard blow at food production. It has well been called commercialized farming; not because it heartlessly threw thousands of well-deserving toilers out of their homes, but because of other evils that quickly began to be apparent.

Instead of aiming primarily to maintain fertility or build up the soils, and to hold

them safely in place in times of floods as well as droughts, the main purpose, or as it seems in many instances, the only aim, has been just to show a profit. Robbing the soil thus has been made a business; but it is a business that ultimately must bring hardships on everyone. A practical example of much earlier date was seen in a nearby State where some 20 years ago a money lender managed to get 14 farmers to put mortgages on their land. After money became tight, the mortgages all were foreclosed; and no sooner had the money lender come into possession than he began to save in every possible manner. While his economy prevented repairs of nearly every kind, the worst of his profits came from robbing the soil. Today all those farms except two stand deserted.

Such influences may be weighed quite accurately from the able description of Rev. L. G. Ligutti, who stated, "They live by exploitation and extraction, not by true husbandry. The roots of restraining grass, legumes, and even trees, are loosened and removed in the mechanical production of wheat and corn. The rootless land more easily drifts away in the wind and the water; and the rootless people herd themselves by the millions into the industrial slums."

So, between increasing soil erosion on the one hand, and the growth of commercialized farming on the other, readily it must be admitted that peonage and serfdom in America must increase—unless adequate provisions are made soon to remedy the difficulties of the millions of average farmers.

SOME AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS ON SOIL FERTILITY LOSSES

Investigations made by the Missouri State University, division of agriculture, show that in raising crops and feeding them to livestock, only four-fifths of the materials that are fed to the livestock are left somewhere on the farm as manure. And studies on nitrogen and humus control of Missouri soils already show an average decrease of 35 percent. A number of specialists have shown that nearly one-third of the cultivated area in this country fast is becoming useless for growing crops that pay.

In his paper, Make the Soils Productive, R. A. Hayne recommends the following quantities of plant food to be applied to the acre when freshly plowed:

Hill clay soils: Nitrogenous matter, 1,500 to 2,000 pounds; potash, 38,000 to 46,000 pounds; lime, none to 25,000 pounds; phosphoric acid, 1,000 to 2,000 pounds.

Black rich soils: Nitrogenous matter, 5,000 to 9,000 pounds; potash, 36,000 to 46,000 pounds; phosphoric acid, 3,000 to 4,500 pounds; lime, none to 50,000 pounds.

For good plant food he recommends humus, phosphoric acid, potash, lime, iron.

Of the amounts applied as above he figures that the following amounts may become available per acre:

Hill clay soils: Nitrogen, 30 to 50 pounds; potash, 80 to 120 pounds; phosphoric acid, 10 to 20 pounds.

Black rich soils: Nitrogen, 100 to 175 pounds; potash, 80 to 120 pounds; phosphoric acid, 30 to 45 pounds.

When 5 tons of alfalfa are hauled off, 255 pounds of nitrogenous matter, 55 pounds of phosphoric acid, 200 pounds of potash, and 400 pounds of lime are removed from the farm; but when those 5 tons are fed to livestock, only about 51 pounds of nitrogenous matter, 11 pounds of phosphoric acid, 40 pounds of potassium, and 8 pounds of lime are removed.

A FARMER'S SHARE IN THE LOAVES OF BREAD

We have heard a great deal about the high prices that farmers (recently) have been getting for wheat. A little investigation shows that only a comparatively very few

bushels changed hands at those figures. And nothing was said about those many years (e. g., 1931) when the price (25 cents), did not repay the cost of growing the grain. Also nothing was said about those many years when practically no wheat could be grown. Between droughts and dust storms in many areas, and floods in others, very many of the toilers considered themselves lucky if they were able to starve it out, until another crop could be grown.

Even when one banner crop finally was harvested (1931), the buyers and the millers held the price down to the pitiful sum of 25 cents per bushel—knowing quite well that many thousands of families had been living on a starvation diet; and that taxes and other payments made it necessary to sell. This, after four very bad crop years. The farmers met that test, only to meet worse conditions during the several years that followed. Droughts became so severe that pastures and ranges failed and cattle died, or had to be sold in starved condition.

Finally came years when some crops were raised and the price also went to 50 cents per bushel. Despite the fact that at various times considerably higher prices were quoted, the dealers held the prices down to much lower figures. And this was true not only of grain, but of fibers and other crops at very many places. Several times in different parts of the South, the growers could get only 4 or 5 cents for their cotton, when prices stated in the newspapers ranged from 8 to 14 cents.

When wheat shortage forced the price up to 50 cents, some farmers felt encouraged; but the fact remained that, as a class, the farmers had to keep on robbing themselves and their families, as well as the soils, in order to keep on going.

Instead of buying new farm implements that already were badly needed, the old had to be made to do. Instead of purchasing new clothes, the old were patched up. Instead of paying the payments as they came due on mortgages, extensions had to be asked, and usually at increased costs for the favor. Insurance policies lapsed by the thousands, and erection of new farm buildings as well as nearly all other improvements had to be put off indefinitely. Very largely the purchasing power of many millions of people was limited severely over a period of years. Skinning the farmers was a great game for the select few who would engage in it; but finally the entire Nation was made to feel the aftereffects through the worst depression in our history. It was during those times that the true relationships to each other of three classes of people began to be understood. The following comparison may serve to drive home the basic facts:

THE WHEAT GROWER AND THE LOAVES OF BREAD

On buying a loaf of bread for 10 cents at the store³ a farmer found it weighed only 12 ounces. Also it was learned later that a bushel of wheat will make 80 such loaves. In other words, simply by grinding the wheat and making it into bread, the sale price had been raised from 50 cents per bushel for the wheat up to \$8 for the bread that it would make, with the addition of a small cost for eggs, lard, baking powder, etc. Also the truth began to appear that with the price of wheat at 50 cents per bushel the farmer who raised the grain had been paid only eight-tenths of a cent for the 12 ounces of wheat that were required to make the loaf. In other words, while the farmer got less than 1 cent, the miller and the baker got more than 10 times as much. Also it became clear that only five loaves of bread could be purchased by selling a bushel of the grain that would make 80 loaves.

At that time the average yield of wheat over the United States was 14 bushels per acre. That would make 1,120 loaves of bread. But while the farmer had to sell his, say,

14 bushels at 50 cents for \$7, the miller and the baker and the grocer got a total of \$112, which was six times as much as the farmer got.

Or to put it another way, the man who raises the grain that makes 1,120 loaves can buy back only 70 loaves; yet the middlemen did only the least and the lightest of the labor and took very little of the risk. The rank unfairness and injustice of the entire set-up readily may be understood by almost everyone.

UNFAIRNESS TO FARMERS—ANOTHER COMPARISON

RATIO OF PRICES RECEIVED FOR FARM PRODUCTS TO THE PRICES PAID FOR INDUSTRIAL GOODS

Year	Prices received	Prices paid	Buying power (in cents per dollar)
1921	125	152	82
1922	132	149	89
1923	142	152	93
1924	143	152	94
1925	156	157	99
1926	145	155	94
1927	139	153	91
1928	149	155	96
1929	146	153	95
1930	128	146	87
1931	87	124	70
1932	65	107	61
1933	70	109	64
1934	90	123	73
1935	108	125	86
1936	114	124	92
1937	121	130	93
1938	92	125	75

LAND-TAX DELINQUENCIES

Ligutti and Rowe have stated⁴ that in many places the taxes are so high that every 10 to 15 years the landowners have paid into State and local government agencies, in the form of taxes, the full value of their farms.

Although taxes have been reduced somewhat since 1929, nevertheless, in 1940, taxes stood so high that they were double the land taxes of 1914. Taxes seldom or never drop back like farm incomes and farm values do. They take an ever-increasing percent of the farmer's income.

In this country, in the 10 years, 1926 to 1935, inclusive, nearly one-twelfth of all the farms were sold for taxes. In the Mid-Atlantic States, one-eighth. Most foreclosures of mortgages were on single-crop farms.

TAX SALES

1931: 1 percent of all the farms sold for taxes.

1932: 16 percent of all the farms sold for taxes.

1933: 24 percent of all the farms sold for taxes.

MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

In the decade 1926 to 1935, 298 farms out of 1,000 were foreclosed on or were sold for taxes. In South Dakota, 50 percent; in Iowa, 40 percent; and in Minnesota and Montana, 33 percent. Foreclosures occurred for a time at the rate of 274 per day. But by 1940 more than 3,000,000 farm owners were located on the farms.

THE MOVERS

March 1 of every year is the time when several millions of sharecroppers change places. This is a part of their life-long effort to get ahead.

The east wind whips the skirts of the snow with a passing shower; and over Iowa on the first of March wheels churn hub deep in mud, or grit their teeth across the icy roads.

“Home is only a shadow flying down the wind in a twisted swirl of snowflakes. It travels down the road now in an old lumber wagon drawn by two shaggy horses, whose bones are too big for their flesh.

“Even the wild goose is not as homeless as these movers, peering ahead through the

sliding curtain of a March rain, they pass with the furniture of a home packed in a wagon, past corners, past groves to a hilltop they go until only chair legs point from the skyline like roots of trees torn from the earth and they are gone.

“This, the parade of the landless, the tenants, the dispossessed. Out of their Canaan they march with Moses asleep in the Bible.

“Who will call them back, who will ask: Are you the chosen people? Do you inherit only a backward glance and a cry, and a heartbreak? Are you the meek?

“But the early twilight drops like a pall on their shoulders and sullen water slowly fills the wagon ruts and the hoof prints.” (James Hearst in *Country Men*.)

AMERICA MUST DEPEND ON HER FARMERS

In the opinion of Lincoln, “No other occupation opens so wide a field for the profitable and agreeable combination of labor with cultivated thought, as agriculture.” And Holden has written, “The soil is a sacred thing. Out of it comes that which sustains life and supplies the commerce of the world.

“To leave a farm more productive than you found it is a blessing to humanity. To leave it less productive is only a little less than a crime, and especially a crime against your children who must farm the soil after you are gone. We are learning that it is just as necessary to feed our soils as it is to feed our livestock and ourselves. There is no more important question facing America today than that of making and keeping our soil productive.

“A desert has no industries, no homes, no life. Plant food, fertility, and making and keeping the soil productive is the foundation for national prosperity and strength.”

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into the matter of whose fault it is that there was some cut in the Veterans' Administration appropriation. That is water over the dam. But we are faced now with the fact that there is not enough money for rendering service to the veterans, which service is very much needed. The Veterans' Administration has made many mistakes in its past operations and I have found that it is very difficult to understand what the budget officer of the Veterans' Administration means and what he is talking about, and frankly, what he has done with the money. I think the cuts that are being contemplated and to be put into effect very shortly in the Veterans' Administration are very unwise and very unfair. They are dismissing the men whom I call the production-line men, that is the contact men, and the rating-board men who rate compensation cases, and others. They are cutting hospital personnel. The Veterans' Administration say that they are not doing it, but they are doing it, as a matter of fact, and we have the facts and figures which were brought out in testimony before our committee to prove it. Our committee yesterday passed a resolution asking General Gray to hold these cuts in abeyance until the matter could be further investigated by the Commit-

³ Rural Roads to Security (1940).

⁴ Rural Roads to Security (1940).

tee on Veterans' Affairs. This resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, while appreciating efforts being made toward economical operation of the Veterans' Administration, directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Carl R. Gray, be informed of its protest of the present reduction in force and requests that this reduction in force be held in abeyance until a detailed study can be effected by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or any standing subcommittee so designated by the chairman, to insure that the service to disabled veterans will not be seriously impaired.

Further resolved, That the chairman be empowered to transmit this message in the most expeditious manner possible.

The veterans are entitled to service, and especially the disabled veterans. Under the present cuts they will not get that service. I say that they should cut out some of the supervisory personnel who are receiving very high salaries. Those who are receiving very high salaries are not being cut and are still working. A few of those high salaries would pay many salaries of the contact men and the men who are doing training work. They are cutting the training officers so that now 1 training officer has to train 1,000 disabled veterans. In New York the training officers were cut from 250 to 85. How can 1 vocational guidance officer counsel 1,000 disabled men who are taking training under Public Law 16? It just cannot be done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

CROW TRIBE

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That the last proviso of the first section of the Act of May 26, 1926, entitled 'An Act to amend sections 1, 5, 6, 8, and 18 of an Act approved June 20, 1920, 'An Act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds and for other purposes,'", approved May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 653, 659), be amended to read as follows:

"Provided further, That any Crow Indian classified as competent may lease his or her trust lands or any part thereof and the trust lands of their minor children for farming and grazing purposes; *Provided*, That any Crow Indian classified as competent shall have the full responsibility of obtaining compliance with the terms of any lease made; *And provided further*, That leases on inherited or devised trust lands having more than five competent devisees or heirs shall be made only with the approval of the Superintendent. Any adult incompetent Indian with the approval of the superintendent may lease his or her trust lands or any part thereof and the inherited or trust lands of their minor children for farming and grazing purposes. The trust lands of orphan minors shall be leased by the superintendent. Moneys received for and on behalf of all incompetent Indians and minor children shall be paid to the superintendent by the lessee for the benefit of said Indians. No lease shall be made for a period longer than five years, except irrigable lands under the Big Horn Canal, which may be leased for periods of ten years. All leases made under this Act shall be recorded at the Crow Agency."

And the House agree to the same.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
WESLEY A. D'Ewart,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GUY CORDON,
ZALES N. ECTON,
CARL A. HATCH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide for the making of leases of trusts and restricted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., more workable and to give to the individual members of the Crow Tribe, who are competent to manage their own affairs such rights. By amending the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658), as suggested herein will liberalize this act with respect to the competency of these Indians and will substantially accomplish the purposes intended by the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate and as it was amended by the House.

The text of the amendment herein recommended is the result of an agreement, after several conferences, between the tribal delegates of the Crow Reservation and the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
WESLEY A. D'Ewart,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2298, an act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, disagree with the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BULWINKLE, and Mr. HARRIS.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not understand what this bill does. Will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 5448 would extend to earnings of aircraft under foreign registry the reciprocal income-tax exemption now granted to earnings of ships under foreign flag. Under the Revenue Act of 1921, earnings derived from the operation of ships documented under the laws of a foreign country were exempted from Federal income tax in the hands of non-resident alien individuals or foreign corporations, if that foreign country granted an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States. This exemption has been continued without change under subsequent revenue legislation.

Under the income-tax regulations, foreign countries which impose no income tax are considered as granting the equivalent exemption demanded by the statute. Countries which do impose an income tax and which have been found to satisfy the reciprocal requirement pertaining to ships' earnings include Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Spain, and Sweden. In the case of the foregoing countries, the reciprocal exemption has been evidenced by a formal exchange of notes through diplomatic channels. In the case of the following countries, there has been no formal exchange of notes but the Treasury has ascertained that they also satisfy the requirement for reciprocal exemption: Andorra, Argentina, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Monaco, Morocco, Nicaragua, Saint Lucia, Siam, Straits Settlements, Switzerland, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The exemption proposed to be extended by the bill to income consisting of earnings from the operation of foreign aircraft has already been so extended

under income-tax conventions with Canada, Great Britain, France, and Sweden. The bill, therefore, would make generally available, on a reciprocal basis, the exemption of aircraft earnings already accomplished by convention with these four countries. Other tax conventions are in process, but negotiations leading to the final exchange of ratifications of such conventions are usually long and tedious, involving many controversial issues. Your committee believes, therefore, that it would be definitely in the public interest to facilitate the exemption of aircraft earnings in the manner provided by the bill. Substantially all the earnings of ships are exempt from taxation by foreign countries and it is anticipated that the same policy with respect to earnings from the operation of aircraft will continue to find international favor.

Your committee is informed that reciprocal exemptions like the one proposed by this bill for incorporation into our income-tax law are already on the statute books of a number of foreign countries. Exemption of our air carriers from income taxation in those countries, therefore, will become practically automatic upon the enactment of the bill. The resulting saving of the time and expense necessarily involved in bilateral convention procedure is immediately apparent.

The present world leadership of the United States in international air transportation leaves little room for doubt that the enactment of this measure will mean a net gain in revenue to the Treasury. The tax relinquished on income derived by foreign carriers from sources within this country will probably be less than the taxes which would otherwise be imposed on the foreign income of our own carriers and which, subject to certain limitations, would be allowed as a credit against the United States tax imposed on the entire net income of our carriers. During the 6 months' period from January through June 1947, according to a Civil Aeronautics Board analysis of trans-Atlantic passenger traffic out-bound from and in-bound to New York City by scheduled United States and foreign air carriers, the number of passengers on United States planes was 60,398, as compared with 19,710 carried by foreign planes. Based on these figures, the percentage of passengers carried by United States planes during that period was over 75. This is particularly noteworthy in view of the fact that it is in the trans-Atlantic service that foreign competition is keenest and most highly developed.

But of greater significance, in the opinion of your committee, would be the encouragement furnished by the bill to the further expansion of the fast growing, keenly competitive air-transport industry. Freedom from foreign taxation and the burdens of compliance with the diverse and unfamiliar administrative provisions of the laws that impose it will contribute much to the growth of our air-borne foreign commerce.

The Treasury Department is in accord with the policy of the bill, a policy which has been consistently followed in the

negotiation of tax conventions with foreign countries since the development of commercial flying.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL—SECTION 1

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of the bill respectively amend in full sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The first of these code sections excludes from gross income and exempts from tax "the income of a nonresident alien individual which consists exclusively of earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States. Section 231 (d) of the code grants the same exclusion and exemption, on the same reciprocal basis, to foreign corporations.

As amended by the bill, each of these code sections is divided into two paragraphs, the first of which continues the existing exemption of the earnings of ships under foreign registry and the second adds the new exemption of earnings derived from the operation of aircraft under foreign registry.

SECTION 2

Under section 2, the amendments made by the bill are applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 212 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income of nonresident alien individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Exclusions: The following items shall not be included in gross income of a nonresident alien individual and shall be exempt from taxation under this chapter:

"(1) Ships under foreign flag: Earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States;

"(2) Aircraft of foreign registry: Earnings derived from the operation of aircraft registered under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States."

(b) Section 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income of foreign corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Exclusions: The following items shall not be included in gross income of a foreign corporation and shall be exempt from taxation under this chapter:

"(1) Ships under foreign flag: Earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States;

"(2) Aircraft of foreign registry: Earnings derived from the operation of aircraft registered under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

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

CLARIFYING EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE STATUS OF CERTAIN NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE VENDORS FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY PURPOSES

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5052) to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 209 (b) (15) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 42, sec. 409 (b) (15)), and section 1426 (b) (15) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(15) (A) Service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in the delivery or distribution of newspapers or shopping news, not including delivery or distribution to any point for subsequent delivery or distribution;

"(B) Service performed by an individual in, and at the time of, the sale of newspapers or magazines to ultimate consumers, under an arrangement under which the newspapers or magazines are to be sold by him at a fixed price his compensation being based on the retention of the excess of such price over the amount at which the newspapers or magazines are charged to him, whether or not he is guaranteed a minimum amount of compensation for such service, or is entitled to be credited with the unsold newspapers or magazines turned back; or."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) to section 209 (b) (15) of the Social Security Act shall be applicable with respect to services performed after the date of the enactment of this act, and the amendment made to section 1426 (b) (15) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be applicable with respect to services performed after December 31, 1939.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1607 (c) (15) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(15) (A) Service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in the delivery or distribution of newspapers or shopping news, not including delivery or distribution to any point for subsequent delivery or distribution;

"(B) Service performed by an individual in, and at the time of, the sale of newspapers or magazines to ultimate consumers, under an arrangement under which the newspapers or magazines are to be sold by him at a fixed price, his compensation being based on the retention of the excess of such price over the amount at which the newspapers or magazines are charged to him, whether or not he is guaranteed a minimum amount of compensation for such service, or is entitled to be credited with the unsold newspapers or magazines turned back;".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to services performed after December 31, 1939, and, as to services performed before July 1, 1946, shall be applied as if such amendment had been a part of section 1607 (c) (15) of the Internal Revenue Code as added to such code by section 614 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939.

SEC. 3. If any amount paid prior to the date of the enactment of this act constitutes an overpayment of tax solely by reason of an amendment made by this act, no refund or credit shall be made or allowed with respect to the amount of such overpayment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, I should point out that the legislation I propose is purposed to clarify the status of certain newspaper and magazine vendors which has been recently thrown into confusion as a consequence of the rendition of several Federal court decisions.

At the time of the enactment of the Social Security Act in 1935, and again when certain amendatory legislation was under consideration in 1939, 1945, and earlier in this session—H. R. 3997 and House Joint Resolution 296—the Congress clearly revealed its intention that the common-law definitions of independent contractor and of master and servant—employee and employer—should govern insofar as social security coverage under old age and survivors and unemployment insurance was concerned.

Up until the rendition of the Federal court decisions I have referred to were rendered the status of the newspaper and magazine vendors was considered by everyone, and as this Congress clearly intended, to be that of independent contractors since they bought their periodicals at a low price and sold them at a higher price, deriving their livelihood from the profit in the operation.

By reason that is fantastic, these court decisions, in order to scoop them into the voracious maw of Social Security against their will and over their violent objection, these vendors were arbitrarily declared to be employees and therefore subject to the pay-roll taxes though the money they receive is not wages, as generally understood, but profits derived from an independent business operation of their own.

This did not suit anybody. The newspaper publishers protested that in many instances they did not even know the names of the men who had established their small businesses on the highways and byways of our cities and counties whom the courts had announced were their employees. The newspaper vendors were staggered by the number of employers they suddenly found themselves possessed of, for, under the same arrangement, many of them were handling hundreds of newspapers and magazines, this to say nothing of fruits, chewing gums, safety razor blades, "who done it" detective stories, and so forth, and so forth.

Realizing the utter unworkability of their newly defined situation, the confusion it would cause everyone engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of newspapers and magazines, I have prepared this bill to take these self-employed independent contractors out of the Social Security Act—as all newsboys under 18 years have long been excluded—at the request of the news vendors themselves, their labor union representatives and the Newspaper Publishers' Association, all of whom vigorously object to this surprising move to reverse the oft-manifested intention of Congress and to

legislate a new rule of coverage by judicial decision and bureaucratic regulation.

The enactment of this legislation does not exclude anyone from coverage who was ever embraced in the social-security system. Its enactment would merely declare that none who is clearly outside of the system shall be dragged into it by judicial decision against his will and in violation of the revealed intent of the Congress of the United States.

When newspaper vendors are covered into the social-security system—and I believe they will be by act of Congress before this session ends—they will be brought in as the independent contractors which they actually are, as the self-employed, this in recognition of their true status, not as a consequence of a fictitious treatment which cannot be justified or defended on any logical or legal basis whatsoever.

I think that everyone understands the provisions and legal effect of the measure which I now offer for enactment. If there are any questions I would be glad to endeavor to answer them.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, I think the memory of my friend and colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] is at fault in the statement which he has just made with respect to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, for the present fiscal year.

The facts are that a cut of 5 percent believed to be moderate was made in respect to the over-all administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration, as compared with budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1948, in the bill which passed the House on June 18 last.

It was made perfectly clear that not one penny of this cut was to apply to any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans, to any financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, or the orphaned, or to hospital or medical care for those eligible.

In fact, the bill carried \$20,000,000 more for hospital and medical work than was requested from either the Appropriations Committee of the House or the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

The cut of 5 percent in administrative expenditure was made as a result of the unanimous vote, both Democratic and Republican, in the subcommittee in charge of the bill. It was made as a result of the unanimous vote, both Democratic and Republican, in the full Committee on Appropriations. It was made as a result, as far as I know, insofar as this item in the bill was concerned, of

the unanimous vote, both Democratic and Republican, of those present and voting, on the floor of the House. I recall no dissenting voice in this connection in either body of the Congress.

Available information would appear to indicate that the present situation, at least insofar as New England is concerned, is the result of the failure to apply available funds in accordance with the intention of the Congress. For example, it appears that the administrative funds of the regional office in Providence were cut to the extent of 13.3 percent; that those of the regional office in Boston were cut to the extent of almost 10 percent; while those of the branch office in Boston were cut only to the extent of 0.04 percent.

The Congress will, of course, make available at any time such funds as may be shown to be essential to the humane and efficient operation of the Veterans' Administration.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5607) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5607, the State, Commerce, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill, 1949, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday we had read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEPARTMENT SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Department of State: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; salary of the Under Secretary of State, \$12,000; salaries of the secretariat for the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 2870); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$26,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Department of State; purchase of uniforms for chauffeurs; hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of nine (of which seven, including one at not to exceed \$3,000, shall be for replacement only); and dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only, or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; newspapers (not to exceed \$15,000); rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; stenographic reporting and translating services by contract and services for the analysis and tabulation of technical information and the preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; expenses as authorized by title VII (except sec. 705), of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; services

as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for the issue of passports as authorized by law (22 U. S. C. 214a); not to exceed \$43,000 for deposit in the Treasury for penalty mail of the Department of State (39 U. S. C. 321d); the examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and maintenance and operation of passport and despatch agencies established by the Secretary of State; \$17,168,000, of which \$1,000 is for payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000 of this appropriation may be expended for necessary expenses, except personal services, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An Act to Amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1354).

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 3, line 9, after the word "State", strike out "\$17,168,000" and insert "\$21,168,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores \$4,000,000 which have been stricken from the departmental services of the Department of State.

Once again an aggressor nation is on the march. The names of the leaders are different, the ideologies are diverse, but the purposes and pattern of encroachment are the same. When we read in today's press the news of events which are transpiring in Czechoslovakia and Finland, our minds revert to the unhappy experiences in the Ruhr, Ethiopia, and Poland prior to World War II. In the light of these rapidly moving events, we must recognize that Soviet Russia has embarked upon a course of world domination, and that her leaders are just as ruthless as those of Fascist Germany. She seeks to extend her conquests by using force and spreading fear and terror which are the effective weapons of dictatorship and totalitarianism.

What is the answer to this situation? Frankly, I do not know, but I do know that the State Department today is facing the most intricate and complicated problems of international relations that have ever been presented in all history. Notwithstanding this fact, the personnel of the Department has been substantially reduced. There were 7,920 positions in the departmental service in 1947. In 1948 this was reduced to 5,914 positions. Only 5,342 were requested for the fiscal year 1949. The \$4,000,000 slash in salaries will necessitate the discharge of nearly 800 present employees in this Department. It will reduce the staff of the Department in Washington by 16 percent.

Can we afford to take this chance under present conditions? I, for one, am not willing to assume that responsibility. I, therefore, offer this amendment to restore the \$4,000,000 slash made by the committee, and I urge you to adopt it as a measure of national security.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. Chairman, this is just the beginning of various attempts which will be made to rewrite this bill in committee.

On yesterday during debate you heard the committee criticized for not decreasing appropriations. Now we have an attempt to increase an item.

I recommend a careful reading of the committee report, especially page 5, in which we call attention to the duplication of effort between offices and divisions and in the diffusion of activities and responsibilities to the extent that very few divisions have a clear-cut definition of their own responsibilities. Our investigators have been in the Department for 4 months in order to determine how we could save the taxpayer's dollar without injuring the efficiency of our various departments, divisions, and agencies.

I call attention to the fact that before the war and during the war the Department of State had less money with which to operate than it had last year and less than the committee is allowing for the next fiscal year.

In 1939 the appropriation was \$2,437,000, with a supplemental appropriation of \$66,000; in 1940, \$2,425,000; in 1941, \$2,695,000, with a supplemental and deficiency appropriation of about \$800,000; in 1943, \$5,415,000, with a supplemental appropriation of \$343,000, plus \$303,000 for overtime; in 1945, \$11,056,000, with a deficiency and supplemental appropriation amounting to approximately \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, your committee is allowing the State Department this year \$17,168,000. We think the committee has been very liberal.

I want to call attention also to an article by Felix Morley captioned "Our swollen State Department." I agree it is swollen. The committee has rendered a great service to the Department of State by making this modest reduction and calling attention to some of the deficiencies that exist down there.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been quite seriously disturbed in noticing this cut of \$4,000,000 for the personnel of the State Department. I have been disturbed even though I have sometimes been critical of the activities or the organizational set-up of the State Department. On the other hand, efforts to force a reorganization within the Department through this very drastic cut of some 15½ percent in the total of administrative personnel in Washington is to my mind, the wrong way of going about it. We have today operating, and operating very thoroughly, a committee headed by former President Hoover, which is making a study of the entire organization of our Government with a view to making recommendations to us before the end of the year. That committee is, among other things, studying the entire organizational set-up of the State Department. I think it is a little dangerous for us here arbitrarily to make as large a cut as this at a moment when the unforeseen contingencies in our foreign affairs are disturbing many of us.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman referred to an investigation by a former President of the United States. Our committee of investigators made an investigation. General Nelson made an investigation. All of them admitted an endless amount of duplication.

Mr. HERTER. I am not going to quarrel with the gentleman, because I think that he knows very well that I have been critical of many of the operations of the State Department and of their organizational set-up. I am not sure that cutting a blanket amount out of the total appropriations, however, is going to settle that form of organization. What I am afraid of is that the money is likely to come out of the very operations in the State Department that are the most needed at the present time. If I might have the attention of the Chairman for one moment for a question, as I understand this cut is a lump sum cut that can be applied by the State Department within Washington wheresoever in its judgment it sees fit; is that correct?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. HERTER. Is it also correct, Mr. Chairman, that in the review that may take place in the other body with reference to this appropriation, in the event that those gentlemen felt that the cut had perhaps been a little too deep, that there would be an opportunity of compromise?

Mr. STEFAN. There is always an opportunity of compromise in the other body.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that this amendment relates solely to the departmental services, and it would have to be applied within the departmental services, which means the personnel in the State Department in the city of Washington.

Mr. HERTER. Yes; I fully understand that it has only to do with that one item.

Mr. GARY. But it ties in with an amendment which I shall next propose restoring certain funds to the Foreign Service. Now, the Foreign Service has also been very materially reduced, but there is no point in restoring the personnel of the Foreign Service if you do not have sufficient personnel in the Washington office to give them supervision and direction.

Mr. HERTER. I will not quarrel with the gentleman, except to this extent, that if you give complete discretion to the department to make cuts of \$4,000,000, running over some 15 to 20 different sections in the department, there is no control that the Congress has whatsoever over where those cuts are going to be made.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. I notice on page 2 of the report that the actual cash reduction is \$35,000,000. Well, \$35,000,000 on

a bill of \$500,000,000 is less than 8 percent. I do not consider that a very radical reduction considering the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. HERTER. The appropriation I am speaking about is the reduction of \$4,000,000 in a requested appropriation of \$21,000,000. They reduced it to some seventeen-million-plus, which is a very substantial reduction.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 26, noes 51.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 38, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service: For necessary expenses of the Foreign Service, except as otherwise provided for, including those authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158), except title VII, sections 701, 702, 703, 704, 706, 707, title VIII, and section 901 of title IX; repairs, alterations, preservation, and maintenance of Government-owned and leased diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5); ice and drinking water for office purposes; the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and purchase of 23, including 2 for chiefs of missions at not to exceed \$3,000 each; maintenance, operation, and repair of airplanes; maintenance, operation, repair, and rental of motorboats and launches for use at posts where determined to be necessary by the Secretary of State; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; excise taxes on negotiable instruments; purchase of uniforms; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); purchase of household furniture and furnishings for Government-owned, rented, or leased buildings, except as provided by the act of May 7, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292-299), and the acquisition, by purchase or otherwise, of household equipment for the purpose set forth in section 912 of said Foreign Service Act of 1946, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; loss by exchange; radio broadcasting; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services, including telephone service in residences as authorized by the act of April 30, 1940 (31 U. S. C. 679); burial expenses and expenses in connection with last illness and death of certain native employees, as authorized by the act of July 15, 1939 (5 U. S. C. 118f); for relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen as authorized by the act of March 24, 1943 (57 Stat. 45), in foreign countries and in Territories and insular possessions of the United States, and for expenses incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; for expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Ethiopia, Morocco, and

Muscat, institutions for incarcerating American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, rent of quarters for prisons, ice and drinking water for prison purposes, and for the expenses of keeping, feeding, and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; for every expenditure requisite for or incident to the bringing home from foreign countries of persons charged with crime, as authorized by section 5275 of the Revised Statutes (18 U. S. C. 659); and the operation and maintenance of commissary and mess service (not to exceed \$200,000, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; \$42,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may lease or rent, for periods not exceeding 10 years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, which rental payments may be made in advance, and may furnish heat, fuel, light, gas, and electricity for Government-owned, leased, or rented offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 8 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), automobiles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales applied to replacement of an equal number of passenger vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other passenger vehicles except station wagons, and such replacements shall not be charged against the numerical limitation hereinbefore set forth.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 6, line 7, strike out the sum "\$42,500,000" and insert "\$44,665,830."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the \$2,165,830 which the committee took from the budget of the Foreign Service.

While the committee's recommended cut is not as great as that applied to the departmental service, the effect is just as serious. The Department has already trimmed its estimates, cutting its personnel abroad 500 below the number authorized for this fiscal year, notwithstanding the fact that it is faced with the necessity of opening 22 new posts. All that has been said with reference to the amendment just disposed of applies with equal or greater force to this amendment. I offer it because I am convinced that the safety of America demands it. I trust that it will be the pleasure of this body to adopt it.

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

Mr. Chairman, this committee will recall that Congress has been very, very liberal with our Foreign Service. I yield to no man in my admiration of this branch of our Government and my efforts to be of utmost service to it. I want the best Foreign Service in the world. I want the highest type of people in the United States representing our Government in every part of the world. But I call your attention to the fact that not very long ago the House, under suspension of the rules, passed a bill reorganizing the Foreign Service and giving them the best salaries in the Government service. They have a special retirement,

which is not enjoyed by other employees of Government. We have taken very good care of our Foreign Service in foreign lands. The lend-lease money which we voted for, and the surplus material which we have been giving away to foreign countries is represented in benefits which we today are extending to our Foreign Service officials. In other words, our Foreign Service officers, in my opinion, are securing more benefits from our surplus property and lend-lease money than any other branch of our Government because we are now buying land and building buildings and residences and equipping them from the credits of lend-lease and surplus property. No other benefits have come to us, in my opinion, from lend lease or surplus property except the beautiful buildings and beautiful homes that we are constructing for these Foreign Service officers for whom this committee is appropriating in this bill \$42,500,000 for salaries and expenses, and which my colleague from Virginia is attempting to increase by over \$2,000,000.

This money is not entirely for personnel, Mr. Chairman. It is for equipment and all other items including travel, and including official residence allotments. What do we do for these Foreign Service officers? Let me give you a little information about what you did by passing that bill under suspension of the rules. Here is a Foreign Service officer whose salary is \$25,000. Annual salary \$25,000. His post allowance is \$1,360. He lives in a Government-owned home for which he pays no rent. He gets \$3,400 for entertainment. He gets \$4,500 in addition as an official residence allotment, or a total of over \$42,000 a year. That is very liberal.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wish to ask how many such officers as the gentleman describes are there in the entire Foreign Service?

Mr. STEFAN. I have three sheets of them here. I can read them off.

Mr. JAVITS. Just the number who get \$25,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Here is one who gets \$15,000, plus \$1,000 for post allowance and he lives in a Government-owned home. His entertainment allowance is \$2,100 and his official residence allotment is \$2,100.

Here is one who gets \$21,500 salary. Here is another who gets \$22,750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. That is about all I have to say about this. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. REES. I notice on page 2 of your report, speaking about salary increases, you say you increased the salary of personnel in the State Department in some

cases as high as 3,085 percent. I would like to have the gentleman explain that a little.

Mr. STEFAN. I endeavored to explain that a little while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I realize full well that my friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has given great study to this bill but I am doubtful if he has carefully gone into the matter of pay in the Foreign Service. He has spoken to you of the Ambassador or Minister who gets \$25,000 a year; of the embassies the United States is building. This amendment raises the salaries which have been cut. The cut will affect in either one or two ways—reduced personnel or a reduced amount which they will receive if you keep all the personnel.

Now I wish to state those who have been in various parts of the world on these various congressional committees must realize, and I am speaking of the commercial attachés, as well as others of similar status and others not getting as much salary, that their expenditures during these days are enormous, even for their own personal expenses.

I cannot visualize that this great country of ours, the leading Nation in the world today, will be penurious with its servants in the foreign field. You gentlemen who went to these various foreign cities last summer and were entertained by various members of an embassy or legation staff or consulate staff must remember that that entertainment they gave to you came out of their personal pockets. So I say to you that in justice to our Foreign Service we should raise this appropriation. Support this amendment which the gentleman from Virginia has introduced.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, although recognizing the value and the great, the consecrated service of our Appropriations Committee, I should feel myself very delinquent if I did not give to the House something of my own knowledge of the Foreign Service and something of what this cut will mean. I realize there are perfectly logical and reasonable criticisms of methods; I do not like some of them myself. I am discussing them with members of the State Department who are responsible and I find they already know about them, that they have been pressuring to get certain things done. Unfortunately they are not always able to surmount the pressure of opinion from higher echelons.

I should feel very sorry to have us accept this recommendation because I know from personal knowledge that in addition to having it made very difficult for the consuls and vice consuls and so on who are in charge of important though not large posts, we have a situation where the wives of these men are using their own personal funds in order to give the parties they have to give—

even for Congressmen, sometimes, when they come. Do we think there is no expense entailed in making possible the meetings between Members of Congress and members of the governments to which they go? In many of the countries it is very necessary that these be first on a social basis. I know there are Members of this House who have very strong feelings about these representation allowances. But how is a man going to be friendly with another man in another country unless he goes down with him to a little restaurant and buys him a dinner or a brandy? He has to buy himself one too, does he not? This he does because he is told by his office to go and get certain information. He cannot go out and take the foreigner off in a forest and hold a pistol to his tummy and tell him, "You tell me this, or else." He will get nothing that way. He has to first set up a spirit of friendliness and that friendliness follows certain formalities of the countries involved.

I realize these are only small matters. Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday for 15 minutes and I would suggest that you will find considerably more information if you will examine the Record. I do not feel that the only way to solve the problems of the Foreign Service or the State Department is by cutting them down in such way as will actually make a very difficult situation for us in the foreign field where we should be building character, building responsibility in the minds of the people of other countries. I regret very much that there has been so great a cut. I realize that it is much less in ratio for the Foreign Service than for the State Department as a whole, but it is enough to make it difficult in our outposts to follow those precedents, those regulations and those formulas that are understood in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any Member of the House who wants to be penurious, as has been suggested, with respect to the salaries or the allowances of Government employees, especially as it may relate to the State, Commerce, and other departments included in the particular bill under consideration.

In reading the hearings and the report on this bill I have observed a rather liberal allowance for these employees, and that is so especially with respect to salaries. On page 2 of the report attention is called to a number of cases of salaries of individual employees since they have been in the service that have been increased up to 3,800 percent in some instances. It appears the Government has been pretty liberal in the payment of salaries and allowances of employees in the State Department. All appropriations for the State Department have been very generous, I think.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about these employees. Unfortunately a lot of the information is not included in the hearings. There are tables, but, somehow, somewhere, we do not get them except by asking the Members. They are not in the printed

hearings or in the report on the bill and not available to the Members of the House.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. He will read from a table that is not in the hearings.

Mr. STEFAN. I merely read from a report showing the salary and allowance range from \$18,000 up to \$52,000. I should like to refer to another breakdown of the employees in the lower brackets.

Mr. REES. I would like to have some of those figures. In fact, they should be placed in the RECORD so the Congress and the people may have the information.

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman that he will find in the lower ranks the salary range for 1938 from \$4,000 plus to \$6,600 plus. That is the average of the low-salaried group. This is the highest paid aggregation of Government employees in the entire Government.

This modest reduction that the committee has made does not affect the salaries. The salaries were fixed by law. This only affects travel, equipment, supplies, and official residence allowance. Certainly there will be a few personnel reductions, but the salaries will not be reduced because we are not reducing the salaries.

Mr. REES. I am interested in this proposition. Our Civil Service Committee has under consideration the question of increases of salaries of Government employees. It is rather difficult to deal with the question when we find employees upgraded and transferred from one place to the other within the agency with increases in salaries out of all proportion to those in other parts of the Government. In the higher grades rules and regulations of civil service are pretty well thrown out of the window.

Mr. STEFAN. Referring to the increase in salaries and the percentage jump from 300 to 380 percent, that included classified employees.

Mr. REES. That is entirely out of line, and shows abuse of authority on the part of officials who take the question of salary adjustment in their own hands. We seem to be condoning the thing in making these appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. That is not for this service at all. You will find that explanation on page 2 of the report.

Mr. REES. I have that before me. It is very brief. Why not explain who they are and where employed? Let the record show who approved these big increases. Also why it was done.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman one question, and that is if he would like to serve in the Persian Gulf area where the temperature remains around 132 degrees in the shade for the salaries that are now paid by the State Department? Those are the salaries we are paying to these men who are giving up their homes and going to remote parts of the world where they are suffering in some instances untold hardships.

Mr. REES. I have not heard of a single instance where there is any demand on the part of anybody for help over in the Persian Gulf area or anywhere else. As a matter of fact, more people want to go abroad for the Government than want to work for the Government at home. There are many other places besides the Persian Gulf where Government workers are employed. The high-salaried employees are not in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. STEFAN. We also have many, many privates first-class who are serving in countries where the temperature average is 120 degrees who do not get \$52,000 a year in salary and allowances.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. If you will look into the matter you will not find the high-salaried employees with big allowances in the Persian Gulf or places of that kind. I think those who are required to pay the bill will feel that Congress is pretty liberal in salaries and allowances to those who represent our country in foreign lands.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not often take the floor for the purpose of defending or opposing a proposition, but I am impelled to do so on this occasion because I believe that the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations for the Foreign Service is unfair, is unjust to the Service, and was ill-considered. The chairman of the committee spoke of the high salaries received by the representatives of the Foreign Service. He mentioned only ambassadors, the highest paid men in the Service, of which there are but a few. Up until the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the Foreign Service of our country was the best trained but the worst-paid men in the service of the United States Government. The salaries in the Foreign Service of our ministers, our consuls, and our ambassadors were fixed by this Congress in the year 1854 and remained unchanged until 1946. In 1854 the salaries of our ambassadors were fixed at \$17,500 a year, and remained unchanged until the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. The salaries of those men in the lower brackets in the Foreign Service were fixed in 1924 and remained unchanged until the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. I had the privilege of serving on a subcommittee under the gentleman before he introduced the Kee bill which became the Foreign Service Act of 1946. At that time we found that when Lord Halifax was receiving \$70,000 a year, tax clear, for salary and expenses, our Ambassador in Great Britain was receiving \$33,000 a year for salary and expenses, tax-free. We felt at that time, in view of the accomplishments of British diplomacy as opposed to ours, that over-all we could possibly save more money in billions of dollars if we paid a little more money for both salary and expenses to our servants, and I believe the

gentleman will agree that the policy which we wrote into that bill for increased salaries and expense accounts for our diplomatic officials is still sound policy, and this reduction is out of line with that policy.

Mr. KEE. I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Ohio. He failed, however, to mention that in addition to the \$70,000 a year that Lord Halifax received tax-free, he also, as I am advised, received an additional allowance for entertainment of an equal amount at that time.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman ask the chairman of the subcommittee how much the embassies and legations in Europe this summer and fall had to spend entertaining congressional delegations?

Mr. KEE. I am afraid that would be impossible for the gentleman to answer.

Let us see for a moment what this cut will do. To absorb the recommended reduction of \$2,165,830 in salaries and expenses in the Foreign Service, it will be necessary to make a reduction of 494 officers and employees. There will be a reduction of 35 Foreign Service officers, men who have been trained for years in the Foreign Service, the most highly trained officers we have in any Service of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. As I said, there will be a reduction of 494 officers and men. In that reduction, in addition to the 35 Foreign Service officers I have mentioned, there will be a reduction of 50 reserve officers, there will be a reduction of 257 members of the staff, and a reduction of 150 aliens employed in the different stations over the world.

If there is any time in the history of this country when we need a full and complete Foreign Service, it seems to me that that time is now.

I am advised that before the committee reported this reduction the Foreign Service officials had planned to screen the representatives in South America and select from those representatives, although they could ill be spared, 400 representatives of the Foreign Service who were badly needed for service in Europe and the Far East. That plan will have to go overboard if this reduction is sustained. During the first 8 months of this fiscal year the Foreign Service has been building up its force within the appropriations authorized for 1948. If the House committee's reduction is not restored, the Department will be forced to undo most of what has been accomplished to achieve a balanced staff during the last 4 months. I submit that this reduction is unfair and ill-considered, and this sum should be restored by the House.

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

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman if he does not know that there are now under contemplation 22 new offices for the Department in the foreign field, which they contemplate opening during the next year?

Mr. KEE. That is true.

Mr. GARY. This will seriously handicap that program. That need arises largely from the tremendous increase in consular services such as visas and passports. There is now a tremendous backlog, and the backlog will be tremendously increased if this appropriation is cut.

Mr. KEE. That is true. Also 35 additional Foreign Service officers planned to be recruited under the Manpower Act cannot be employed and plans to recruit 50 reserve officers will have to be abandoned.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment for this primary reason: We are very careful on the floor, as the debate on appropriations for our military forces will show, that in the present state of what is euphemistically called the "cold war" between the ideologies, to consider our military forces a sacred cow. There is real justification for such a position. But are we saying there is so little hope left for peaceful accommodation, and that arms alone must settle the ideological issue? Are we willing, therefore, to hamper and dismantle our peace machinery which is our Foreign Service and our State Department?

Let us see why the committee says it cut this particular Foreign Service appropriation. It says, according to the committee's report, which I now read:

This reduction is in part related to the reduction made in the departmental salaries and expenses and in part on the information of the committee that the Foreign Service organization is in many instances rendering services to private individuals and business organizations which they could do for themselves.

And the next sentence I ask the committee to note very particularly:

Also it is the thought of the committee that the great number of additional posts proposed for the Far East cannot be established within the time limits indicated, coupled with the greater reductions in personnel and activity that might be effectuated in other parts of the world, particularly the Western Hemisphere.

Here we are considering the spending of \$570,000,000 to aid China, and yet for the very front rank of the American position in the Far East, which is our own Foreign Service, we hesitate to vote the necessary money so that the establishment of offices in the Far East may be expedited. Whereas the one thing in the world we would want to supplement with relation to our policy there, and we would want to expedite rather than retard because we did not appropriate enough money, is the opening of offices there.

The report of the committee itself in its hearings is very illuminating on this question of cutting salaries. The House should know that the Foreign Service has asked for no more personnel, 11,265 positions, than they had in the fiscal year 1948. But, the testimony shows, and I am reading from page 318 of the hearings, that \$547,000 more is needed for salaries due to automatic promotions by virtue of this very Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The chairman of the subcommittee has told us that this \$44,665,830 asked for represents a lot of other things besides salaries, but it is a fact that over \$29,000,000 of the \$44,665,830 here cut, \$42,500,000, goes for direct payment to all these employees according to the committee's own report.

One final thought. Right now we have a very restricted visa service in the United States occupied areas of Germany and Austria. But we have no appreciable visa service in the areas of Germany and Austria occupied by the British or French. A great many of us here in the House are very concerned about the fate of the displaced persons who have been very neglected, and, who I have said here myself are suffering a "living death." It would take about a quarter of a million dollars in order to extend the visa service, so that the displaced persons in the British and French zones of Germany and Austria would also have a chance, but with the policy of cutting appropriations for the Foreign Service which we have here, even simple requirements of justice and humanity cannot be served. I therefore respectfully suggest that on the basis of the facts this amendment should be voted in the bill and the cut should not be made in the Foreign Service, which is our first line of defense for the United States. The amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The item that the gentleman is talking about was considered. We took into consideration the opening up of offices in the Far East. I am just as interested as the gentleman from New York in having a strong, fine, efficient Foreign Service. But I call your attention to the fact that the amount of money we are allowing this agency for their permanent field forces, namely 11,265 positions, would cost around \$29,452,000. You should know that they have approximately 202 vacancies which they cannot fill. You should know that, and the House should get some accurate information instead of a lot of information that is not absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if we can reach some agreement to close debate on this amendment?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment

and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we could all profit by a little perspective now and then. We are not treating the State Department as painfully as has been asserted. All of this heart-bleeding is entirely unnecessary in my opinion. The fact remains that in this appropriation bill we have got 10 times the sum that we had 10 years ago. It has risen from around \$20,000,000 for the State Department until today it is over \$190,000,000 in the bill before you. Where do we stop?

I also want to point out that in this particular item alone, for salaries and expenses of the Foreign Service, we appropriated in 1939 a little less than \$10,000,000. As late as 1945, 2 years ago, we appropriated less than \$25,000,000 for this. Today that item is more than \$42,000,000. When and where do we stop?

A lot of sad words have been poured out here this afternoon about the small cut in an item that is about \$20,000,000 more than it was 2 years ago. Where do we stop? We are not only considering salaries and expenses here. Let us look at the whole picture and not delude ourselves. Otherwise we might meet ourselves coming back some day. There is \$7,000,000 in this bill for living quarters and quarters allowances. That is remuneration. If you do not think so, ask some veteran who would like to rent a house here in Washington. We also have a half million dollars for representation allowances. That is remuneration. If you do not believe so, ask somebody in the Foreign Service. We also have an item of \$2,150,000 for Foreign Service retirement and disability fund. You are considering not \$42,000,000, but about \$52,000,000 when you vote on this matter. I just want to leave the question with you who have the responsibility of the fiscal soundness of this country. Where do we stop?

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that there is just one way to reduce and that is to reduce?

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Then if we put in this \$2,000,000, the hatchet boys will be out here in a few days asking where is the reduction program of the Republicans in this House.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 56, noes 64.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 7, line 8, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, in view of what has transpired thus far I assume it is unpopular to offer an amendment to cut any of these items because the effort seems to be to increase them. Not being a member of the committee, I realize there may be some criticism that I am not as familiar with this problem as those who have given this bill as much study as they have.

What I propose to do by my amendment is to cut \$200,000 from the \$500,000 allocation in this bill for representation allowance—entertainment, they call it. Your attention has been called to the fact that the amount of money spent for the Foreign Service has been increased by some \$20,000,000 in 2 years. No wonder the cost of Foreign Service has reached such large proportions.

What was done last year was to not only allow \$700,000 for this item but this House allowed several other items for the same purpose. I mean entertainment expenses. When we talk about entertainment allowance we mean allowances to various individuals for expenses of various kinds. Then to cap it off the committee throws in another \$500,000, together with another \$128,000 for so-called participation in international organizations and things of that kind. Last year this Congress allowed additional expense items, other than the regular expense items and the same thing seems to be done again this year. There are what is described as "contingencies" and other items amounting to several hundred thousand dollars.

All in the world I am asking you to do by my amendment is to save \$200,000, a small amount. Just put it back somewhat in line with what the Congress did some 6 years ago and 8 years ago. Have you stopped to think \$500,000 would buy a lot of bread for hungry people? It would do so much more good in reaching understanding with people in other parts of the world.

May I say incidentally that the members of the committee have not put in this report just what the money is spent for, but if you will ask any one of them, they will tell you the itemized account is sort of off the record. In other words, they come to this committee and off the record will tell how much money they are spending to buy liquors and things of that kind. Unfortunately too much of

the testimony of the State Department representatives is not on the record.

Let us cut out about \$200,000 of this allowance. And while we are talking about this entertainment matter, and there is a tremendous amount of it, of course, we could well use the money that is spent for these various embassies and for representatives abroad for a more valuable purpose. Why not use some of this money to send over a number of teachers, a few lawyers, a few laboring men, ministers, businessmen who can really better represent the people of this country rather than spend this money on this particular group that just entertain themselves and other foreign representatives. Nothing is accomplished.

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

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has always supported me in an effort to reduce this appropriation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Has the gentleman any idea how many billions of dollars the people of this country have lost, and how much loss of prestige this entertainment has cost the people of this country? I know something of human history and I have observed my fellow man. I have never heard of a drunk hero or of any man who found wisdom at the bottom of a bottle. If we could be assured that our representatives would let the other fellow drink this liquor and wine that is to be bought with these funds and would themselves remain sober, this might be a good investment. Certain it is no drunk man and no partially drunk man should be entrusted with the interests of this country when it comes to determining whether our boys should fight and die in foreign wars. We will safeguard the interests of this Nation if we can keep our foreign representatives sober. You have only to turn back the pages of history and read the account of how much bourbon and Scotch whisky our representatives took to the conference between Roosevelt and Stalin at Yalta, and remember how much vodka and champagne the Russians took to that meeting, and then think of what happened to this country as a result of what took place there. Read Elliott Roosevelt's book *As I Saw It*. And when you have read of the drunkenness at Yalta as recited by Elliott Roosevelt, you will then understand why this Nation, England, France, and China came out losers and Russia gained the Balkans, Poland, Hungary, outer Mongolia, and Manchuria. You will see the stark and brutal truth of Will Rogers' statement that "This country never lost a war and never won a conference."

Mr. REES. The gentleman from Tennessee always makes a good statement. Anyway, we could use a little sobriety here and save a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and still spend more money than we should for this sort of thing. Last year Congress spent practically a million dollars, and the committee is proposing \$500,000, which would buy a tremendous amount of food. In fact, if you spent the whole \$500,000 for food,

you would do a whole lot more good and bring about a better understanding with the people of other countries than attempting to do it by spending it for liquor.

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

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, the only way to reduce governmental expenses, which the people are praying this Congress will do, is to really reduce them. Here we meet again today on about the third appropriation bill, and every time we seek to reduce expenses there is a great cry coming up from the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House in particular, that we should not do it, and they offer amendments trying to put back into the bill all that we have cut out. Two or three years ago they had this representation allowance up to about \$1,000,000. Part of it could be seen, but part of it was unseen. Now, the gentleman from Kansas has asked, inasmuch as we have made considerable progress last year in reducing this to about \$600,000, that we further reduce it by \$200,000. I think it is a sound proposition. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that we need to keep our foreign representatives in a position to do the clearest thinking in these most serious times. When I look at the colossal blunders that have taken place in the State Department year after year, which have got us into a position where it looks like we are about to lose the peace of the world after the great sacrifice we made in the last war, I believe that we ought to have at least as clear thinking as possible on the part of our representatives in foreign countries. Consequently, I am supporting this amendment to reduce this appropriation by \$200,000. In these serious times, when we hear so much about starvation and the lack of food throughout the countries of Europe, where many of our diplomats serve, you could take this \$200,000, if we can save it, and buy 1,800,000 loaves of bread for the women and children in those countries. This amendment means more bread for hungry people and less liquor for well-fed diplomats. The gentleman from Kansas has not offered this amendment just as a matter of form; neither am I speaking for it just as a matter of form. Let us see if we cannot reduce the amount by a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

I hope that the Members of this House will vote to reduce this item, which will be spent largely for more liquor and for more entertainment than is necessary on the part of our representatives, and by our diplomats abroad. I think we ought to reduce this by \$200,000. I hope the majority of the House will join in this request. I do not believe the American people who are supposed to control this Government through us, their elected representatives, would approve this excessive appropriation of \$500,000, to be used for wasteful and excessive entertainment in foreign countries. I urge the Members of the House to support this amendment and save \$200,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had a Foreign Service ever since the days of Benjamin Franklin. This amendment would seek to reduce our representation allowance from half a million to \$300,000.

The amendment would not do what the author of the amendment seeks to do. We have had representation allowances in our Foreign Service for many, many years, and every other government in the world has its representation allowance.

It is not the intention of the chairman of this subcommittee to sabotage our Foreign Service in spite of the fact that I am opposing certain amendments to increase amounts which in the judgment of the majority of the committee are fair. Other things are done with the representation allowance besides what is alleged. The committee went into this item very, very carefully last year; in fact, I had vouchers brought to Washington from all parts of the world giving me information on minute expenditures of money from this particular appropriation. We feel that this fund is well supervised, better than ever before. We cut the request from \$700,000 to \$500,000. Last year the request was for \$1,000,000, and the item was increased in the Senate from \$500,000 to \$700,000 as a compromise between the Senate and the House committees.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. REES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but he well knows that this \$700,000 item is not the only item that is going for the representation allowance. Not only that, as the gentleman has suggested, he has the vouchers that indicate what the money is spent for. Unfortunately, we are not able to get those items in the hearings. We never have. The members of the committee get them and carry them around in their pockets, but we who are also entitled to the information just do not get them. If those figures could be placed in the hearings so we could see them, there is no question in my mind but that my amendment would carry.

We are still leaving \$300,000 here for the representation, which is for liquor, and things of that kind. Not only that, you still have an additional \$400,000 in here that goes for the same purpose, as the gentlemen of the committee well know.

I realize the gentleman has to sustain his committee, and I appreciate his viewpoint. Nevertheless, he knows as well as I do by reading his own hearings that there still is in this bill a further allowance of something around \$400,000 that is going for the same purpose. If the gentleman did not happen to hold the important position he has here and did not have to sustain his committee, I think he really would agree with me.

I am sorry the gentleman cannot put in the record the complete story about the amount of money that is actually

spent for all kinds of high-powered liquor. I am not holding that against him any more than I hold it against the gentleman from Virginia, who also has the figures on that subject.

I give due credit to the chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], for cutting it down to \$500,000, but let us save a couple of hundred thousand more while we are at it. It will do us all good and be better for the State Department. My amendment puts this expenditure in line with what it was 6 years ago.

Again I want to commend the chairman for keeping the figure at \$500,000 because I believe if it had not been for his efforts the State Department might have had their way. If the State Department's views on this item were approved, it would have been a million dollars. So, I commend the gentleman for his good work, even though I would like for him to go still further and cut it another \$200,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is most unfortunate that every year when we reach this item in the bill we have a discussion in which the item is referred to as the liquor item. That is not true, and it conveys an entirely false impression to the people of our country.

I hear a lot of talk about putting business methods into government. There is not a business organization in the United States that sends its salesmen out to sell its products that does not give them a representation allowance. They may not call it by that name, but they give them an allowance with which they may entertain prospective customers. The State Department is engaged in selling the United States of America to the rest of the world. We charge them with the duty of selling our system of free enterprise. We must furnish them the machinery, the tools, with which it can be done. That is all this item does.

It enables the State Department to hold conferences to which they can invite representatives of other governments and sit down and discuss the various problems that arise.

It was my privilege to travel in Europe last fall. I have no doubt that I enjoyed the benefits of this very fund. Why? Because some of the most interesting and important conferences that we had while I was abroad were conferences at dinners or lunches or some occasion which had been arranged by the State Department or by the Army to gather together the important people of the country where we were visiting so that we might there discuss with them our problems and gain certain information which we were seeking. I think that a fund of this kind is of the utmost importance. Last year the State Department requested \$1,000,000 for this fund. The House cut them to \$500,000. We cut it exactly in half. It went over to the other body and there was increased to \$700,000, and we agreed on that amount. The State Department did not request the \$1,000,000 again this year, but only requested \$700,000. We cut that back to \$500,000, the same

amount that the House approved last year. I trust it will be the pleasure of this body to keep it at that figure.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman well knows that we also have in this bill additional items under so-called contingencies that total something over \$800,000. The gentleman well knows that. I am sure he knows it, although it is not marked for buying liquor. They always have had the items showing how much they spent for it. All that I am asking the gentleman to do is to just cut it a little bit. Let us cut it a small percentage. Let us cut it by about 25 percent. Let us save about \$200,000, and let us use that now especially when the people abroad need to be fed. If you want to use \$200,000 let us use it to feed the people who need it abroad, and in that way we will come much closer to creating good will among the people abroad than we will by a thing of this kind. Of course, they have to spend a certain amount of money for dinners and things of that kind, but they do not have to spend it on this kind of thing. Let us put it back to where it was some 4 or 6 years ago when we only used \$250,000 for this. Let us put it back to \$250,000. That is all I am asking the gentleman to do. I am not asking to cut it out completely.

Mr. GARY. My answer to the gentleman's question is that every item in this bill has been scrutinized very carefully by the subcommittee and we think that every one of these items is needed.

Mr. REES. Let us supervise these items a little more, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 10, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

International information and educational activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, approved January 27, 1948), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$50,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158), except title VII and title VIII; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$6,000); rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; ice and drinking water for office purposes; acquisition, production, and free distribution of information materials for use in con-

nexion with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of information and educational activities outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the maintenance and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, and the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; \$28,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 may be transferred to the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," "Printing and binding, Department of State," "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service," "Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service," and "Printing and binding, Foreign Service," under this title: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests (which may be for one or more years) payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That \$4,400,000 of this appropriation shall be available exclusively for the purchase, construction, and improvement of buildings and facilities and the purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception, including the acquisition of land and interest in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) necessary therefor, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY:

On page 21, line 15, after the word "statutes," strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$34,378,000."

And on page 21, line 16, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,450,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the \$6,378,000 which the committee struck from the budget of the information and educational activities of the State Department.

I do not intend to make another speech on this subject. The Congress has been carefully considering these activities for more than a year. I attempted to describe to the House on yesterday the results of our handiwork in reducing this fund last year. I had hoped that we had learned our lesson, but although experience is a great teacher, we do not all learn by experience. The State Depart-

ment requested \$34,378,000 for the 1949 information program. The committee has reduced the appropriation to \$28,000,000. Many of the Congressmen who traveled abroad last year think we should spend not less than fifty or one hundred million dollars a year on this vital activity. I am merely restoring the amount to the \$34,378,000 requested by the State Department. I trust that it will be your pleasure to adopt this amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to some agreement on a limitation of debate on this item. Has the gentleman any other speakers?

Mr. GARY. Not so far as I know, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is in reality two amendments, but they are tied together.

The gentleman from Virginia seeks to increase from \$28,000,000 to \$34,378,000 the amount for the Information Service, in which the Voice of America is included. He also seeks to increase the limitation of \$2,500,000 to \$3,400,000 for administrative purposes. I oppose both of the amendments for many reasons.

The information that the committee received from the Department as to their actual requests from the Bureau of the Budget was not correct. I wish to make the statement now that I am very much disappointed that we do not get the true information when we ask for it.

The committee is allowing this agency, which was not authorized during the last session but which is now authorized by law, \$28,000,000, which is more than two times the present appropriation.

The activity, in my opinion, is not organized administratively to economically spend more money. Greater economies would result if more opportunity were given private firms and private organizations to operate abroad such as motion pictures, private magazines, and periodicals; and I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk which I shall offer for what it is worth in order to improve the service and in order to take care of the present emergency, one which will not require additional funds. Rather than spending money for portable motion-picture equipment, private theaters should be allowed greater opportunity to show our films. The State Department has done nothing along this line.

There is a request here for \$4,400,000 for the purpose of constructing relay stations. It is admitted today that the Voice of America is a feeble voice. Our signals are not strong enough. So we must spend money to build relay stations in order to get our voice out so people can hear it; so, in reality, instead of an increase there should be a decrease, there should be a rescission. Some of the activities that are not effective today should be discontinued and something effective should be done. The \$4,400,000 for construction of relay stations is too large a sum. I have received subsequent information after the hearings were held

indicating that the \$4,400,000 is too much to build the relay stations they are planning to build, that the price should be considerably less. Being somewhat acquainted with radio technology and radio theory, I know that \$4,400,000 will build a lot of relay stations. I therefore suggest that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] be defeated.

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

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman take the position that so far as the Voice of America is concerned we definitely need a stronger Voice of America?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; we do, and we are providing for it in this bill.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is the amount the gentleman refers to in the bill the total amount appropriated for it?

Mr. STEFAN. We have appropriated \$28,000,000, twice as much as last year, and in that is the \$4,400,000 for relay stations to make the Voice stronger.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. What can we do in this bill to make the Voice adequate for America? That is what we need, it seems to me.

Mr. STEFAN. Get better administration, sir, and more efficient people from private industry, who know the business, people who know the radio business, who know the newspaper and magazine business.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that most of this radio business is now being handled by private industry?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, but not to the extent possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: Page 22, line 16, after the word "Statutes" and before the period, insert the following new proviso: *"Provided further, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films."*

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to offer amendments to an appropriation bill which contain legislation; however, I have spoken to my colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and he is agreeable to allowing me to offer the amendment. I have also taken the matter up with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], author of the Mundt bill, which authorized the information service, and he has agreed to allow me to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be honest with the membership of the committee and say that this amendment is subject to a point of order because it is legisla-

tion on an appropriation bill. I have been one who has tried consistently and conscientiously to eliminate all legislation from appropriation bills. I want the prerogatives of the legislative committees to be preserved. However, this is an emergency. It has to do with one country, Italy, where elections will be held, as I understand it, in April.

One individual is given the monopoly on the showing of newsreels. He controls the newsreels in 8,000 theaters in Italy and he shows those newsreels to not less than 8,000,000 people every week. I understand that perhaps there is broad authority in the bill giving the Administrator of this item the power to contract with individuals in that country, however there is some fear that he will not take advantage of such authority and that special authority is needed.

I have, therefore, offered this amendment in good faith in order to make the Voice of America a little stronger through private industry, through people who understand how to show it. Instead of showing these pictures to people in the embassies, to the rich people in consultates, we will have a chance here to show them to the rank and file of the people who go to picture shows of their own choice and run by their own countrymen.

I believe that the amendment which I offer should be accepted for the sake of a stronger Voice of America.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. I might say that we have made some study of this amendment, and while we think the authority is now in the bill, it is also true that we face this urgent situation in Italy in April, and rather than take a chance that it might not be so construed by the legal authorities downtown, I think the amendment should be added at this time, and I certainly approve of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes, but I do want to bring to the attention of the House what I think is the intent of Congress, particularly those Members who were instrumental and active in passing what is now known as the Smith-Mundt bill, the so-called Voice of America program. While that bill was on the floor here I offered an amendment which was accepted by the committee. It is now known as section 1005 of the Smith-Mundt bill. That amendment was designed to do just one thing, and I want to take this time so that the departments downtown will know the feeling of Congress in this matter. We wanted those who were going to operate the so-called Voice of America, or more properly, the Office of Information and Education, to use every adequate and qualified American private facility in this Voice of America work. We wrote section 1005 into the bill. Since the hearings closed, I have been struggling

with an attempt to provide an amendment that would spell that out in this bill. That was not easy to do. But, I trust that taking this time and reading some expressions from Senator SMITH and from Congressman MUNDT may spell that out for the Department and make it unnecessary to write it into the bill.

After the bill was passed, Senator SMITH, in a complimentary broadcast over the Worldwide System, had this to say:

In this bill we will emphasize all the way through that as far as possible private organizations, private facilities, organizations such as your own, the existing educational foundations, shall be incorporated in this work, and so far as the Government can get cooperation from these private agencies, the Government itself will withdraw, because we want to encourage the private initiative in the way Americans do things in this entire enterprise.

At the same broadcast the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had this to say:

Mr. Lemmon, I think there is no question at all about that. You have done a grand piece of work in the past, and after all it must be emphasized over and over again, that this is not a propaganda program—simply a program of presenting the facts about freedom to the peoples of the world. For that reason, we are determined to use private agencies and private enterprise wherever possible, and you very fittingly qualify under that category.

I think that should make it sufficiently clear to the Department of State and those operating this program that they should bring into this program every qualified and able American facility, individuals, corporations, groups, or what have you.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the objection being made against placing the Marshall plan under the State Department is that this Department is so incompetent and so completely infiltrated with Communists that it would be dangerous to the security of the United States to trust it with this responsibility. In my opinion, both grounds are unimpeachable. The whole business ought to be abolished, entirely reconstituted and put in charge of real Americans. If that were done, the State Department could be operated with about one-tenth the force and cost now required. In addition, it would give us an American foreign policy instead of a foreign American policy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since food is such an important item in the world and since during the last 20 years in our foreign offices we have had what are known as agricultural attachés, I shall include with my remarks here a statement showing the individual histories of the agricultural attachés in the various legations throughout the world and a further statement showing the salaries they receive. There is no doubt but that their work is an important part of the work of every legation, especially when there is so much conversation about food as there has been during the war and since the war.

My only comment in connection with these men is that their service records indicate that most of them are men of agricultural training. This would not be a bad idea to put into effect once in a while in our own Department of Agriculture. There is no reason why as a group they should not be relied upon really to do some good so far as the agriculture of the world is concerned. Incidentally, I could mention that one of these men was not an American citizen until 1944. Possibly he has learned much and will make a good attaché.

The information I have referred to concerning these agricultural attachés is as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, STAFF OFFICERS, AND RESERVE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO FOREIGN SERVICE POSTS FOR FULL-TIME AGRICULTURAL WORK AS OF JUNE 30, 1947

ARGENTINA

Arthur T. Thompson: Wiota, Iowa, September 2, 1906; Iowa State College, bachelor of science, 1928-42; secretary, Combined Food Board, 1943-45; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Buenos Aires, September 20, 1945.

Richard O. Cromwell: Cass County, Nebr., November 25, 1890; Weeping Water High School graduate; Weeping Water Academy graduate; University of Nebraska, bachelor of arts, 1912, doctor of philosophy, 1918; State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, master of science, 1916; United States Forest Service, summer, 1913; assistant plant pathologist, North Carolina State Agricultural Experiment Station, 1918-20; director of commodity department for mercantile company, 1920-21, 1923-41; commodity analyst for grain merchants, 1921-23; senior agricultural economist, 1941-44, marketing specialist, 1944-45, Department of Agriculture; appointed assistant agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Buenos Aires, May 18, 1945.

AUSTRALIA

Llewellyn V. Toyne: Sedgwick, Colo., February 27, 1906; Logan County High School graduate; Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, bachelor of science, 1927, summer school, 1927, 1930, 1933, 1937, 1938; county extension agent, 1934-45; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to the Department, December 16, 1944; at Sydney, February 21, 1945; also vice consul at Sidney, September 28, 1945; agricultural attaché and vice consul at Canberra, February 12, 1946.

AUSTRIA

Richard A. O. Schwartz: London, England, July 12, 1901; naturalized, 1944; schools in England and Germany; George Washington University, 1944; clerk and accountant in England, 1919-25; secretary-accountant, United States Department of Agriculture, Berlin, 1925-28; foreign correspondent for London bank, 1928-29; head clerk and office manager, United States Department of Agriculture, Berlin, 1929-39; transferred to American Embassy at Berlin, 1939; clerk at Oslo, September 22, 1939; at Ottawa, January 4, 1940; administrative assistant, British Food Mission, 1942-44; administrative assistant, Department of Agriculture, 1944-45; appointed assistant to agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to office of United States political adviser on Austrian affairs, Commanding General, United States Army Forces, Mediterranean theater, January 13, 1945.

Frederick A. Motz: Crookston, Minn., September 12, 1893; Rock Island (Ill.) High

School graduate; Oregon State College, bachelor of science, 1917; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, master of science, 1929; extension horticulturist and professor of horticulture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1917-29; principal marketing specialist and agricultural commissioner, 1929-39; international commodity specialist and chief of horticulture branch, 1942-45, Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural adviser in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to office of United States political adviser on Austrian affairs, Commanding General, United States Army Forces, Mediterranean theater, December 28, 1944.

BELGIUM

Jerome T. Gaspard: Minneapolis, Minn., January 18, 1907; St. Thomas Academy graduate; St. Thomas College, B. A. 1927; Sorbonne, diplôme d'études supérieures de philosophie, 1929; Harvard, M. A., 1933; instructor, St. John's University, 1931-32; economist, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 1933-41; liaison officer, 1941-43; assistant to director, 1933-44; Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural economist in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Brussels October 23, 1944; agricultural attaché at Brussels November 1, 1945.

BRAZIL

Guy L. Bush: Gordon, Nebr., April 17, 1890; Cotner Academy graduate; University of Nebraska 1913-16; United States Navy 1917-18; farmer 1918-25; editor of farm publication 1925-33; supervisor of farm loan department for insurance company 1933-35; information specialist, Department of Agriculture, 1935-43; appointed agricultural attaché at Rio de Janeiro July 2, 1943.

Dwight R. Bishop: Winfield, Ala., June 11, 1914; Raymondville (Tex.) High School graduate; Texas College of Arts and Industries, B. S. 1937; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, M. S. 1939; overseer for fruit company, Guatemala, 1939; adjuster for insurance company 1940; trainee, Department of Agriculture, 1941-42; United States Navy, 1942-45; lieutenant, overseas service; statistician in commodity brokerage company 1945-46; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at São Paulo January 7, 1946.

Jack E. Conner: Marfa, Tex., January 16, 1921; Henrietta M. King School (Kingsville) graduate; Texas College of Arts and Industries, B. A., B. S. 1939; University of Texas, summers 1936-40; University of Virginia, 1939; teacher in public schools 1940-41; ground instructor in private and Army flying schools 1942-43; United States Navy 1943-46, lieutenant; appointed Foreign Service officer unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service July 25, 1946; to the Department September 22, 1946.

CANADA

Meade T. Foster: Franklin, Pa., September 27, 1900; Franklin High School graduate; Pennsylvania State College, B. S. 1922; University of Missouri, A. M. 1926; associate professor, University of Missouri, 1923-30; marketing specialist, Department of Agriculture, 1930-44; appointed assistant agricultural attaché at Buenos Aires May 24, 1944 (cancelled); at Rio de Janeiro August 21, 1944; at Buenos Aires May 18, 1945; agricultural attaché at Ottawa, February 5, 1946.

Roy O. Westley: Panora, Iowa, April 9, 1892; Guthrie County High School graduate; Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, B. S. 1915, M. S. 1918; instructor, Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts and Washington State College, 1915-23; agronomist 1923-38, supervisor 1938-42, Department of Agriculture; assistant manager, Office of Defense Transportation, 1942-43; agronomist, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1943-45; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to the

Department March 20, 1945; at Belgrade, Budapest, Sofia, and Tirana May 24, 1945; also at Bucharest October 16, 1945; assistant agricultural attaché at Belgrade, Budapest, Sofia, and Tirana March 12, 1946 (canceled); assistant agricultural attaché at Bucharest March 12, 1946; agricultural officer at Bucharest November 13, 1946.

Quentin R. Bates: Fairfield, Iowa, March 28, 1919; Fairfield High School graduate; Parsons College, B. A. 1940, graduate work 1946; student instructor in history, Parsons College, 1937-40; United States Army 1941-45, first lieutenant, overseas service; appointed Foreign Service officer unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service July 19, 1946; to the Department August 16, 1946.

CHILE

Eugene V. Harris: Kenmare, N. Dak., February 8, 1913; Minnesota State Teachers College, B. E. 1933-37; University of North Dakota 1940-41; Ohio State University, 1941-43; University of Chile 1943; assistant principal, public school, 1938-40; part time teaching, University of North Dakota, Ohio State University 1940-43; Maintenance Fellowship, Institute of International Education, 1943; appointed clerk (OEW) at Santiago, January 21, 1944; appointed assistant agricultural attaché February 23, 1947.

CHINA (ALSO MANCHURIA)

Owen L. Dawson: Frost (Harrison), Mich., December 6, 1892; Joliet (Ill.) High School graduate; University of Illinois, B. S. 1920; South Dakota State College, M. S. 1926; Department of Agriculture Graduate School 1927-28; United States Army 1916, 1917-19, Mexican border and overseas service; farmer 1920-21; teacher in high school 1921-22; agricultural statistician and economist, Department of Agriculture, 1922-28; appointed assistant agricultural commissioner at Berlin January 1, 1929; delegate, International Congress of Agriculture, Bucharest, 1929; Congress of the Rose and the Orange of the Sahara, El Golea, French North Africa, 1929; agricultural commissioner at Shanghai, January 1, 1931; adviser, Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs, Manila, 1937; agriculture attaché at Shanghai November 17, 1939-December 7, 1941; to the Department and detailed to the Department of Agriculture September 4, 1942; agriculture attaché at Chungking June 11, 1943; liaison secretary United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, Hot Springs, Va., 1943; liaison secretary, first session of the council, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J., 1943; to the Department October 16, 1944; agriculture attaché at Chungking November 27, 1944; agriculture attaché at Shanghai March 25, 1946.

Alexander L. Peaslee: Oak Park, Ill., February 5, 1922; Defiance (Ohio) High School graduate; Miami University, A. B. 1943; Stanford, A. B. 1945; United States Army 1942-46; employment officer, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1946; appointed Foreign Service officer unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service June 3, 1946; to the Department June 17, 1946; vice consul at Shanghai September 11, 1946.

Willard O. Brown: Stanford, Tex., August 12, 1911; Abilene High School graduate; McMurry College, B. S. 1931; University of Texas, graduate work 1931-32; Louisiana State University, A. M. 1933; Iowa State College, graduate work 1934-35; Department of Agriculture Graduate School 1941-42; liaison work in farm management for Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts and Department of Agriculture 1934-35; assistant professor of agricultural economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, 1935-40; associate agricultural economist, Department of Agriculture, 1940-42; appointed agricultural economist at London June 2, 1942;

staff of United States political adviser on German affairs, Supreme Headquarters, AEF, June 22, 1945; assistant agricultural attaché at Manila October 2, 1946; en route to post on June 30, 1947.

COLOMBIA

Kenneth Wernimont: Ohiowa, Nebr., August 30, 1909; Geneva High School graduate; Nebraska Wesleyan, bachelor of arts, 1930; American University, master of arts, 1937, graduate work, 1937-40; exchange fellowship, University of Rome, 1937-38; member of bar of Nebraska; farmer, 1930-34; with farm-loan association, 1934-35; with Agricultural Adjustment and Resettlement Administration, 1935-37; legislative planning analyst, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1938-42; administrative officer, Commodity Credit Corporation, 1942-43; appointed agricultural commissioner at Para, April 16, 1943; at Rio de Janeiro, June 6, 1944; at Bogotá, October 7, 1946.

John G. Gossett: Lawton, Okla., January 20, 1921; University of Oklahoma, bachelor of arts, 1936-40; Army of the United States (captain), 1942-47; appointed department, April 30, 1947; training in Department of Agriculture on June 30, 1947.

COSTA RICA (ALSO NICARAGUA AND PANAMA)

Dr. Theodore J. Grant: Newton, Mass., January 20, 1903; Newton High School graduate; Massachusetts State College, bachelor of science, 1926; University of Wisconsin, 1930-33; associate pathologist, 1933-40; senior pathologist, 1940-45, Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at San Jose, Managua, and Panama, July 16, 1945.

CUBA

Dr. Paul G. Minneman: Sidney, Ohio, July 9, 1902; Sidney High School graduate; Ohio State University, bachelor of arts, 1924, master of science, 1926, doctor of philosophy, 1929; University of Breslau, Germany, 1926-27; first lieutenant, Officers Reserve Corps; research assistant, 1928, and instructor, 1929, Ohio State University; economist, Department of Agriculture, 1929-36; appointed assistant agricultural attaché at London, May 1, 1936; to the Department and detailed to the Department of Agriculture, September 15, 1939; member Joint Survey of Cuban Agricultural Resources, Habana, 1941; agricultural attaché at Habana, April 15, 1942.

Dr. Louis C. Nolan: Senoia, Ga., December 28, 1904; Senoia High School graduate; Emory University, bachelor of philosophy, 1926; graduate work, University of South Carolina, 1926-27, University of Chicago, 1929-30; Duke, doctor of philosophy, 1935; information specialist, Department of Agriculture, 1934-39; associate editor on agricultural publication, 1939-41; economics analyst, 1941-43; chief of Division of Foreign Information, 1943-46, Department of Agriculture; appointed assistant agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Habana, January 17, 1946.

Philip M. Davenport: Washington, D. C., December 21, 1915; McKinley High School graduate; University of Pennsylvania, bachelor of science, 1937; Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, master of arts, 1938; appointed Foreign Service officer unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service, July 6, 1938; vice consul at Berlin, July 18, 1938; Foreign Service School, June 9, 1939; vice consul at Canton, January 8, 1940-Dec. 7, 1941; at Karachi, July 20, 1942; second secretary and vice consul at Habana, June 22, 1945.

DENMARK

John L. Stewart: Philadelphia, Pa., July 16, 1897; Bethlehem Preparatory School graduate; Pennsylvania State College, bachelor of science, 1922; Lehigh University, master of science, 1923; with Department of Agriculture, 1924-45; United States delegate, Fif-

teenth General Assembly of International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, 1940; appointed agricultural attaché at Copenhagen, May 28, 1945; adviser, United States delegate, second session of the conference, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Copenhagen, 1946.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Rollo P. Stovall: Gainesville, Ga., February 18, 1912; Miami (Fla.) Senior High School graduate; University of Florida, bachelor of science, 1935; Georgetown, master of science, 1938; Academy of International Law, The Hague, summer, 1938; supervisor of correspondence unit, Rural Electrification Administration, 1935-39; junior economic analyst, War Department, 1939; examiner's aid, Bureau of Customs, 1940-42; assistant chief and chief of mica section, War Production Board, 1942-45; appointed economic analyst in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Ciudad Trujillo January 3, 1945.

ECUADOR

Hugo W. Alberts: Watertown, Wis., March 29, 1889; Johnson Creek High School graduate; Milwaukee State Teachers College, diploma 1914; University of Wisconsin, bachelor of science, 1918, master of science, 1920, doctor of philosophy, 1924; University of Illinois, doctor of philosophy, 1926; Harvard, 1926; teacher, 1908-11; principal of elementary school, 1911-12; assistant county superintendent of schools, 1914-15; principal of high school, 1915-16; instructor, University of Wisconsin, 1918-24; director, agriculture experiment stations, Alaska, 1926-32; specialist in northern agriculture, Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Leningrad, 1933; assistant crop and livestock estimator, Department of Agriculture, 1934; agricultural economist, Land Policy Section, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1934-35; regional director, 1935; associate agronomist, 1936-37; agronomist in charge of research station in Puerto Rico, 1938-43, Soil Conservation Service; appointed agricultural adviser at Lima February 16, 1943; at La Paz, Bolivia, temporary, September 26, 1944; at Lima November 10, 1944; agricultural attaché at Guayaquil and Quito May 10, 1946.

EGYPT (ALSO PALESTINE, TRANS-JORDAN, SUDAN, AND ETHIOPIA)

Robert B. Elwood: Omaha, Nebr., November 30, 1912; Napier (Iowa) High School graduate; Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, bachelor of science, 1935, master of science, 1939; associate agricultural economist, Works Progress Administration, 1936-39; research assistant, Iowa State College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, 1939-40; extension specialist, University of Tennessee, June-December 1941; agricultural specialist, Foreign Economic Administration, 1943-45; appointed assistant agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Cairo February 15, 1945; assistant agricultural attaché at Cairo March 5, 1946; at Athens, temporary, April 30, 1946.

FRANCE

Ben H. Thibodeaux: Breaux Bridge, La., December 13, 1903; Breaux Bridge High School graduate; Louisiana State University, bachelor of science, 1925; Iowa State College, master of science, 1928; Harvard, graduate work, 1932-33, 1940-41; instructor, Louisiana State University, 1925-28; agricultural economist, Department of Agriculture, 1929-43; United States Army, 1944-45, colonel, overseas service; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Paris, January 10, 1946.

Richard C. Desmond: Lynn, Mass., September 2, 1916; Leesburg (Fla.) High School graduate; Massachusetts State College, bachelor of science, 1937; Yale, master of forestry, 1939; forester, United States Forest Service, 1939-42; United States Army, 1942-46, captain, overseas service; to the Department, August 9, 1946.

Harry R. Zerbel: Appleton, Wis., February 17, 1920; Appleton High School graduate; University of Wisconsin, bachelor of arts, 1941, master of arts 1942; United States Army, 1942-45, overseas service; appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service July 5, 1946; to the Department July 24, 1946.

GERMANY

Roy I. Kimmel: Las Vegas, N. Mex., March 19, 1901; Lamar (Colo.) High School graduate; Colorado College, bachelor of arts, 1926; Yale, master of arts, 1931; assistant to Administrator, Farm Security Administration, 1935-37; assistant, office of secretary, 1937-39, chief program analyst, 1939-42; Department of Agriculture; chief of industrial division, War Relocation Authority, 1942; head of United States lend-lease mission to New Zealand, 1943; United States Army, 1943-45, lieutenant colonel, overseas service; member, Combined Working Party on European Food Supplies, London, 1944; appointed assistant agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service auxiliary and assigned at London November 16, 1945.

GREAT BRITAIN (ALSO IRELAND)

Paul O. Nyhus: Chippewa Falls, Wis., April 18, 1894; Chippewa Falls High School graduate; University of Wisconsin, bachelor of science, 1923; United States Army, 1918-19; second lieutenant Officers Reserve Corps; county agriculture agent, Wisconsin, 1919-20; manager farm department of bank 1920-22; agriculture statistician, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, 1922-26; agricultural commissioner at Shanghai, 1926-31; at Department of Agriculture in Washington, 1931-34, appointed agricultural attaché at Buenos Aires July 28, 1934; adviser, Pan American Commercial Conference, Buenos Aires, 1935; and Eighth International Conference of American States, Lima, 1938; agricultural attaché at London May 5, 1945; adviser, United States delegation, International Wool Talks, London, 1946.

Fred Taylor: In England, January 25, 1878; naturalized 1899, New Bedford Textile Engineering School graduate; associate professor, Clemson College, 1907-12; division chief 1912-19; agriculture commissioner 1930-44, Department of Agriculture; general manager of cotton mills 1919-30; delegate to International Cotton Conferences in Europe and Washington, D. C.; appointed agriculture commissioner in the Foreign Service auxiliary and assigned at London Oct. 20, 1944; at Tokyo February 8, 1946.

Irvin M. Eltreim: New Underwood, S. Dak., July 1, 1910; Mount Vernon High School graduate; University of Minnesota, bachelor of science, 1932; Harvard School of Business Administration, 1936-37; administrative assistant, Department of Agriculture, 1933-36; with manufacturing company, 1937-38; agriculture economist, Department of Agriculture, 1938-40; appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service September 3, 1940; vice consul at Nuevo Laredo September 7, 1940; at Mexico City March 19, 1941; to the Department, August 15, 1941 (Foreign Service School, November 3 to December 6, 1941); vice consul at Winnipeg December 3, 1941; at Fort William and Port Arthur, temporary, August 15, 1942; at Winnipeg September 22, 1942; third secretary and vice consul at Ottawa December 8, 1942; at London September 28, 1944.

GREECE

Jay G. Diamond: Lafayette Hill, Pa., December 27, 1891; Conshohocken High School graduate; University of Pennsylvania, 1909-11; United States Army 1918-19; agriculture statistician, Bureau of Agriculture Economics, 1921-45; appointed agriculture officer in the Foreign Service auxiliary and assigned to the Department August 29, 1945; at Berlin, October 10, 1945.

GUATEMALA (ALSO HONDURAS AND EL SALVADOR)

Graham S. Quate: San Diego, Calif., April 4, 1890; Baker High School graduate; University of Mexico, summer 1941; private tutor in Spanish 1943-44; forest ranger 1920-25; engineer 1927-33; planning engineer, United States Foreign Service 1933-34; agricultural engineer 1934-35; State conservationist for Utah 1935-42, Soil Conservation Service; with office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs 1942-45; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Guatemala April 5, 1945; also agricultural attaché at San Salvador and Tegucigalpa April 5, 1945.

HAITI

Edward L. Tanner: Bunkie, La., April 2, 1892; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, B. S. 1914; superintendent of schools 1914-15; entomologist inspector, office of Texas Commissioner of Agriculture, 1915-16; United States Army 1917-19, captain, overseas service; instructor in agronomy 1920-21; county agent 1922-24; 1925-37 Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas; director of schools, Tamaulipas, Mexico, 1921-22; rehabilitation assistant, Veterans' Bureau, 1924-25; assistant information specialist 1937-40; water facilities supervisor 1940-42; community manager 1942-43; senior agronomist 1943-45, Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Port-au-Prince January 1, 1945.

HUNGARY

Harry Le Bovit: Newark, N. J., April 12, 1915; West Side High School graduate; Rutgers University, B. S., 1939; American University 1940; Department of Agriculture Graduate School 1940; dairy plant manager 1940; analyst, Department of Commerce, 1940-42; industrial economist, War Production Board, 1942-44; marketing specialist, Department of Agriculture 1944-45; appointed agricultural economist in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to office of United States representative, Advisory Council for Italy, December 26, 1944; in office of United States political adviser, staff of Supreme Allied Commander, Mediterranean theater, February 17, 1945; at Budapest, April 10, 1945; assistant agricultural attaché at Budapest June 5, 1946; Foreign Service staff officer of class eight, November 13, 1946; agricultural economist at Budapest, November 13, 1946.

INDIA

Dr. Clifford C. Taylor: Loveland, Colo., May 15, 1895; Fort Collins High School graduate; Colorado Agricultural College, B. S., 1917; Iowa State College, M. S., 1923; Harvard, A. M., 1926; Ph. D., 1930; county agricultural agent, Colorado, 1917-18; research assistant, Department of Agriculture, 1918-20; farm management specialist, University of Idaho, 1920-21; research assistant, Iowa State Experimental Station, 1921-23; associate professor and head of department of agricultural economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1923-30; entered Bureau of Agricultural Economics November 15, 1930; agricultural attaché at Pretoria 1930-33; appointed agricultural attaché at London July 27, 1935; American representative, International Wheat Advisory Committee, 1936-39; technical adviser, International Sugar Conference, London, 1937; delegate, meetings of International Sugar Council, London, 1937-39; Foreign Service officer of class four, July 1, 1939; agricultural attaché at Ottawa, September 30, 1939; consular and secretary in the diplomatic service, November 16, 1939; adviser, United States delegation, first session of the conference, United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, Quebec, 1945; class 1, December 17, 1945; consul of embassy for economic affairs at Warsaw, January 2, 1946. En route to post on June 30, 1947.

Cleveland B. McKnight: Atlanta, Ga., June 24, 1908; Emory University, bachelor of arts, 1932; with tractor and equipment company, 1924-30; with motor company, 1933-35; teacher in public schools, 1935-36; with Department of Agriculture; travel in Europe, north Africa, and Near East; appointed clerk in the Foreign Service and assigned to the Department, December 26, 1940; at London; April 26, 1941; vice consul at London, September 29, 1944; at Foynes, January 23, 1945; Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service, July 19, 1946; to the Department, July 29, 1946.

Henry W. Spielman: Chickasha, Okla., September 28, 1911; Classen High School (Oklahoma City) graduate; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, bachelor of science, 1933, master of science, 1935; Department of Agriculture Graduate School, 1940; Brookings Institution, 1933-34; clerk, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, August-November 1934; supervisor of research, 1935-36; statistician, Farm Security Administration, 1936-37; junior agricultural economist, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1937-39; associate marketing specialist, Surplus Marketing Administration, 1939-42; appointed junior agricultural economist at Sao Paulo, February 10, 1942; agricultural economist at Bombay, December 10, 1945; also administrative officer at Bombay, July 1, 1946; agricultural economist at Bombay, November 13, 1946.

IRAN

Horace G. Bolster: Buford, N. Dak., November 21, 1899; Plentywood (Mont.) High School graduate; Montana State College, bachelor of science, 1932; Iowa State College, master of science, 1933; appraiser, 1933, on loan commission, 1933-34; Federal land bank; extension economist, Montana State College, 1934-45; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Tehran, July 21, 1945.

ITALY

Dr. Howard R. Cottam: St. George, Utah, July 27, 1910; Provo High School graduate; Brigham Young University, bachelor of arts, 1932; University of Wisconsin, master of philosophy, 1938, doctor of philosophy, 1941; research assistant fellow, teaching assistant, and assistant to dean of men, University of Wisconsin, 1935-39; research assistant, Ohio State University, 1939-40; assistant professor, Pennsylvania State College, 1940-42; chief rent examiner, Office of Price Administration, September-November 1942; Chief of Program Appraisal Division, War Food Administration, 1942-44; appointed agricultural economist in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Paris, October 21, 1944; agricultural attaché at Rome, April 8, 1946.

Nathan B. Salant: Scranton, Pa., July 28, 1910; Suffolk Law School; Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science; Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, master of science; assistant chief of division, Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Cairo, September 14, 1945; at Rome, April 10, 1946; assistant agricultural attaché at Rome, November 13, 1946.

Robert A. Brand: Norwich, Conn., November 5, 1920; Norwich Free Academy graduate; University of Connecticut, bachelor of arts, 1941; production expeditor with electric boat company, 1941-42; United States Army, 1942-46, captain, overseas service; appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service, July 19, 1946; to the Department, August 14, 1946.

MEXICO

Jacobs B. Gibbs: Columbia, Mo., November 5, 1900; University High School graduate; University of Missouri, bachelor of science

1924; Columbia, master of arts 1930, graduate work 1939-40; United States Army, 1924-40, captain; junior statistician 1924-25, assistant statistician 1925-29, associate statistician 1930, assistant agricultural commissioner, 1930-39, international commodity specialist 1939-45, Department of Agriculture; chairman and secretary of Combined Food Boards Commission; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service auxiliary and assigned at Mexico City, January 22, 1945.

Don Stoops: Roosevelt, Okla., August 2, 1917; Roosevelt High School graduate; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, bachelor of science, 1940; Ohio State University, graduate work 1940-41; Department of Agriculture Graduate School, 1941; junior agricultural economist, Department of Agriculture, 1941-42; appointed junior agricultural analyst at Buenos Aires, January 14, 1942; furlough for military service, December 6, 1943-January 1946; assistant agricultural attaché, January 13, 1946; at Mexico City, January 20, 1946.

John N. Smith: Mutoto, Belgian Congo, of American parents, October 10, 1916; Stuart Robinson (Blackey, Ky.) High School graduate; Davidson College, bachelor of arts, 1938; University of North Carolina, master of arts 1940; teacher in high school 1938-39; United States Army 1940-46, major, overseas service; appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service, July 25, 1946; to the Department, September 21, 1946; Foreign Service officer of class 6, November 13, 1946.

NETHERLANDS

Dr. William H. Riddell: Fort Langley, British Columbia, June 19, 1897; naturalized 1940; King Edward High School (Vancouver) graduate; University of British Columbia, bachelor of science and agriculture 1922; University of Minnesota, master of science 1924, doctor of philosophy 1932; graduate fellow and instructor, University of Minnesota, 1926-29; assistant and associate professor, Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, 1929-39; professor and head of dairy department, University of Arizona, 1939-44; United States Army, May to December 1944, captain; appointed agricultural adviser in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned near the Government of the Netherlands, established in England November 21, 1944; agricultural attaché near the Government of the Netherlands established in England, May 3, 1945; at The Hague, August 29, 1945.

NORWAY

Abner K. Chestem: Decatur, Nebr., May 13, 1892; University of Nebraska, 1910-15; Nebraska State Board of Control 1915-17; United States Army 1917-19; farmer 1919-35; chairman county corn-hog association, 1934-35; with Department of Agriculture 1935-44; appointed agricultural adviser in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned near the Government of Norway established in England November 30, 1944; at Stockholm, February 5, 1945; at Calo, July 1, 1946.

PERU

Dr. Clarence A. Boonstra: Grand Rapids, Mich., January 5, 1914; Grand Rapids Christian High School graduate; Michigan State College, bachelor of science, 1936; Louisiana State University, master of arts, 1937, doctor of philosophy, 1942; auditor for milling company, 1937-38; economist, State agricultural experiment station January to September 1938, Department of Agriculture 1938-39; instructor, Louisiana State University, 1939-42; information and administrative officer, Department of Agriculture, 1942-43; appointed agricultural economist at Habana, February 13, 1943; assistant agricultural attaché at Habana, October 14, 1943; agricul-

tural attaché at Manila, October 19, 1945; agricultural attaché at Santiago, November 20, 1946.

PHILIPPINES

George H. Maness: Pauls Valley, Okla., May 26, 1913; Ada High School graduate; East Central State College, bachelor of arts, 1933; Universidad Nacional de Mexico, 1935; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, master of arts, 1936; private language study, Berlitz School of Languages, 1936; teacher of Spanish in high school, 1932-36; principal of high school, 1936-40; appointed Foreign Service clerk October 14, 1940; vice consul at Manáos October 26, 1940; at Rio de Janeiro April 19, 1943; at Sao Paulo, temporary, January 23, 1945; assistant agricultural economist at Chungking February 28, 1945; vice consul and administrative assistant at Nanjing May 15, 1946; at Manila October 2, 1946.

POLAND

Edwin R. Raymond: Evansville, Ind., March 26, 1896; Ohio State University, bachelor of science, 1919; department manager on farm, 1919-20; county agent, Ohio State University, 1920-29; district manager of nitrate bureau, 1929-32; salesman for insurance company, 1932-33; farm appraiser for Federal land bank, 1933; field representative, 1933-40; assistant to general agent, 1939-40, Farm Credit Administration; secretary, Production Credit Corporation, 1940-45; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to the Department May 5, 1945; agricultural attaché at Warsaw May 24, 1945.

SPAIN

Joseph E. Wiedenmayer: Newark, N. J., February 16, 1905; Montclair Military Academy; Cornell, bachelor of science, 1929; administrative assistant, 1929-38, assistant manager, 1938-43 for dairy products company; officer and director of association of ice cream manufacturers, 1938-43; administrator of aviation education bureau New Jersey Council, National Aeronautic Association, 1939-41; president and public relations director of aviation ground-school program, 1941-43; member of board of directors and chairman of aviation committee, American Red Cross in New Jersey, 1941-43; aviation adviser, Civilian Aide Commission, United States Army Air Forces, 1942; United States Civil Air Patrol, 1942-43, captain; business analyst, 1943, assistant head of fluid-milk section, 1943-44, Office of Price Administration; at Montevideo September 10, 1944; agricultural officer at Montevideo August 1, 1945; senior economic analyst at Madrid September 14, 1945.

SWEDEN (ALSO FINLAND)

Eric Englund: Trehörningsjö, Sweden, April 1, 1893; naturalized, 1917; school in Sweden; high-school graduate; Oregon State College, bachelor of science, 1918; University of Oregon, bachelor of arts, 1919; University of Wisconsin, master of science, 1919; Harvard, doctor of philosophy, 1936; United States Army, 1918, second lieutenant; field agent, Department of Agriculture, 1919; assistant, University of Wisconsin, 1919-21; professor of agriculture and economics, Kansas State College, 1921-26; divisional head and assistant chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1937-42; branch chief, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, 1942-46; adviser, First West Indian Conference, Barbados, British West Indies, 1944, Second West Indian Conference, St. Thomas, V. I., 1946; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service and assigned to Helsinki and Stockholm, September 2, 1946.

SWITZERLAND

Dr. Einar Jensen: Copenhagen, Denmark, January 3, 1896; naturalized; Royal Agricultural College, University of Copenhagen; University of Wisconsin; University of Minnesota; Harvard, doctor of philosophy; gen-

eral manager of agricultural laboratories, Copenhagen; lecturer, University of Alberta; agricultural economist, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1933-34; analyst, Board of Economic Warfare; international commodity specialist, Department of Agriculture; agricultural economist, United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, 1944-45; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned at Bern, August 14, 1945.

TURKEY

Charles R. Enlow: Spivey, Kans., June 28, 1893; Harper High School graduate; Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, bachelor of science 1920, master of science 1927; United States Army, 1917-19, second lieutenant, overseas service; teacher and athletic coach, 1921-23; assistant agronomist, Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1924-27; agronomist, 1927-33, chief agronomist, 1933-45, Department of Agriculture; United States delegate, Fourth International Grassland Congress, London, 1937; appointed agricultural attaché in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to the Department April 3, 1945; at Pretoria, May 7, 1945.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Joseph L. Dougherty: Newcomerstown, Ohio, March 13, 1907; Newcomerstown High School graduate; Ohio State University, bachelor of science in agriculture 1930; manager of farm, 1930-33; assistant soil conservationist, 1933-43; superintendent of rubber plantation in Haiti, 1943-44; appointed agricultural analyst at Porto Alegre, August 26, 1944; assistant agricultural attaché at Ottawa, February 18, 1946.

U. S. S. R.

Joseph J. Bulik: New York, N. Y., February 25, 1916; High School of Commerce graduate; University of Wyoming, bachelor of science 1937; University of Minnesota, master of science 1939; research assistant, University of Minnesota, 1937-39; section chief, Bureau of the Census, 1940-42; agricultural economist, Department of Agriculture, 1942-44; secretary of commission, 1942-44, and Soviet liaison officer, 1943, Combined Food Board; appointed attaché at Moscow, March 30, 1944; agricultural attaché at Moscow, November 13, 1946.

VENEZUELA

James H. Kempton: Cincinnati, Ohio, April 14, 1891; high-school graduate; University of Minnesota, 1908-09; special agent, 1907-08, 1908-09, assistant plant breeder, 1910-24, assistant, associate, and senior botanist, 1924-42, Department of Agriculture; appointed agricultural adviser at Caracas, September 7, 1942; adviser, United States delegation, Third Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Caracas, 1945; agricultural attaché at Caracas, May 15, 1946.

YUGOSLAVIA (ALSO ALBANIA)

William Kling: New York, N. Y., May 8, 1915; James Monroe High School graduate; College of the City of New York, bachelor of social sciences 1937; Massachusetts State College, master of science 1938; Clark University, doctor of philosophy, 1943; graduate assistant, Massachusetts State College, 1937-38, Clark University, 1938-39; instructor, College of the City of New York, 1939-40; agricultural economist, United States Department of Agriculture and War Food Administration, 1940-45; appointed agricultural officer in the Foreign Service Auxiliary and assigned to the Department, April 2, 1945; at Bucharest, Budapest, Belgrade, Sofia, and Tirana, May 14, 1945; agricultural attaché at Belgrade in addition to duties as agricultural officer at Bucharest, Budapest, Sofia, and Tirana, April 17, 1946.

Foreign Service officers, staff officers, and reserve officers assigned to Foreign Service posts for full-time agricultural work as of June 30, 1947

Country	Name	Title	Salary	Allowances ¹	Total
Argentina	Arthur T. Thompson (FSO) ²	Attaché	\$8,000	\$3,076	\$20,696
	Richard O. Cromwell (FSS)	Assistant attaché	7,380	2,240	
Australia	L. V. Toyne (FSS)	Attaché	15,380	5,316	7,761
	Frederick A. Motz (FSS)	Adviser	6,660	1,101	
Austria	Richard A. O. Schwartz (FSS)	Assistant attaché	4,500	382	14,548
	Jerome T. Gaspard (FSR)	Attaché	13,620	628	
Belgium	Guy L. Bush (FSS)	do	7,500	3,580	11,080
	Dwight R. Bishop (FSS)	Assistant attaché	8,580	4,610	
Brazil	Jack E. Conner (FSO)	Third secretary, vice consul	4,860	2,280	25,645
			3,500	1,815	
Canada	Meade T. Foster (FSR)	Attaché	16,940	8,705	19,725
	Roy O. Westley (FSS)	Assistant attaché	6,900	1,965	
Chile	Quentin Bates (FSO)	Third secretary, vice consul	5,760	None	4,320
	Eugene V. Harris (FSS)	do	3,900	1,200	
China	Owen L. Dawson (FSO)	Assistant attaché	16,560	3,165	25,610
	Alexander Peaslee (FSO)	Vice consul	3,240	1,080	
Colombia	Willard O. Brown (FSO)	Attaché	10,350	3,060	14,180
	Kenneth Wernimont (FSR)	do	3,500	2,700	
Costa Rica (also Nicaragua and Panama)	John G. Gossett (FSO)	Third secretary, vice consul	6,000	(³)	10,280
	Dr. Theo. J. Grant (FSS)	do	19,850	5,760	
Cuba	Dr. Paul G. Minneman (FSO)	Attaché	10,500	3,680	37,282
	Dr. Louis C. Nolan (FSS)	Assistant attaché	7,380	2,900	
Denmark	Philip M. Davenport (FSO)	Second secretary consul	10,350	5,406	12,370
	John L. Stewart (FSR)	do	7,860	4,060	
Dominican Republic	Rollo Stovall (FSS)	Second secretary consul	6,000	3,606	9,045
	Hugo W. Alberts (FSS)	Attaché	24,210	13,072	
Ecuador	Robert V. Elwood (FSS)	Economic analyst	8,900	3,470	9,106
	John L. Stewart (FSR)	Attaché	5,220	1,825	
Egypt (also Palestine, Trans-jordan, Sudan, and Ethiopia)	Hugo W. Alberts (FSS)	do	7,380	1,726	8,747
	Robert V. Elwood (FSS)	Assistant attaché	6,120	2,627	
France	Harry L. Zerbel (FSO)	Attaché	8,900	4,240	25,690
	Dr. Ben H. Thibodeaux (FSR)	Third secretary, vice consul	4,300	2,640	
Germany	Richard C. Desmond (FSO)	do	3,900	1,710	10,940
	Harry L. Zerbel (FSO)	Assistant attaché	17,100	8,590	
Great Britain (also Eire)	Roy I. Kimmel (FSS)	do	9,120	1,820	33,804
	Paul C. Nyhus (FSO)	Attaché	10,700	4,513	
Greece	Fred Taylor (FSS)	Commissioner	7,860	2,204	9,096
	Irven M. Eitreim (FSO)	Second secretary, vice consul	6,000	2,527	
Guatemala (also Honduras and El Salvador)	Jay G. Diamond (FSS)	Attaché	24,560	9,244	7,140
	Graham S. Quate (FSS)	do	7,140	None	
Haiti	Edward L. Tanner (FSS)	do	7,140	2,760	9,900
	Harry LeBovit (FSS)	Assistant attaché	6,660	2,436	
Hungary	Dr. Clifford Taylor (FSO)	Attaché	5,220	3,540	8,760
	Cleveland B. McKnight (FSO)	Secretary	12,000	(³)	
India	Harry W. Spielman (FSO)	Consul	4,500	1,680	27,385
	H. G. Bolster (FSR)	do	6,000	3,205	
Iran	Dr. Howard R. Cottam (FSR)	Attaché	22,500	4,885	10,720
	Nathan B. Salant (FSS)	do	6,900	3,820	
Italy	Robert A. Brand (FSO)	Assistant attaché	7,900	2,857	24,349
	H. G. Bolster (FSR)	Third secretary, vice consul	6,660	2,220	
Mexico	Jay G. Diamond (FSS)	do	3,500	1,212	18,060
	Don Stoops (FSS)	Attaché	8,900	3,561	
Netherlands	J. Newton Smith (FSO)	Assistant attaché	4,900	2,100	25,861
	Dr. Wm. H. Riddell (FSR)	Third secretary, vice consul	4,300	2,100	
Norway	Abner Chestem (FSS)	Attaché	18,100	7,761	11,340
	Dr. Clarence Boonstra (FSO)	do	7,900	3,440	
Peru	Hubert Maness (FSS)	Adviser	7,330	2,019	9,349
	Edwin R. Raymond (FSR)	Attaché	6,000	1,880	
Poland	Joseph Wledemeyer (FSS)	Assistant attaché	4,500	1,400	5,900
	Erick Englund (FSR)	Attaché	7,800	853	
Spain	Charles R. Enlow (FSR)	Assistant attaché	6,120	1,430	8,653
	Dr. Einar Jensen (FSS)	Attaché	10,000	4,240	
Sweden (also Finland)	Charles R. Enlow (FSR)	do	7,380	4,570	14,240
	Joseph L. Doughterty (FSO)	do	8,900	(³)	
Switzerland	Joseph J. Bullock (FSR)	do	6,000	(³)	11,950
	James H. Kempton (FSS)	do	5,300	2,660	
Turkey	William Kling (FSR)	do	8,820	7,140	15,960
	Union of South Africa	do	6,300	4,304	
U. S. S. R.	En route to post				10,604
	Training, Department of Agriculture				
Venezuela	Report not yet received				8,900
	Yugoslavia				

¹ Allowances include cost of living and rental, when officers are entitled thereto, based on annual rates last reported by posts as having been established for each individual during the fiscal year 1947.

² FSO: Foreign Service officer; FSS: Foreign Service staff; FSR: Foreign Service Reserve.

³ En route to post.

⁴ Training, Department of Agriculture.

⁵ Report not yet received.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, one of the surprising developments in the debate on this measure is the irresponsible character of some of the statements made here on the floor.

The gentleman from Ohio who has just left the floor said that if the Department of State were put in the charge of real Americans we would accomplish something. This is the first time I have heard General Marshall charged with not being a real American. I am certain the House listened to the statement with astonishment.

Yesterday we heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in the same vein, make a still more astonishing statement. He said he wondered if the United States had any real representation at all in the Department of State. It was so absurd that I thought I must have misunderstood him, but I note he has it in the RECORD this morning.

I want to ask you, my friends, what do you think of the serious statement made here on the floor and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the United States has no representation at all in the Department of State?

The gentleman from New York has a favorite phrase which he uses continually on the floor, "It is ridiculous." That phrase is certainly applicable here. The statement that he wonders if the United States has any representation at all in the State Department is ridiculous. What credence can be given to any argument prefaced by such a statement as that?

And he supports that absurd statement by argument just as absurd. He would have the world believe that the State Department is honeycombed with Communists and communism.

But in endeavoring to support charges that the State Department is employing Communists by advancing the highly novel argument that it has declined to employ two Communists, we are running true to form.

In the memorable effort to impeach the WPA in which the gentleman from New York was one of the leaders, and which incidentally, after an investigation lasting for months, completely exonerated the WPA of every charge, a Negro was brought down from New York who had been taken to Russia, from whence after a 6 months' course in street fighting and other subversive activities he was returned and planted in New York to await developments. There was no question about the trip to Russia and its purpose. And a facsimile of the man's membership card as a Communist was printed in the hearings—an unprecedented procedure. The only hitch was that the man had never worked for WPA, had never received any WPA benefits, and had never had any connection of any kind with WPA at any time. Yet he was

brought down to Washington at the expense of the Government and testified before the committee and his testimony was printed in the hearings to prove that WPA was infested with Communists.

And here again when the charge is that the State Department is infested with Communists, the cases of two men who have never been identified with the work of the State Department in any way, case 99 and case 100, are submitted as proof. That is a fair sample of the logic and the tactics employed in an attempt to convince the American people and foreign governments that the American State Department is not American at all—that it is in charge of men who are not true Americans and that its employees are Communists seeking to undermine our form of government. Mr. Chairman, that is too high a price to pay for political advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it is not necessary for me to take a position against communism or against the employment of Communists in Government positions. In the last Congress we had identically the same situation we have here. It was charged that there were three men in the Government who had Communistic leanings or were under Communistic influence. We took prompt action. I appointed a special subcommittee to investigate. And on the findings of the subcommittee we denied them their salaries. The Supreme Court intervened and awarded them back salary but their position was untenable and they have had no position or connection with the Government since that time.

The committee still has the authority to go into any Department and bring any employee up here and investigate him, and if the situation warrants, certify the evidence to the Justice Department. If there are Communists in the Department of State, why does not the committee bring them up here for questioning? The chairman of the committee cites the McCarran amendment and says the Secretary of State can arbitrarily fire anybody in his Department. As a matter of fact, the Secretary has exercised his authority under that law, and has had before him all the evidence adduced in an FBI investigation, and has acted on every case submitted.

But the Committee on Appropriations has not exercised its authority. It has not brought anybody up here or provided a subcommittee to look into these sensational charges. It has had FBI men investigating the employees of the State Department for months under instructions to produce evidence to convict any Communist found down there. After intensive screening of every employee of the Department by the ablest investigators to be found anywhere, they have produced no evidence that would warrant the committee in bringing anyone up here for questioning or certifying evidence to the Secretary of State or the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. CANNON. Please let me conclude this statement and I shall be glad to yield.

Let us take another of the cases cited by the gentleman from New York. He brings up the case of No. 9, and in reading from page 190 leaves little doubt as to No. 9's disloyalty. No. 9 is apparently a dangerous character. But he did not refer to page 190 of the record where it is pointed out that No. 9 served for 3 years in the United States Army and received the Legion of Merit for his services. Part of the citation reads "by his resourcefulness, ingenuity, and dynamic energy, broad vision, and high efficiency." No. 9 "reflected great credit upon himself and the military service." No. 9 was also made a knight officer of the crown of Italy for his outstanding military service. It was surprising that in the charges made here this pertinent evidence has been overlooked.

The gentleman also read from page 182 of the record relating to case No. 52 as evidence of subversive disloyalty in the State Department. You will find, however, on page 190 that he considers No. 52 ineligible for his high diplomatic post on the basis of charges attributed to a high OSS official. That official has reported to the State Department that he has never made any such charges, and has never previously heard of them and that he was falsely quoted.

So far as Hamilton Robinson is concerned, notwithstanding the unsupported charges made against him, we can be safely guided by the opinion of Assistant Secretary of State John E. Peurifoy. I mention Jack Peurifoy because he is referred to by every member of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, on both sides of the table, in words of the highest praise. And knowing him as the Members of the House do I think all will agree that he deserves everything said about him. And he is free to say that he has every confidence in Mr. Robinson's competence and ability and in his absolute loyalty. And nothing is to be found on any of the pages of the record which have been cited here on the floor to cast any doubt on Mr. Peurifoy's judgment in the matter.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is the gentleman from Missouri telling the Congress there are no Communists in the State Department?

Mr. CANNON. If I thought there were I would insist on calling them up as we did here in the last Congress and firing them. If the gentleman believes there are Communists in the Department why does he not do that?

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

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

Mr. KEEFE. I am rather intrigued by the statement of the gentleman that in the last Congress the Appropriations Committee called some people up who were alleged to be Communists and fired three of them. I am a member of that committee and I never heard of any such procedure as that at all.

Mr. CANNON. We denied them their salaries.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman referring to the work of the Kerr committee, of which I was a member?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. KEEFE. That is an entirely different situation than what you have placed in the Record by your statement and the gentleman well knows it and I shall answer you in a few minutes.

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

Mr. CANNON. I would like to ask for five additional minutes, Mr. Chairman, so that the gentleman can answer me now.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to tell me wherein the situation differs from the situation in the last Congress? It is charged that men in the State Department are Communists, and you have not done anything about it except to talk. In the last Congress when it was charged that employees of the Government were Communists, we called them up here and investigated them and refused to appropriate money for their salaries. The Supreme Court held they were entitled to back pay but we got rid of them. And the Committee on Appropriations can take action which will rid the Government of any disloyal employees whenever it can produce the evidence to sustain the charges.

Mr. KEEFE. I will answer the gentleman in a moment in my own time and I think you will be glad to stay here and listen. If you do, you will get some enlightenment because I was a member of that committee.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. I appointed the gentleman on the committee myself.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad you did.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman came in here and recommended that we take their salaries from them, and we did, and, although the Supreme Court held it to be unconstitutional, they have never held any office under the Government from that day to this. But we do not have to deny the salaries of disloyal employees to get rid of them. If the Committee on Appropriations will produce the evidence, Secretary Marshall will do the rest.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I would like to advise the gentleman that I happen to be a member of the subcommittee on the State Department of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

If the gentleman wants to know some of the facts regarding Communists in the State Department and will consult some of us privately he can find out. Unfortunately, I cannot reveal here, and no responsible American would reveal, some of the situations which we found. It would make us look too bad before the world. After all, the State Department must deal with other nations and we would like them to have some confidence in us.

Mr. CANNON. Whenever it is disclosed that there is a traitor anywhere in any department, whether the State Department or any other department of the Government, he should be promptly discharged and properly dealt with. And it is the duty of any loyal citizen to divulge any information which might lead to the apprehension of such persons.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman please consult some of the members of our subcommittee?

Mr. CANNON. There is no reason why the gentleman should not tell us and why he should not disclose to the Committee on Appropriations or other appropriate committee, in executive session if he prefers, the name of any employee he believes to be engaged in subversive activities.

Mr. JUDD. We got rid of a good many more than has been publicized. The thing would look too bad if the whole story went abroad. I can repeat that a great deal has already been accomplished.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman's committee has been so successful in getting rid of Communists why has it left in the Department of State the Communists of whom the gentleman from New York has been complaining?

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has had the best FBI operatives obtainable at work on an exhaustive investigation of the State Department with instructions to ferret out any possible Communist in the employ of the Department. After months of investigation they have been unable to produce evidence which would justify the committee in bringing anyone up here for questioning or even appointing a subcommittee to handle such cases, or which would warrant the certification of such cases to the attention of the Secretary of State.

The cases I have cited here are a fair sample of the character of proof offered to show that there are Communists in the Department or that it is in charge of men who are not true Americans or that the United States has no representation at all in the State Department. It is not necessary to defend such men as Cordell Hull, James F. Byrnes, or General Marshall. No one believes that they would tolerate for an instant such a situation as has been charged here on this floor.

In these unsupported charges we have reached a new era in political partisanship.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the amazing statement made by the gentleman from Missouri, I feel that the House should have a fact or two. I am wondering how the gentleman voted when the question was presented to us to pay these people whose salaries had been cut out by the Congress after a Supreme Court judgment which was rendered in my opinion improperly and without fair consideration.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I voted to cut out their salary and fire them. When the ques-

tion came before us later as to whether we would follow the Constitution of the United States, I voted to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. TABER. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. The gentleman voted to pay those salaries after voting that they should not be paid.

I just want to tell you that I do not go off half-cocked. The investigations of the Appropriations Committee indicated a very large number of Communists on the rolls of the State Department. The very least that they have there now is 14, and those cases, instead of resulting in immediate dismissal as the interests of the United States required, have been dragged on and dragged on for 6, and 8, and 10 months. I do not know whether anyone is entitled to wonder whether we are getting American representation in the State Department when that sort of people and their cases are not disposed of and they are not discharged in 8 and 10 months, but for my own part I believe that the interest of the United States requires that the State Department be clean, that it be loyal. Only just the other day we were given the picture of a blond United States Embassy "gal" over in Moscow in a strategic position going off and getting married to a Russian and then admitting her preference for Russia. I quoted four or five cases here yesterday; I described them. They are in the hearings. They begin at page 177 and run through to page 186.

They still have 13 cases of that kind pending and of those cases I do not believe a single one of them is loyal. On top of that they have employed people whose record according to their own files is not such that any loyal American would trust them.

I do not know how much longer the people of the United States can stand it to have such things as that go on in the State Department. We are not going to inspire the rest of the world with confidence in our foreign policy as long as we go ahead in this ridiculous way.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that because Assistant Secretaries of State and heads of departments are obliged to spend so much time going about the country lecturing on the Marshall plan they cannot know what is going on in their own departments in Washington?

Mr. TABER. Well, I think it is a case of too much fear. They are afraid that they will offend people who are inclined to be liberal. They call themselves liberals. Oftentimes they get themselves out so far that they are absolutely a menace to the United States.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the outburst of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is indeed characteristic, but I am astounded that when he ought to be in a position to give this Congress the facts and the truth he would so garble his statement a reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find difficulty in ascertaining the truth. The substance of his complaint is that the present chairman of the Appropriations Committee made a charge on the floor that certain Communists were retained in employment in the State Department. After giving great praise to General Marshall, dragging poor General Marshall into the situation, he rises up, pointing to himself as a former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and exclaims that—

In the last Congress when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee we did something about it. Why have they not done something about it now? We brought these Communists up here and we fired them, we took them off the pay roll. Why have you not done it?

Did you hear him say that in substance?

What a pitiful statement in view of the facts. To some of you gentlemen who were not here, let me tell you the facts. In the last Congress and in several before that, since I have been a Member of the House, year after year when appropriation bills came before the House someone would offer an amendment to the appropriation bill containing a proviso that none of the funds should be used to pay the salary of this person or that person or the other person, naming them in the appropriation bill. Year after year appropriation bills were tied up with that sort of proviso. I had the privilege of standing here on the floor myself and making the suggestion that if there were people that were accused of having Communist affiliations in any department of government, why would it not be a good thing to set up a committee in the Committee on Appropriations and give these people an opportunity to be heard. That was done. The Speaker was authorized to appoint such a committee as a result of action of this House. Such a committee was appointed under the chairmanship of my very dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR. There served on that committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Lane Powers, and myself. Pursuant to that mandate we brought certain people who had been charged with having communistic affiliations before the committee to give them an opportunity to answer the charges that had been leveled against them. Then, what happened? We took three people and held extensive hearings. One involved a man by the name of Robert Lovett, another involved a man by the name of Dodd, and another involved a gentleman by the name of Watson. The latter two were employed by the Federal Communications Commission. As a result of those hearings, the KERR committee voted unanimously to

report back to this Congress that Federal funds should not be used to pay the salaries of such people. The House passed such an amendment on an appropriation bill, and it went over to the other body, then in control of the Democrats, whom the gentleman from Missouri represents.

The contention was made that the House was usurping the authority of the executive and had in effect passed a bill of attainder and that the action of the House was unconstitutional, and so forth. So, that appropriation bill, as you will recall, was tied up until it got almost to the very last day. Finally, as the result of the influence of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Woodrum, we finally agreed upon a compromise which provided that those people would go off the pay roll unless the then President, President Roosevelt, reappointed them to their jobs by a certain date. The President did not veto that bill, but issued a statement on it in which he said to the departments of Government and to the judiciary to pay no attention to the action of Congress; that the action of the Congress was unconstitutional. The then Attorney General, Francis Biddle, rendered an opinion and held that he could not defend the action of Congress because he felt that our action was unconstitutional. So, they did not fire these three people at all. They stayed on their jobs. The Comptroller refused to approve payment of their salaries. They started suit in the Court of Claims against the Government of the United States for their pay. And, who defended the action of the Congress? The most unusual thing happened, perhaps, in the history of the Congress. We had no Attorney General to defend the action of Congress, and this Congress provided, by resolution, for the appointment of its own counsel to represent the Congress in those suits by these three people, whom the executive department had refused to fire in defiance of the Congress. That case was heard in the Court of Claims, and the Congress was represented by its own counsel. The Court of Claims sustained the claims of these three men and the cases went to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States in effect held that the Congress could not do the very thing that the gentleman from Missouri is here asking that the Congress do. So we went through all that effort and spent all that money in a vain attempt to get three people off the pay roll that a committee of this Congress and the Congress itself had declared were unfit to serve upon the pay roll of the Government.

There followed the McCarran rider, which in effect gave the departments themselves the right, after suitable investigation by the Civil Service Commission, to dismiss those people who were considered not to be good security risks. So when the gentleman from Missouri makes the speech he did this afternoon, he should get himself in accord with the facts of the situation and not have the charge made on the floor of the House that the Republican Party and the Republican Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished

gentleman from New York, are failing in their responsibility to get rid of the communism that exists in the State Department or any other department of Government.

I do not know how many Communists there are in the State Department, but I want you to know that when the gentleman from Missouri makes the bald statement that under his administration as chairman of that committee he got rid of three of them and challenges the present chairman to emulate him in doing the thing which he says he did, but which never took place at all, he is making a statement that is neither in accord with the facts nor in accord with simple, sound, common sense, and judgment as applied to the situation now at hand. I challenge the gentleman from Missouri or anybody else to dispute one single fact I have stated this afternoon. In view of these facts, I am sure the gentleman would feel compelled to stand up here on the floor and in good conscience state for the purposes of this record that he was in error in making the charges he made against the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the preceding discussion regarding the extent of communism in the State Department has been very interesting and informative. It is something which the Congress and the country should consider carefully. In my opinion the time has long since passed when those in charge of the executive departments, generally, and the State Department in particular, should hesitate to take bold and definite steps to rid their services once and for all of all Communists and their fellow travelers of every shade, tint, and variety.

In drafting the Mundt bill to establish a permanent and comprehensive United States information service abroad our subcommittee took positive and definite steps of an unprecedented nature in requiring that as a condition precedent for employment in our information service that all employees must first of all be checked and cleared for loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Speaker, this may mean that it will take a little longer to recruit the necessary staff for this all-important information campaign, but it will also mean that once the staff is recruited and trained we shall be represented in this branch of the service by men and women whose loyalty to the United States is above and beyond all question. I wish the time would speedily arrive when we could be sure that this status of things existed in the State Department, generally.

While I regret that the full amount of money requested by the State Department for this new information service was not made available by the Appropriations Committee, I nevertheless do

want to congratulate the subcommittee and its chairman, Mr. STEFAN, on the fact that they have recommended a substantial figure for the first year of this program's operation. I do not believe it is sufficient to do the job satisfactorily, but it is a substantial start. I hope the other body, after hearing testimony as to what will be entailed by the reductions made by the Appropriations Committee, will restore all or part of these cuts. In fact, in view of the rapidly changing foreign situation, I dare to hope the other body will even increase beyond the State Department's estimate the amount of money to be utilized for this significant peace-preserving program in the next fiscal year.

Above all, I hope the deficiency committee of this House will act promptly to bring in a deficiency appropriation to be used during the remainder of the current fiscal year so that the vital work of recruiting adequate and efficient personnel can be started promptly and so that we can begin locating the office space and the technical facilities abroad which will be required to put this information program into full-scale operation immediately after next July 1. In fact, in my opinion it is simply common sense, good prudence, and action in our own self-interest to appropriate money within the next week or so to let the American information program get under way within the next 30 days to begin doing a man-sized job of publicity in those areas of the world which are today in such critical condition. If, for example, we fail to provide for prompt action in Italy and find that the Communists have won the election the middle of next month, we may never be able to forgive ourselves for our tardiness and our temerity.

Mr. Allen, the new Director of the United States Information and Educational Service, has taken over the administration of that Service only this week. A number of us are meeting with him in a planning session early next week. It is expected that his rich background of experience in the Foreign Service will provide him with knowledge which will stimulate him to move into action promptly and positively in today's critical areas. But without funds he can do little and without a deficiency appropriation, now, the Voice of America must remain a muffled whisper in a world in which it should be a strident call for decency. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Deficiency Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee will measure up to expectations and come to us very soon with recommendations for the immediate appropriation of funds to put our new information service into operation with emphasis and with efficiency.

Now for the first time in American history we have the machinery available under the terms of the so-called Mundt bill to wage a peace and to implement the leadership which only the United States is capable of giving a distraught and a distracted world. I have every confidence that this Congress will not fail to provide the money power required to put this machinery into action. I hope that we can do it promptly and adequately. The forces of aggression are moving

rapidly and we must step up our action and increase our efforts in the field of information abroad if we are to prevent the eventuality of confronting a world which has been either coerced or corrupted against us. A few extra dollars spent within the next 5 or 6 months in getting the truth to the people abroad may well save us in the end many billions of dollars in war and the lives of many millions of human beings.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperation with the American Republics: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American Republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the act entitled, "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics," approved August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$150,000 for printing and binding; temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment; not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, interns, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States or the other American Republics; and the actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons, not United States Government employees, who may die while away from their homes under the authority of this appropriation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American Republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 600; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939; purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; rental of boats, \$3,900,000; and the Secretary of State, or such official as he may designate is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American Republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the pur-

poses of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, nonprofit institutions in the United States and the other American Republics, including the distribution of materials and other services in the fields of education and travel, arts and sciences, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema.

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

Mr. Chairman, I refer you to the hearings on this item, cooperation with the American Republics. I believe the program could be far more efficient than it is. Your representatives on this subcommittee in going over the budget for the State Department did not fail to point that out to the State Department. They are not doing the job the work calls for. I trust that the justifications next year will reflect some of the advice we gave them that I think is altogether to the point.

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret that we find it necessary to turn aside in this appropriations debate to discuss how much each party has done to get rid of the Communists, and other subversive elements in the public service.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee on the Civil Service, of which I was a member, appointed a subcommittee of three, consisting of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and myself, as chairman, to look into the question of what had been done about getting disloyal elements out of the Government service. A lot of talking had been done, but we decided to try to find out what had been done toward actually getting them off the pay roll, and to recommend some kind of machinery and procedures to screen employees and get them out without being unfair and doing an injustice to honest, loyal employees. As a result of our investigations, carried on behind closed doors and not in the newspapers, we made recommendations that led to the Presidential order many months ago setting up the Loyalty Board, in the Civil Service Commission which, with the cooperation of the FBI and under an appropriation made by the present Congress, is now engaged in a systematic, down-to-earth, honest-to-goodness, fair screening of the employees of our Government in an effort to separate the disloyal employees, who I am sure are only a small minority, from those who may be subject to suspicion, and to remove from the pay roll those found to be guilty of subversive acts or who are bad security risks.

A number have been fired or have resigned, so I understand, as a result of that investigation. I just thought that you would like to have that called to your attention.

A real job is being done when it comes to dealing with this question of communism or disloyalty to our Government. It is not a Democratic question or a

Republican question; it is an American question.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. Appropriations under this Act available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such expenses when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the fiscal year 1949 pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the fiscal year 1949.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: On page 30, after line 17 and before line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. No part of the sums appropriated by this title shall be used to pay any officer or employee who is found by the Department of State to be in violation of the Government policy set forth in Federal Personnel Manual, page C-2-27, by virtue of having participated directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or commodities for speculative purposes as distinguished from bona fide investment purchases."

NEED FOR RESTRICTING SPECULATORS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

MR. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, those of you who have been following the tremendous sums of money that have been expended by the Department of State in our foreign purchases which run into the billions of dollars should be tremendously concerned in the light of recent disclosures as to the effect of that particular activity in the State Department if we allow speculators to take any part, however small, in that program. I do not charge that there are any substantial number of people in the State Department who are engaged in speculative activities, but we know that some have in the past, and we know that our foreign-aid program is going to be seriously endangered unless it be honestly administered.

The Federal Government has a stated policy in its manual for all employees, which prohibits speculation by Federal officers and employees. This was promulgated in 1937. I have a letter here from President Truman in which he states:

It has always been my opinion that the policy set out by the letter of President Roosevelt to the President of the Civil Service Commission should be enforced, and that is what I have been trying to do.

This particular amendment would not do one thing more than to make it possible to enforce that particular policy which is presently contained in the Federal Personnel Manual. It is thus a matter of public knowledge open to all in the Government, but we have found that this policy is not being enforced. I include at this point the correspondence with the President and the Civil Service Commission on this subject:

JANUARY 17, 1948.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is copy of bill I have recently introduced to

prohibit speculation by certain Government employees. In studying this matter I have come across a letter from President Roosevelt to the President of the Civil Service Commission dated April 22, 1937, in which the president stated it a matter of policy that no employee should be permitted to speculate in stocks, bonds, or commodities. On April 30, 1937, notice of this policy was forwarded to heads of departments and independent establishments. Copies of this letter of April 22, 1937, and the notice of April 30, 1937, are attached.

Since the statement of policy promulgated by President Roosevelt is somewhat broader than the bill I have introduced, and since it would be unnecessary to pass the bill if the policy were enforced, I would like to have made known to me the attitude of the Executive Department with respect to the policy enunciated by the letter and notice hereinbefore referred to. I would appreciate your informing me with respect to these matters.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE MACKINNON.

APRIL 22, 1937.

HON. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement.

I would appreciate it if you would take steps to make this known throughout the Government service.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1937.

To Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments:

In a letter dated April 22, 1937, the President requested the Commission to take steps to inform all officials and employees of the Government that speculation on their part or in their behalf in corporate stocks or bonds or in commodities is contrary to Government policy. The President said:

"I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement."

Accordingly, an official notice to this effect should be distributed to each officer under your jurisdiction, whether under the competitive civil service or not, for the information and guidance of the officials and employees therein.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

H. R. 4826

A bill to prohibit certain officers and employees of the United States from engaging in transactions involving contracts of sale of commodities for future delivery

Be it enacted, etc., That no officer or employee in the Executive Office of the President, the National Military Establishment, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and no member of the military or naval forces of the United States shall directly, or indirectly, through an organized commodity exchange, engage in any activity involving any contract of sale of any commodity for future delivery unless such activity is incident to the disposition of commodities grown or produced on land owned, rented, or leased by such officer or employee. As used in this section, the terms "contract of sale," "commodity," and "future delivery" shall have the same meaning as when used in the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates the first section of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years or by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the 30th day after the date of its enactment.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 20, 1948.

HON. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACKINNON: I appreciated very much your letter of the 17th with the attached bill.

It has always been my opinion that the policy set out by the letter of President Roosevelt to the President of the Civil Service Commission should be enforced and that is what I've been trying to do.

Of course, I have had no opportunity to study your bill and can't pass on it for that reason. I appreciate very much your calling it to my attention, however.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 17, 1948.

HON. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Attached hereto is notice directed to heads of departments and independent establishments dated April 30, 1937. Will you kindly advise me whether this policy is being presently enforced, and if not, when this policy was changed. If you have any subsequent directives upon this same subject, I would also appreciate very much to receive them.

I desire this information in connection with my pending bill to prohibit certain employees in the Federal Government from speculating in commodities. Your early attention to this matter will be highly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE MACKINNON.

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

HON. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MACKINNON: As the enclosures to your inquiry of January 17 show, the Commission by letter of April 30, 1937, transmitted to the heads of departments and independent establishments the letter of the President of April 22, 1937, as to speculation on the part of officers and employees of the Government. The Commission's letter stated that whether the employees were under the competitive civil service or not the President's letter should be brought to the attention of officials and employees for their information and guidance.

No jurisdiction was given the Commission to follow up on this letter; but the Commission, nevertheless, has done so by having included in the Federal Personnel Manual, on page C2-27, the following:

SPECULATION

"I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement." (Letter of the President to the Commission, dated April 22, 1937.)

This Federal Personnel Manual is a publication of the Commission which is sent to all agencies of the Government and is maintained on a current basis by transmittal letters from the Commission. In its own information pamphlet, which is given to each employee of the Commission, specific information to this effect appears.

Furthermore, the Commission is preparing a letter to go to all the departments and agencies referring to the letter of April 30, 1937, and calling their particular attention to this provision in the Federal Personnel Manual, advising them that it continues to be in full force and effect and that its provisions should again be brought to the attention of all officers and employees.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

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

Mr. MACKINNON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. The reason I did not make a point of order against the amendment is because I believe it is really a limitation, but I am wondering if the gentleman does not feel that would be quite restrictive. For instance, somebody in the employ of the Department and who has a farm might want to buy some corn or wheat as against a future crop. Would that affect him?

Mr. MACKINNON. No, I do not think so. I have gone into that matter quite thoroughly. Where he has a legitimate interest in it, where it is a hedging operation, it is not speculation.

I sincerely hope the Committee will give this very serious consideration. This proposed amendment only applies to the officers and employees in the Department of State and it is directed there because of the tremendous sums of money that are presently placed at their disposal to buy goods and materials for shipment to Europe. I feel it is absolutely essential that we throw every safeguard around this activity, to assure the American people that our foreign-aid program will be honestly administered and not in any way open to the charge that it is done for personal profit. If that condition arises, future support for the program will be jeopardized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because it is too restrictive. I do not believe an amendment like this should be in an appropriation bill. I believe it should be studied by the appropriate committee

and some legislation brought to the House for its full consideration for the protection of those who may be unfairly treated with this very restrictive amendment.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I interrupted the gentleman for the purpose of pointing out that there is a job to be done, undoubtedly, in the commodities-exchange markets, but I want to point out that the proper way to approach that would be through a strengthening of the possibilities in our already established commodity exchange authority, which is in the Department of Agriculture, and also the approach whereby we might get the business-conduct committees of the commodity exchanges themselves to operate more forcefully. I certainly know a wheat grower in my district would not like to restrict those who can buy in commodity exchanges. Even the Farmers' Union, which is certainly not a conservative organization, supports the commodity exchange. There is a job to be done here, but it cannot be done on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. Is it your thought that Government employees ought to be free to buy in a speculative market on commodity exchanges, notwithstanding the present policy that has been announced since 1937?

Mr. STEFAN. Let me answer that. Certainly we believe in the objectives of the amendment which the gentleman has offered. Of course we do not believe that a Government employee who has first-hand information of how much corn the Government is going to buy, how much grain or how much meat is going to be shipped overseas, should be in the speculative market. No Government employee who is in position to get information ahead of the general public should be in the market. We believe in the objectives of the gentleman's amendment but I do not believe this belongs in an appropriation bill. I think we should adopt separate legislation. I would be glad to support it. I think the gentleman is doing a service to the country in looking into the matter, but I suggest that he write some legislation so that we can act on it in the regular way.

Mr. HORAN. I share in the objectives of the gentleman's amendment, but what we should do is to strengthen these facilities against those who may be speculating. We have got to do that rather than exclude people from dealing in speculative commodities.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Minnesota is seeking to do, but the mechanics of it will encumber the audits of the General Accounting Office, will require that every voucher drawn against these millions of dollars appropriated herein will have to be covered by affidavits of the people receiving the money that they were not in a speculative position.

I think the amendment of our personnel acts or the Civil Service Act would do far more to correct the situation than could be done by adding an amendment to an appropriation bill which costs thousands and thousands of dollars to carry out.

Mr. STEFAN. I share the views of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations on this proposition. The United States, if we can believe what the Congress is discussing these days, especially over in the other body, together with what has happened in the last few months in the way of the purchase of basic commodities by the Federal Treasury, you might say operating through the agents of the Government, we are rapidly getting into a position where Government agencies operating primarily under the direction of the State Department will set up the greatest buying, selling, distributive, and allocating agency of all history. I refer to the operations under the Marshall plan. We have reached the point where the employees of various agencies of Government can spend weeks and months planning a buying campaign, and after all of the reports are in and everything is tied up ready for action the Secretary of Agriculture, for instance, can make a decision entirely on his own judgment which may cost our people literally hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars incident to the costs of living, or by reason of the inventories which they happen to have on hand; and that goes right down to the little farmer himself who produces these basic commodities.

I will give you an illustration. We have seen and heard about this so-called speculation in commodities during the last several months. We have seen the gyrations of the market up and down. We know that those economic operations blow across the capital structures of individuals just like physical storms blow across fields and villages and tear them all to pieces. Within the last few weeks the sugar industry of this country, as an illustration, operating in the open market, voluntarily reduced the price of sugar to the American consumer first from \$8.40 a hundred down to \$8, and then to \$7.75, making those reductions in the interest of decreased cost of living and for the benefit of the American people. After that second reduction, however, the sugar operators in Cuba came to the State Department and said: "Now, wait a minute! These reductions are hurting us, and we want you to support the market." The State Department and the Commodity Credit Corporation stepped into the picture and purchased a million tons of sugar from Cuba to support the market against 145,000,000 sugar consumers here in the United States and raised economic hell generally through the whole sugar industry here in the United States. That is the power of the State Department and Government employees carrying on transactions of that nature. That is why our friend has offered this amendment. If Govern-

ment employees are going to run the economy of this country and if Congress is going to permit loopholes whereby Government employees operating with inside information can raise these economic storms from time to time, you can bet your life our people are going to be economically bull-whipped all over the economic lot time and again, and you will have no stability in prices or cost of living or otherwise. Now, those are the actual difficulties we are up against in connection with considering this amendment. I do not know any way in which you are going to be able to legislate honesty and fair dealing at the hands of Government employees who have their special friends on the outside and who can tip them off to what is going to happen in these great economic movements when the departments of Government say what shall happen to this commodity price or that commodity price and so on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacKINNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MacKINNON) there were—ayes 6, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of district attorneys, and so forth: For salaries, travel, and other expenses of United States district attorneys, their regular assistants, and other employees, including the office expenses of United States district attorneys in Alaska, \$5,200,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to make a brief statement in respect to an item that has not been submitted in the appropriation bill which would continue the work of a special commission established by the State Department looking to the enactment of treaties with various countries in the North Atlantic, a work that has been conducted over a period of many years with formal discussions already had by representatives of the State Department with officials of Canada and Newfoundland.

The State Department for years has been working on this information in order that we might be able to effectuate a treaty among those whose nationals ply the North Atlantic fishing grounds so that in turn we might be able to conserve perhaps one of the greatest fishing areas in the whole world. When I tell you that the New England fisheries alone last year produced over 750,000,000 pounds of fish in 1947 and that the fishermen themselves received in wages from that production over \$50,000,000 I do not need to tell you of the importance that the fisheries play in the food emergency that we are facing. The fishing industry is an important one and we ought to give every consideration to it.

Last year, however, Congress included an appropriation of \$25,000 for the purpose of expanding the facilities of the State Department so that it could put its representatives to work in making a complete study of the over-all situation confronting the fishing industry in the North Atlantic, with the idea of coming

to some kind of an agreement not only with Canada and Newfoundland but with a number of other European countries whose nationals fish in the North Atlantic.

Now, with that appropriation last year of \$25,000 they have been able to make considerable progress. This year they had hoped to receive another appropriation of \$30,000 that the State Department recommended to the Bureau of the Budget, but the Bureau of the Budget struck it out entirely, and as the report says here, the activities have been liquidated. Well, here we find ourselves with an expenditure of \$25,000 for laying the groundwork for these international agreements relating to our fisheries, and all of a sudden we find the appropriations are cut off, and all the work that has been done has practically been of no value.

I have spoken about this to the members of the committee, whom I do not in any way blame for this situation, because it did not come up in the form of an item from the Bureau of the Budget, but realizing the value of such a treaty with these various governments whose nationals fish in the North Atlantic, we are hopeful that the other body will provide an appropriation in the bill when it gets over there as was recommended by the State Department. On the other hand, the members of the committee have assured me that they will give the matter very serious consideration when it goes to conference so that this very important work, that is so vital to conserving the fishing industry in the North Atlantic, will go forward. These are the greatest fishing banks in the world, and some international agreements should be entered into between this country and Canada, Newfoundland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and others interested in this very important industry.

I just wanted to say these few words as the bill was drawing to a close, with no criticism toward the committee, but hoping that when the bill goes to conference, the situation will be recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join in the remarks made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and if the other body should insert an amount in the bill, I hope that the members of the subcommittee who will be on the conference committee will weigh carefully the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and my own observations, and that in conference they will allow an amount to remain in the bill, assuming the other body puts in an amount, that will enable the carrying on of the activity which was authorized by appropriation for this fiscal year.

The fishing industry is the oldest industry on the Western Hemisphere; as a matter of fact, in a sense it antedated the settlement of the Western Hemisphere. It is an industry that covers all parts of our country; all along the North Atlantic, the Atlantic, the Gulf, the Pacific, and the Great Lakes. I am very pleased to note that recently those interested in the fishing industry, both management and labor, no matter where located

throughout the country, united in the interest of the justifiable strengthening and furtherance of this basic industry, not only in a proper way that Government should participate in, but in an educational program to show the people of this country and other parts of the world the value of fish as a food.

Within the last month or so I was pleased to have several gentlemen from the west coast call to see me in connection with a united proposal to urge the State Department to establish an Assistant Secretary of State for Fisheries, and to be contacted also by friends of mine interested in New England, I think that should be done. I say "united" because I refer to representatives of the fishing industry throughout the country, and in "industry" I include labor. I mean it in its broadest aspect.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The subcommittee in writing up the bill took that matter into consideration. We had some difficulty in approaching it in that way. I assure the gentleman that in all fisheries matters he certainly has a sympathetic member on that committee in the person of the gentleman from Washington. I do hope we can work things out. The gentleman and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] provide a service to one of our major industries by bringing this matter to the floor at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. I know of the gentleman's keen interest in the furtherance of the fishing industry, and I know that he as a member of the subcommittee and all the members of that subcommittee view the proper progress of the fishing industry in not merely a sympathetic but a most favorable light. I hope the State Department will recognize the importance of this big industry, the first one in the Western Hemisphere, by providing for it recognition which will give it dignity and strength by placing in charge of this matter an Assistant Secretary of State or some high official in the State Department, so that the fishing industry as a whole will be given that recognition to which it is entitled, which will be beneficial not only to the industry but to the people of our country.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts give some idea of the dollar value of the tonnage referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The fishermen themselves receive over \$50,000,000 as their share of the cost of production of 750,000,000 pounds of fish in the New England area alone. There is a total of over 4,500,000,000 pounds of fish produced in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I was getting at was this: We have a salmon fishery in the Alaskan waters which last year had a production of about \$66,000,000 in value. I am talking about dollar

value now. I was trying to get a comparison of that with the value of New England production.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the New England fisheries production is far in excess of that, because the \$50,000,000 is just wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the value of the entire fishing industry in this country is hundreds of millions of dollars. I suggest to my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] that he get the figures and put them in the RECORD. I think that would be a valuable piece of information.

Mr. Chairman, I join my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in regard to the particular item to which he has addressed himself, and I know he joins me in the hope that the State Department will take the necessary steps to see that an Assistant Secretary for Fisheries is appointed or that there is some high official of the State Department designated whose responsibility it will be to deal with those problems that are connected with the fishing industry.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Those of us who are interested in fisheries all know that the country north of us, Canada, has already made fisheries a part of the Cabinet set-up.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. They have given them what would be the equivalent of Cabinet status here.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They are constantly increasing the appropriations to maintain the fisheries, while we as a result of our action on appropriations last year and this year are actually decreasing the appropriations for the fisheries of this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to show that this question is one that is of interest to various sections of our country. This is an important industry. It employs hundreds of thousands of persons directly and indirectly. It is an industry which, in order to strengthen our economic system, should be encouraged in every way that it properly can be encouraged through legislative and governmental action.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my regret that the committee did not see fit to include in this bill an appropriation to continue the studies which were begun last year toward developing an international conservation agreement among interested countries on methods to conserve the Northwest Atlantic fisheries. A draft or treaty already exists. Studies conducted by William C. Herrington of the Fish and Wildlife Service published in 1901 clearly indicated that uncontrolled fishing was endangering the supply of haddock. There was also unmistakable evidence that conservation measures will soon be needed to protect the Atlantic halibut, cod, rosefish and other ground fish. A \$25,000 appropriation was made last year and an additional \$30,000 to the Department of State is needed this year to carry

on the work. In no other manner are funds available.

The National Fisheries Institute, the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, an organization of State conservation officials, have for some time been insisting that there be such an international conservation agreement. Labor unions, trade associations, boat owner groups, and a number of individual operators have for several years been concerned at the apparent reduction in quantity and size and the possibility of depletion of some of the more important species of fish in this area, which includes Georges Bank, the Grand Banks, the Nova Scotian Banks and other smaller fishing grounds north as far as Greenland and east to the Flemish Cap.

While I am on the subject of fisheries, I should also like to call attention to the bills which I have introduced—H. R. 4907 and H. R. 4909—which authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to make a comprehensive continuing study of the softshell clam and the methods of its conservation in the States of Maine and Massachusetts. The State of Maine is said to have derived a gross revenue of \$7,000,000 from the sale of its clams last year and we want to do everything possible to arrest depletion in existing productive beds, to restore beds formerly productive, and to develop new digging areas and new methods and techniques in digging, transplanting, and handling clams.

All of us have been much exercised in the last few years about existing and threatened meat shortages and high meat prices. Probably the best answer to these difficulties is to be found in more fish and I am decidedly of the opinion that we cannot be too industrious or too intelligent about dealing with the problem. Historically and currently the New England fisheries play a great part in the life of the district which I represent and in the life of the entire Nation.

I hope that the other body may make the appropriation lacking in this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, representing as I do the city of New Bedford and Woods Hole in the town of Falmouth, and Provincetown that has large fishery interests, I endorse the remarks of the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES and Mr. McCORMACK] in respect to an appropriation to continue the work of the State Department in its efforts to negotiate treaties with those countries whose nationals engage in fishery operations in the North Atlantic. New England produces practically one-sixth of the country's fresh-fish supply. The three leading ports of New England are Boston, Gloucester, and the city of New Bedford which is in my district. There was a total of over 77,000,000 pounds of fish landed in New Bedford during 1947 and the fishermen received nearly \$9,000,000 in wages as their share. There are 30,000 fishermen and shore workers with 800 vessels of five net tons and over, engaged in the fishery industry of New England. About 7,000 smaller craft also are employed in the catching of fishery products. The New England fishery industry is an important

industry from the standpoint of the food supply of this country. The North Atlantic is one of the greatest fishing grounds in the world. Fishermen, not only from the United States, but also from Canada, Newfoundland, Denmark, Norway, and other European countries fish in these waters. If the total catch of the nationals of all these countries were known, no doubt it would run a way over a billion pounds per year. The New England fishermen alone landed 750,000,000 pounds last year. Because of these large catches, it is greatly feared these fertile fishing grounds will be depleted unless conservation programs are put into effect at the earliest opportunity. The money that the State Department needs to carry on the work of formulating treaties with the countries I have mentioned so that steps can be taken toward conserving these great national resources should be given and I trust that the Congress this year will give the State Department the \$30,000 it has requested which was cut out by the Bureau of the Budget. These funds are needed so that this Department can continue the work already well advanced toward entering into an international agreement with other interested countries. This appropriation, if inserted in the Senate bill, will have my hearty support when it comes back into the House for consideration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the copy of a broadcast script of the State Department program sent over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on February 16, 1948. This came to me as an authentic description of what took place in the Voice of America program. I want to just read a part of this script for you, and then if you think that we ought to spend the taxpayers' money in this way, then I will have nothing further to say. I just feel like resigning from the Congress, because I think we are doing so many things that are just so silly and nonsensical that they do not make any sense at all.

Following is copy of a broadcast script of a State Department program sent over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on February 16, 1948:

KNOW NORTH AMERICA

(NBC Spanish)

Music: Up and under.

Announcer: The National Broadcasting Co. presents Know North America, a weekly program in which we relate the intellectual adventures of two travelers who are discovering the multiple surprises and present-day life in the United States.

Music: Up and out.

Train sounds—establish and to background.

Voice: What book is that?

Narrator: Inside the United States.

Voice: Illustrated?

Narrator: Yes, it has more than 300 photographs and several maps.

Voice: Let me see it.

Voice II: You are like children. You are more interested in the illustrations than in the text.

Voice: In books, yes, but in women I like the text better.

Narrator: Materialist.

Voice II: O. K. You win.

Voice: As always.

Voice II: You are a plastic master. [Laughs.]

Voice: When you want to flatter me, use plain words, I mean a simple one. Thanks for the plastic, but I warn you it does not sound good to me.

Voice II: You have a vivid imagination.

Narrator: Let's see, give me the book, and then go on with the discussion.

Voice: Wait, I want to see the pictures of Colorado.

Narrator: What for? We just left there.

Voice: No matter how long I live, I will never forget the city of Denver.

Narrator: Where, according to the chamber of commerce, the air vibrates like a bell.

Voice II: And it's the truth.

Voice: The mountain paths, the plains, the canyon, the Brown Palace Hotel, and that Zeit's Cafe, full of vivid memories of the conquest of the West.

Narrator: Its owner is the only survivor of Buffalo Bill's companions.

Voice II: Every time I heard him talk, I felt like a little boy.

Voice: That's exactly why I like these trips: one sees, hears, and touches.

Narrator: Not as much as you would like to.

Voice: Of course not. But these travels are a sort of—of moving geography.

Narrator: And of history with seasoning?

Voice: Well, yes; although sometimes we have to swallow it plain.

Narrator: Is that an insinuation?

Voice: If this man were a baseball player, he would call strikes curves.

Both laugh.

Narrator: All right, all right. One of these days I'll get my revenge.

Voice II: On us?

Voice: How?

Narrator: Forewarned is forearmed.

Train up and under again.

Narrator: Although we still have not covered the whole country—

Voice: We are not complaining.

Narrator: I suppose that by now you have a pretty good idea of the United States.

Voice II: Of course we have.

Voice: When I was in my country and I heard people talk about the Octopus of the North I trembled with rage. But now I'd give anything to have the octopus devour me.

Narrator: The great thing about this country is not its big cities, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, but the interior, the part a tourist almost never sees—above all, the interminable and unique West, where the most extraordinary things are commonplace, because nature is in a perpetual state of exaltation as if she wanted to outdo herself.

Voice: That's all true, and maybe very poetic, but, frankly, the thing that surprises me most about the United States is that everywhere one finds the same conveniences; there is no difference between New York and the smallest town.

Voice II (laughing): There is always a five and ten.

Narrator: And the price is always the same.

Voice: To me, who am a perfectly common man, civilization is comfort.

Narrator: That is the continual concern of the Government, to raise the standard of living in the whole country; because if some live better than others, there is inequality.

Voice: And inequality is not democracy.

Train whistle.

Conductor (going through car): Next stop, Cheyenne; next stop Cheyenne.

Voice: What is he saying?

Narrator: Cheyenne is the next stop.

Voice II: So soon?

Voice: Cheyenne is the capital of Wyoming, isn't it?

Narrator: Officially, but the inhabitants of Casper, Cheyenne's rival city, say that their town is the real capital of the State.

Music: Up and out.

Station noises, voices, etc. Up and in BG.

Voice: What does that sign say?

Voice II: Looks like verse.

Narrator: They are short, rhymed lines.

Voice: Go on, read it.

Narrator: Wait (as if reading):

Traveler, no more adventures.

Pitch your tent in those grand heights.

You are at the end of your journey.

You are in Wyoming paradise.

Voice: The part about the end of the journey would not concern me if there were Eve in this paradise.

Narrator: There are plenty to choose from.

Voice II: And all kinds of snakes—especially rattlesnakes.

Voice: Not for me.

Narrator: Ingrate. It was because of the serpent that the apple did not rot on the tree.

Voice: Hmmm! What a bad opinion you have of father Adam.

Mexican (slightly off): Gentlemen, I have a very nice little car at your disposal.

Voice II: This guy is a Mexican. Put away your dictionary—you won't need it here.

Narrator: In the West it is not necessary to speak English. The traces of Spain and Mexico will never be erased from these lands.

(Up.) Listen, fellow, where is your car?

Mexican: Right out here, señor.

Narrator: All right, let's go.

(As they walk.)

Voice II: Are you a Mexican or a gringo?

Mexican: Well, I'll tell you, señor, I am both. My parents were from Chihuahua, but I was born here and, so, I am a gringo, although I am far from a blond.

Voice: You can tell that you are a gringo, because your language is different from ours.

Mexican: But we'll understand each other because the word "dollar" is the same in all languages.

(Laughter into.)

Music: Up and under.

Narrator: Wyoming is the Bolivia of the United States. High, naked lands, exposed to the snow and the sleet. In territory, it is one of the vastest States of the Union, and nevertheless it has only 250,000 inhabitants, that is to say, one-tenth of the population of Brooklyn.

Voice: How can that be?

Narrator: That's just the way it is. In this immensity of marvelous mountains, there are only 327 inhabited towns, and of these 171 have fewer than a hundred souls.

Voice II: Then, this is a place of the future.

Narrator: Of course, it is. Wyoming is a colonizable State, it is a land of the future.

Voice II: How is it possible that this State can be so rich having so few people?

Narrator: Wyoming is an endless pasture, full of cows, sheep, and horses; two-thirds of its inhabitants are ranchers.

Voice: That is to say, in Wyoming the important thing isn't the people, but the cattle.

Narrator: In addition to meat and wool, there are great oil wells, there is gold and silver, and the production of beet sugar is greater than that of Utah and Colorado.

Voice: By the way, we are going to buy a pound of beet sugar, for a souvenir. It must be very pretty.

Narrator: Just like any other sugar.

Voice: Do you mean to say it is not red?

[Laughter.]

Narrator: Listen, if that is a joke, it is a bad one.

Voice: You laughed.

Narrator: And if you said it seriously, you deserve to be tarred and feathered.

Voice: What for? Every human being has the right to say a few stupid things. The difference between us is that you say them solemnly, while I—I can't think of the word.

Narrator: I can. I have it on the tip of my tongue, but I don't dare say it.

(Street noises, up and behind.)

Voice II: How many inhabitants has Cheyenne?

Narrator: Thirty-five thousand.

Voice II: Anyone would think that it had more. It seems like a big city.

Voice: The buildings are tall and modern.

Narrator: Here in the business section, yes; but on the other side the city is more primitive, more western.

Voice II: Cheyenne also had its tumultuous periods, didn't it?

Narrator: Yes; like all frontier cities, this one was a center of vice and crime.

Voice: A sort of real-life cowboy movie, with shootings and killings and held-up stagecoach?

Narrator: Cheyenne was the last stop of the famous Wells-Fargo Express. Farther than this no one dared go, except in caravans, and very well armed. [Laughs.] Imagine how that must have been, if an American historian says this: "There was a time when all the inhabitants of Cheyenne were outlaws, including the mayor." [Laughter.]

Voice: I suppose that he was elected by his own gang, like in the movies.

Narrator: Of course. The laws of the State, even to this day, forbid the treasurer-general to serve more than 4 years.

Voice: Why?

Narrator: The governing officials in those days gave a very original and a very human explanation: "Everyone has the right to get rich, but anyone who cannot do it in 4 years should look for some other business."

Voice II: It seems impossible that these towns, so well-ordered, and so law-abiding, were semibarbarous regions 50 years ago.

Voice: What do you mean? Look at those cowboys, every one of them carries two guns!

Voice II: Really!

Narrator: In Wyoming all citizens are allowed to carry firearms if they keep them in plain view, like these cowboys.

Voice: Then this is a situation made to order for the gangster.

Narrator: That's what they thought. But in 1929 a Chicago gang hid out here, and the ranchers hunted them down like wolves.

Voice II: You don't say.

Narrator: Another peculiarity of Wyoming is that here nobody needs a driver's license.

Voice: That's the way it ought to be everywhere.

Narrator: This State, furthermore, has the honor of being the first one to give the vote to women.

Voice II: Yes? When was that?

Narrator: In 1869 when it was still a Territory.

Voice: You see? They had to make a mistake somewhere.

Narrator: And that is not all. In 1925 Mrs. Nellie T. Ross was elected Governor.

Voice: It's unbelievable. Texas and Wyoming, two such masculine States, have allowed themselves to be governed by women. What's the matter with these cowboys?

Voice II: Nothing at all. The more masculine one is, the more he favors the women.

Music: Up and out.

Narrator: The longest and most bitterly fought war in the history of Wyoming was not between the Indian and the white man but between (mixed sounds of cows and sheep) the early cowmen and the upstarts who filled the State with sheep (sheep up and behind). The cowboys saw, with horror, how the grass of their pasture was disappearing, eaten to the ground by the sheep. That seemed to them an outrage, a humiliation. Nevertheless, at the beginning the struggle was fair and legal, but when they became

convinced that arguments were useless, acts of violence broke out. Many men died and thousands of sheep were killed by running them into rivers and gullies, and they blew up the most prosperous ranches with dynamite. That war, like all wars, was a disaster for both sides.

Voice: Especially for the sheep who had to work overtime to recover their losses.

Narrator: But today nearly all the ranches in the State are mixed. However, one of the most important ranchers of Wyoming has said this: "It is sure that sheep produce more, but in cattle there is something of legend, something romantic—I do not know, but perhaps it is the combination of man and horse."

Music: Up and out. Large crowd, music, etc.

Voice: We certainly are having wonderful luck.

Voice II: To happen to be in Cheyenne at this moment.

Voice: And what is that they are celebrating—so that I can get enthusiastic, too?

Narrator: The past—the good old days—when Cheyenne was a lady of the world.

Voice II: And not an honorable and rich woman, as now?

Voice: Imagine how those times must have been, when they still miss them.

Narrator: The Frontier Day celebration is the most extraordinary festival of the West. People come from everywhere—from California to the Canadian border.

Crowd up. Big applause.

Voice II: Look! What magnificent Indian girls.

Voice: Feathered and naked.

Voice II: What are they going to do?

Narrator: Let me see the program. It's the 100-meter race.

Voice: Bravo! I bet \$10 that the one with the blue kerchief wins.

Narrator: Laughs.

Voice II: What are you laughing at?

Narrator: Listen to the names of the runners: Alice, of the Red Lake; Zena, the wounded; Zonati, the one afraid of horses; and Julia, the great eagle.

Voice: The one I like is the wounded.

Crowd up, yell, etc., into.

Music: Band up and out.

Narrator: So we say good-by to Wyoming, the most cordial State of the Union, the most fertile, and the most primitive—with its innumerable hills covered with sheep, its mountains full of mines, and its vast plateaus trembling under the hoofs of wild horses.

Music: Up and out.

Announcer: You have just heard *Know North America*, a weekly program in which we relate the intellectual adventures of two travelers who are discovering the multiple surprises of historic and present-day life of the United States.

The following persons took part in the program. The production and direction were in charge of Juan Jose Vasquez.

Music: Up and out.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does that script mention Pennsylvania as it does Colorado?

Mr. RICH. You read it tomorrow and get the whole text of it. Then you will wonder why you voted for the Voice of America.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would like Pennsylvania to get a little advertising, and I am sure the gentleman would himself.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman want the United States to print all that stuff in the RECORD?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I want the Members of Congress to see how silly they have been in voting this money for the Voice of America.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons: For salaries and travel expenses in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in connection with the supervision of the maintenance and care of United States prisoners, \$400,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,500 of this amount shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Bureau of Prisons when incurred on the written authorization of the Attorney General.

Salaries and expenses, penal and correctional institutions: For expenses necessary for the support of prisoners, and the maintenance and operation of Federal penal and correctional institutions and the construction of buildings at prison camps, interment or transporting remains of deceased inmates to their relatives or friends in the United States, transporting persons released from custody of the United States to place of conviction or arrest or place of bona fide residence within the United States or to such place within the United States as may be authorized by the Attorney General, and the furnishing of suitable clothing and, in the discretion of the Attorney General an amount of money not to exceed \$30, regardless of length of sentence; including purchase of 15 passenger motor vehicles; purchase of one bus at not to exceed \$5,000; purchase of one large bus at \$25,000 for replacement only; not to exceed \$10,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Prison System when authorized in writing by the Attorney General; traveling expenses; furnishing of uniforms and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees in the performance of their official duties; not to exceed \$35,000 for the acquisition of land adjacent to any Federal penal or correctional institution when, in the opinion of the Attorney General, the additional land is essential to the protection of the health or safety of the institution; firearms and ammunition; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; \$17,800,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered under this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$500: *Provided further*, That collections in cash for meals, laundry, barber service, uniform equipment, and any other items for which payment is made originally from appropriated funds, may be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for maintenance and operation of the institutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical and hospital service: For medical relief for inmates of penal and correctional institutions and appliances necessary for patients including personal services in the District of Columbia and furnishing and laundering of uniforms and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for the employees in the performance of their official duties; \$1,497,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditure by that Service.

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

I simply do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the script which my friend the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] just referred to in the RECORD was prepared by the National Broadcasting Co. and not by the personnel of the State Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract; purchase, construction, repair, and rental of mechanical and electrical tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices; tabulating cards and continuous form-tabulating paper; \$3,729,000.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 46, line 21, strike out "\$3,729,000" and insert "\$7,120,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will restore \$3,391,000 cut from the budget for current census statistics, by the committee. The appropriations for the Bureau of the Census are \$4,000,000 less than the 1948 appropriation, notwithstanding the fact that the Bureau has begun preparation for the seventeenth decennial census in 1950.

The proposed cut added to the very material reductions of last year will seriously impair the efficiency of the Bureau of the Census; in fact, very few of the activities of the Bureau will remain. I called attention on yesterday to the very great importance at this time of statistics for the guidance of business and even for the guidance of the Congress and Government departments; and yet here we are practically eliminating the sole means that we have of securing those statistics. One item that has been cut out has been statistics with reference to cotton. The Census Bureau has been collecting these statistics for 50 years. They are used not only by the producers of cotton but also by the textile mills and other people processing and handling cotton. Mr. Chairman, I am merely trying to restore the item, and I hope the committee will see fit to restore it.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are some real reasons for the reduction in this item. The committee is providing \$2,676,000 to prepare during this year for the seventeenth decennial census which is to be taken in 1950, and that will cost the taxpayers of the United States from \$70,000,000 to \$75,000,000. We are providing every possible assistance to the Census Bureau to get ready for that very important task. It will require thousands of people, part-time employees, to gather and compile that very census. Presently, many forms of current statistics are being gathered by private institutions. For instance, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. indicates that the population of the Pacific coast area has increased more than 40 percent in the past 7 years. Other companies and organizations are gathering current statistics. We also provide considerable money for

current statistics. Many of them are being gathered on a monthly instead of a quarterly basis. We are endeavoring to arrive at some means of saving just a little money in order to have sufficient on hand when we are going to be called upon to appropriate around \$70,000,000 to \$75,000,000 for gathering complete statistics in connection with the regular decennial census in 1950.

Regarding the cotton ginning statistics, it is true that not only the Census Bureau but also the Department of Agriculture is authorized to gather cotton statistics. We thought it was only economy to turn it over to the Department of Agriculture to perform. Why have two agencies of government gathering cotton statistics even though both were authorized to do so?

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. My purpose is to ask about these cuts in statistics. I notice from the committee's report they agree that these statistics must be obtained.

Mr. STEFAN. We certainly want them.

Mr. GARY. We have just concluded the marking up of the Agriculture appropriation bill. No provision whatever has been made for the Department of Agriculture to take over this work. As I understand it, under the basic law the Bureau of the Census is charged with the duty of doing this work; and I just wondered how the mechanics of taking over from this agency could be worked out. Should a report be made to the Subcommittee on Agriculture?

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to my friend from Virginia that we studied this matter very carefully. The suggestion was made to us to consider the transfer of cotton statistics from the Commerce Department to the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman's statement is quite convincing. I have talked to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] about it, and if it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Mississippi and the committee I will take the matter up with the Department and the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am sure we can arrive at some satisfactory conclusion in the transfer we suggest. I may say to the gentleman that we certainly are not going to interfere with the gathering of cotton statistics.

Mr. WHITTEN. The agricultural bill will be up here in about 10 days for consideration, and there is no provision being made in it to take over this work.

Mr. STEFAN. I assure the gentleman from Mississippi that a very fine conclusion will be reached in connection with the cotton statistics item in this bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that this work will be carried forward.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year we went into this matter of duplication of services quite fully with Mr. Capt, of the Census Bureau, and at that time he indicated to us something that does need clarifica-

tion. On page 210 of last year's hearings, in reply to a question of mine, Mr. Capt stated:

We know in a general way about what other agencies collect, but the Bureau of the Budget has a responsibility under the law to see that duplication does not exist and where it is found, to eliminate it.

We have nothing in the hearings, to my knowledge, that would indicate any clarification of the present position. I do know that the responsibility for collecting all sorts of agricultural statistics is claimed by the Department of Agriculture. I submit that the Congress could very well explore this matter and cut out duplication. As it is we have allowed for this one item almost as much as the whole Bureau of the Census received in 1937.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] made the statement that the broadcast which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] referred to on the floor and read part of was not sponsored by the State Department nor paid for by the State Department, but was a National Broadcasting proposition. I want to say that that broadcast was furnished to me following my request to General Marshall for all broadcasts on the sixteenth day of February 1948, and that particular one was furnished me.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I say I did not make the statement that it was not sponsored by the State Department, I did not say that it was not paid for by the State Department. What I did say was that my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has insisted throughout that the State Department should use the facilities of private organizations and that the script which was read on the floor, according to my information, was prepared by the National Broadcasting Co. It was one of the scripts which was given over the radio because the State Department is trying to follow out the instructions or views of the committee that it use private agencies. The script was prepared, as I understand it, by the National Broadcasting Co., and not by the State Department.

Mr. TABER. But it is just as bad. It does not make any difference. The State Department is just as blameworthy as they would be if they had prepared it themselves. They had it prepared, and they used it, and it was one of those that they submitted as having been issued under the so-called Voice of America when it is a type of thing that they are putting out themselves.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. I was informed, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of State not only O. K.'s these scripts, but they pay for them.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the State Department also pay for the time on the radio?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is all paid for?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it is a State Department proposition all the way through?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The same as if you hired me as your attorney or accountant, or otherwise?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You pay the bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

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

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

Mr. RICH. The point that I make is that it is bad enough to have it go over the air, but when you think that we are taxing the American people to pay for such trash as that, then it is just too bad.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 46, line 21, strike out "\$3,729,000" and insert "\$3,869,000."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], for his statement that it was not the intention of the committee to eliminate the provision for collecting cotton-ginning statistics. But, I want to say this: In good faith, it does strike me that this amendment should be adopted in order to effectuate the assurance that the chairman has given to the committee. This amendment will add \$170,000 to the amount in the paragraph and provide and be intended to provide for the collection of cotton-ginning statistics.

The report of the committee states on page 21 that it is intended to reduce the items, including: "Cotton statistics, \$115,000."

I read further from page 21 of the report:

Cotton (agriculture) statistics: The reduction in this item is predicated on the apparent duplication that exists between the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture with respect to statistics on cotton ginning and cotton production. It is believed that considerable economy would result if the collection of these statistics were transferred to the Department of Agriculture. It is realized, of course, that these statistics are necessary.

The mere elimination of this item from the bill, as stated by the committee in its report, will not result in a transfer of

this function to the Department of Agriculture.

I oppose duplication. The Department of Agriculture undertakes to collect statistics with respect to the production of cotton, of wheat, of corn, and of other products, and they do send out questionnaires. But I can recall as a cotton grower when the growers as well as the consumers of the country were dependent upon the reports as to ginnings, and upon the reports as to production by the cotton buyers, by the speculators, those who rigged the markets. The Congress provided in 1924, having previously provided more than 20 years before that, that there should be 12 collections of cotton ginnings from the cotton gins during the season. Visits have been made to those gins to collect for years. I respectfully submit that not only the cotton growers but that the users and consumers of cotton in this country ought to be protected, because without this provision now, which is not a duplication, which collection could not be transferred to the Department of Agriculture by a report of this committee, that a very great injustice is done to the people of the country, including both the consumers and the producers, because you set back the matter 50 years by making the people of the United States dependent, as I used to be as a cotton grower, upon what the cotton buyers and the speculators said as to how much cotton Texas was going to raise, as to how much cotton was going to be ginned, and as to how much the other States were going to produce, or had ginned.

I now read from the hearings. When this item was reached, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska the chairman of this committee [Mr. STEFAN], who has very frankly stated that he does not want to interfere with this vital function, questioned the Director of the Census and his assistant, Mr. Eckler, and I read from page 127 of the hearings:

Mr. STEFAN. Let us go into agricultural statistics, item No. 6. That is \$340,000. What is the reason for that?

Mr. ECKLER. One-half of that is for the preparation of cotton statistics for which there is specific legislation, which we will present for the record.

That specific legislation was presented for the record, and it is to be found in United States Code, title 13, paragraphs 71 and 72. That title of the code provides that the Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect these cotton-ginning statistics. That act was amended just before I came here in 1924, by a Republican administration, because the virtue of the act was recognized. It was intended to protect those who use cotton as well as those who produce it, who had therefore been at the mercy of the speculators and those who rig the market.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the chairman of the committee, stated it was not the purpose to abolish the collection of these statistics. I state that the collection is made mandatory by the substantive law, as I stated, by title 13 of the United States Code, paragraphs 71 and 72. I state, as a lawyer, that the language of the committee

report, that the function should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, is not sufficient to transfer the function or to abolish the existing statute. The only way it can be transferred is by amendment to existing law.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the gentleman's statement, may I say that the fact that an expenditure is authorized does not mean that we have to appropriate money for it. That is an argument about which I shall have something to say in my own time in just a minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman. I say that every year there has been an appropriation for this purpose. The gentleman says that statistics should be collected, and he thus approves an appropriation. It is a small item, but I do not know of any item that is more beneficial to the consumers, those who buy as well as those who produce cotton than as to the amount of cotton ginned. There was a drop in the cotton market very recently of \$20 a bale because of certain conditions, but it was not because of the production of surplus cotton.

If the statute ought not to be executed, the committee would be justified in not making an appropriation, but I rely upon the statement of the chairman made in the report that the statistics ought to be furnished. This is not an authorization for which an appropriation should not be made. I am most grateful to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for saying that it is not the purpose of the committee to eliminate the function, but it is the duty of the House to correct the mistake if any mistake has been discovered. Let us insert the \$170,000. If it is found then that it is not proper, it can be taken out in the other body. But this House has a duty to perform. That appropriation has been made through the years, and in view of the language in the report, the only way it can be provided for is by an appropriation for that purpose, by the adoption of my amendment, which I trust the committee will accept.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right when he states that the committee, and especially I as chairman of the subcommittee, agree on the value of these cotton statistics. I think the gentleman from Mississippi and I are aiming at the same objective: We are against duplication. For his information, may I say that the majority of the committee felt, after analyzing the situation in the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau, that the act of April 2, 1924, should be amended to consolidate the ginning and farm stock reports in one agency in the Department of Agriculture. It has been determined by conference with the officials of the Department of Agriculture, which department also collects statistics on cotton ginning and cotton production, that the Department of Agriculture could in-

corporate the present census activity into its endeavors at a modest cost and that elimination of duplication would result.

The cost of this series of cotton reports by the Census is extremely costly, over \$100,000, and could be performed by the Department of Agriculture at a fraction of that cost.

The gentleman from Mississippi seeks to amend on page 46 the appropriation for the Department of Census, adding \$170,000 to the total of \$3,729,000, making a total of \$3,899,000. The gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. WHITTEN], one being on the Appropriations Committee for the Department of Agriculture and the other having a great deal to do with the Committee on Agriculture of the House have convinced me that perhaps something should be done in the House on this very important item at this time. If there is any doubt in the minds of you gentlemen at all that this cotton ginning statistics program cannot be carried on and that we cannot get this matter into the Department of Agriculture so that we can eliminate duplication, I wish to state that so far as I personally am concerned, I will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I assure the gentleman as a cotton grower that there is no duplication involved here, although I know there may be duplication in other instances.

Mr. STEFAN. I am accepting the amendment so far as I personally am concerned.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The information collected by the Department of Agriculture has to do with cotton forecasts and there is no duplication on this very, very important item. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for accepting the amendment. I think you are doing the right thing.

Mr. STEFAN. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), and other acts incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; including personal services in the District of Columbia; hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the operation and maintenance of 226 aircraft, but not more than 85 Government-owned aircraft shall be maintained or operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration after September 30, 1948; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; purchase (not to exceed 150) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase

and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other organizations serving aviation; \$82,451,000, and the Departments of the Air Force, Army and Navy, are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers: *Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Plant Corporation and acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, is authorized and directed to transfer to the United States and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency (Public Buildings Administration) without charge a tract of land and the improvements thereon at Los Angeles, Calif., covered by lease dated January 1, 1947, between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and surplus to the needs of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to transfer to the Departments of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, without charge, aircraft, aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment and hangar, line, and shop equipment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLSON: On page 48, line 9, strike out "\$82,451,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$82,485,854."

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee had no cognizance of the necessity for this amendment until the last 3 or 4 days. This is an amendment to allow the operation of a control tower in the city of New Bedford, which is a city in the State of Massachusetts which I have the honor to represent. We already have authority from the CAA at the present time to have an instrument-landing system installed. I have no fault to find with the Committee on Appropriations. I think the chairman of the committee is about as strong an oak as there is in this country. I find no fault with him.

All I am asking is \$34,000 in one appropriation and \$40,000 in another. I would like to call to the attention of the Members who do not come from Massachusetts, that this is considered the summer playground of the world. We lose money and lives by not having equipment of this kind. I am asking the Congress to do something for Massachusetts and New England.

The committee has not considered this installation because they never had an opportunity. Since I came here recently, the CAA has advised me that the traffic at the New Bedford Airport justifies the need for the control tower. I am asking the Congress to appropriate an item of approximately \$70,000 to give us the control tower which will serve southeastern Massachusetts, representing about a million people.

This year the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has said it is going to abandon passenger service on the Old Colony line. How are we going

to reach Cape Cod, one of the greatest resort sections there is in the United States? All I am asking, Mr. Chairman, is that we appropriate \$34,000 under this item, which puts up the tower, and \$40,000 under the next item, which will maintain it and carry it along. After all, the airport was built by the municipality.

I hope you will listen to me, because I think the chairman of this committee and other members, had they been advised of the situation, would probably have included it in the budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I appreciate very much the interest of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] in civil aviation. I have discussed with him at great length the importance of New Bedford, Mass., as a place for visitors from all parts of the country and the world and its great importance regarding air traffic. New Bedford, because it is fog-bound a great deal of the time, has been given considerable encouragement by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, who is going to install in New Bedford this year an ILS system in order to take care of the air traffic which cannot land there during zero weather.

The matter of control towers, however, is a very controversial one. Before the war the municipalities and States which had airports paid for the operation of the control towers themselves. During the war, when our armed forces needed airports, they took over quite a few airports in this country and paid for the operation of the control towers because they had to have a standard system of air traffic and air-traffic control. After the war, however, they released these airports and with them the control towers, and immediately officials of commercial air lines in the various cities bombarded the Congress, with the result that control towers for 125 locations came into the appropriation bill. We are appropriating money to operate 153 of them now. In this bill, however, we have added 15 more, at the recommendation of the Administrator. There are 15 others which meet the requirements, but for which no money was requested. As you know, they have to have a minimum number of control points before they are allowed to come into the program. However, we cannot appropriate money to provide the operation of a control tower in every town in the United States that wants one. I will assure the gentleman that there will be at least 100 towns in the United States which are perhaps presently or will soon be eligible with the minimum number of traffic points to come to Congress and ask for money to pay for the operation of their control tower.

This committee cannot designate a control tower here and a control tower there. It must be done by an administrator of an agency. The Administrator of the CAA has not recommended at this time the operation of a control tower at New Bedford, Mass.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. The reason I offered the amendment was because the CAA had recommended this, had said after a thorough study that we had more points than they required.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the gentleman's town has 19,000 points, I understand. The CAA, however, did not come before the committee and justify the operation of a control tower at New Bedford, Mass., or at a hundred other points that would like to have control towers. Unquestionably the CAA told the gentleman that New Bedford met the requirements; but they have not told the committee which held hearings on this bill for many weeks, that they wanted a control tower located at New Bedford, Mass. Perhaps next year they will recommend New Bedford and we will give it consideration. This committee has provided a tremendous amount of money, I may say to my colleague from Massachusetts, for the operation of the CAA. Approximately \$154,000,000 of the appropriation for the Department of Commerce goes for aviation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much of the time of the House. I merely want to say that I agree with the remarks of the chairman of our committee and ask the members of the committee to support him in his opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the committee said that the committee had not been officially advised by the CAA in reference to the New Bedford control. Apparently the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has had a talk and I assume from what has taken place they told him personally about this situation. Is that correct?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We know the predicament of the committee, of course. If between now and the time the bill is considered in the Senate the CAA should in writing or in the proper way notify the Senate committee and if these items should be inserted in the bill by the Senate, will the members of the House committee in conference give serious consideration to concurring?

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, in answer to his question, that we cannot do that because it would be discrimination. There are fifteen or twenty others that have been waiting for years for the same service and some of them, I can assure the gentleman, are in very important locations in our country. They are in strategic areas. We have 40,000 miles of Federal airways and we are endeavoring to build these towers under a standard program in order to make air safety more certain. We cannot discriminate against those who are on the waiting list.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the statement that there has been no official

notification, and apparently the gentleman from Massachusetts has received verbal notification to him personally, I wanted to find out whether or not it would be possible to have favorable consideration given this year if later the Senate committee was notified and the item put in. However, I hope if the Senate puts an amount in while the bill is in that branch, the House conferees will act favorably on it and concur in the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLSON) there were—ayes 9, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], about the policy of his Subcommittee on Appropriations regarding the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

On page 25 of the committee report, House Report 1433, Eightieth Congress, second session, appears the following statement:

Instances have been called to the attention of the committee wherein approval for a certain class airport has been given despite the fact that a similar or nearly similar class airport existed in the immediate vicinity. It is not known, of course, how many instances such as this exist throughout the country, but the committee intends to go into this matter more fully in the future, and should it become warranted, it may be obliged to make appropriations on an individual project basis.

If I understand this statement correctly, it has reference to future appropriations and does not indicate a policy of earmarking by congressional action any funds provided for in the bill now under consideration or heretofore appropriated.

On page 723 of the hearings before the subcommittee the gentleman from Nebraska, Chairman STEFAN, made the statement that the committee had nothing to do with the administration of CAA in administering or carrying out the laws governing that administration. The bill now before Congress for consideration, H. R. 5607, provides on page 52 for the appropriation of \$40,000,000 for the Federal aid airport program, and on pages 283 and 284 of the hearings the spread of the allocations planned by CAA is discussed. My question is this, Does the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations plan to exercise any jurisdiction over the allocation of these funds or any unexpended funds heretofore appropriated for the Federal aid program to the extent of directing CAA as to what specific projects CAA shall allocate the funds heretofore appropriated and the funds provided for in the bill now before the House for consideration?

Mr. STEFAN. We do not try to administer, but we take a great interest in the pattern that is being followed in order that the funds appropriated by Congress are spent judiciously and properly. However, the location and the

selection of airports is a matter between the Administrator of the CAA and the municipal locality or the State or the group that is planning to build airports.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Whenever the Committee on Appropriations undertakes the study indicated on page 25 of the committee report referred to in the afore-mentioned quotation I will want to be heard by the committee and I will appreciate the committee having some of my constituents appear as witnesses before the committee to set out more fully the record of developments and proceedings concerning the proposed airport at the Mount Joy site near Davenport, Iowa, in my congressional district. Some of the statements made before the committee on February 5 and appearing in the committee hearings on pages 719-723 need considerable clarification whenever your committee undertakes this study. I will not take the time of the House of Representatives to discuss this matter in detail at this time, but I wish to endorse wholeheartedly the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska, Chairman STEFAN, appearing on page 723 of the hearings that "there must have been some reason for CAA recommending an airport in Iowa 9 miles away."

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, or somebody who can furnish some information, a question with respect to this matter. Congress has heretofore shown that it is alert toward a proper program for aviation. I have been looking at this bill, particularly at page 52, where this committee recommends that we appropriate \$37,000,000, of which \$36,500,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said act and \$500,000 shall be for projects in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. I have also examined the report attached to the bill and I cannot find either in the report, in the bill, or in the hearings, where this \$37,500,000 is going to be expended.

Mr. STEFAN. I can tell the gentleman where it is going to be spent all right, because I recently requested a list from the CAA. If the gentleman is interested in Oklahoma, I can tell him now where it is planned to build.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not asking about any control stations or any airports in particular, but I think this Congress has some obligation to see to it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, all of that information is available from the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and all Members are entitled to that information. We passed a law setting up a Federal airport program. The reason we did not give them \$40,000,000 in cash is because we found they had too much cash on hand now and had not spent it. They have had perhaps about \$2,000,000 really allocated and spent. They have about \$67,000,000 on hand. These are round figures and are not absolutely correct. Instead of giving them \$40,000,000, we give them \$37,000,000 more for contract authorization and \$3,000,000 for admin-

istration, because they are just beginning to get into the program, and they will need that administrative money.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not finding fault with this committee in not appropriating enough money; what I am attempting to do is to find out whether we are wisely appropriating this money.

I should like to know whether under the program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, in which they propose to spend \$37,500,000, they may be duplicating in many instances airports that have already been established and paid for by cities themselves. I am wondering whether now, just because we have a program for Federal aid for airports, we should appropriate money for specific airports, using Federal funds to build airports to satisfy the whims of some particular cities. It seems to me that Congress could better vote on this total amount of \$37,500,000 if somewhere in the bill or the report it was set out where these airports are going to be built and who is going to get this money. Somebody might know of some city that is trying to get an airport by the expenditure of a lot of Federal funds, where it would duplicate an airport not needed at all. I am not criticizing the committee, but I cannot ascertain from reading the bill or the report where these airports are to be built, and I just do not know how to vote on these lump-sum appropriations. We have to take them on faith, I assume.

Mr. STEFAN. It was impossible to put into the record the thousands of airports with which the CAA is dealing. However, a record of what they are planning to do in 1949 has been furnished the committee and is available to every Member of the House. I have now turned to the page relating to Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not talking about Oklahoma; I am talking about the overall program.

Mr. STEFAN. The information the gentleman is seeking is available here. As to the duplication of airports, where they are competing with one another, much of what the gentleman says is true. However, during the vacation last summer, some members of the committee made an exhaustive investigation and visited 20 or 30 States in regard to the problem the gentleman is now discussing. We feel that the matter now is much improved over what it was when the gentleman first got his information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except sec. 5 (a)), \$3,000,000, and in addition, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized until June 30, 1953, to enter into contracts and incur obligations for purposes of this paragraph in an amount not exceeding \$37,000,000, of which \$36,500,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said act, and \$500,000 shall be for projects in Hawaii and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That the amount of \$3,000,000 appropriated herein shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses; including personal services in the District of Columbia; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which \$3,000,000 not to exceed \$223,500 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," to pro-

vide for necessary administrative expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and \$18,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce": *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1948 is hereby merged with this appropriation.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of Texas: On page 52, line 7, after "exceeding", strike out "\$37,000,000, of which \$36,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$34,392,000, of which \$33,892,000"; and on page 52, line 23, after "appropriation" add the following: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be expended on the development of Fort Worth International Airport in Tarrant County, Tex."

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Along the line the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Ohio have been talking about, I have offered an amendment on page 52 to strike \$2,608,000 from both of these items by marking the \$37,000,000 down to \$34,392,000 and the other figure down to \$33,892,000. I have made two statements on the floor also in the past 3 or 4 days about this matter which many of you, I am sure, have not read or did not hear. I made a speech yesterday afternoon. Here in a nutshell are the facts. We have a great airport at Love Field. The citizens of Dallas have an investment of \$12,000,000. The Army took that airport over during the last war and during the First World War. During the last war, that is World War II, the Army built certain hangars and extended the runways a little bit and spent some 4 or 5 million dollars in hangars, much of which is not material to the airport now. Fort Worth has an airfield by the name of Meacham Field. It is a fine field. But the CAA at the instance and request of the air lines went down into that part of the country right between Dallas and Fort Worth, a little closer to Fort Worth than to Dallas, and bought 632 acres of land. In order to save the air lines money, they propose to relegate Love Field and Meacham Field to auxiliary second-rate feeder airports. It was said on the floor yesterday afternoon by my friend and colleague from Tarrant County, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Lucas] that Dallas was sore because Fort Worth wanted an airport. He knows that is not the fact. Fort Worth has an airport and has received Federal aid for Meacham Field for years. Dallas has an airport and has also received, not from the CAA, but back in the leaf-raking days, money from the Federal Government and the Army during World War II, so that four-motor bombers could land, extended the runways, and built certain hangars and shops. But the CAA proposes now to spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers money building that new airport to be known as the Fort Worth International Airport proposing to destroy Love Field and build a useless airport 12 miles away so that they can move all the air lines over to that airport and cause the citizens of Dallas who furnish 83 percent of the air-line traffic and 87 percent of their cargo traffic in the Fort Worth and Dallas area and Dallas who gets and

sends more air mail than San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth put together, a great deal of inconvenience.

My friends, as I say I have voted three times for tax cuts since I have been here, which is a year and a half. I voted to override the President's veto two times and I intend to vote to override it the third time. But I say in connection with that, that we must save some money and quit spending Federal money foolishly building airports where they are not needed and certainly not between Dallas and Fort Worth. My friends, the engineers' report itself says that this airport will only do for a few years, that is the International Airport at Fort Worth, and then a larger airport will have to be built a little farther out between Denton, Fort Worth, and Dallas. I say the engineers in Dallas are fair-minded people who are conversant with the facts, and they say that Love Field is big enough to take care of the traffic around Dallas and that whole area for the next 15 years.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the expenditure of this \$2,600,000 will simply result in rendering useless the amount of money already put into both of these fields?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is right. That is entirely correct. That will only save the airlines \$10,000 a month and it will increase the money which the passengers who travel the airlines from Dallas will have to spend between one and two million dollars in taxicab and limousine fares to go from Dallas to this new airport 19½ miles away. The postmaster at Dallas estimates that it will cost \$54,000 per year more to handle the mail.

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

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, there is a very important program of 1 hour to follow this afternoon, Pulaski Day. Judge SABATH is chairman of that program and I have been requested to move that the Committee do now rise.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to speak on this matter. I know it will be important and I would like to listen to the ceremony but it is also important that Fort Worth get a new airport.

Mr. STEFAN. I think we could devote more time to it tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS], have 5 minutes at this time after which I will request that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does the House object to my having five more minutes either now or tomorrow? I have not had an opportunity to discuss this.

Mr. STEFAN. I would not object to the gentleman talking from now on because I think he has a very important message. So has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS]. I think both of those messages are very important. I am very happy that the Members of the House are taking an interest in aviation and that some of them know something about it. I think it is very healthy that this airport bill be discussed and aired in this House. I would like to devote considerable time to it, but I have been requested to move to rise at this time.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I suggest that this matter go over until tomorrow, with the understanding that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] have 5 minutes tomorrow and then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS] have 10 minutes in reply.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia make that as a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GARY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do I understand that that request provides that none of the rest of us may talk on this particular issue? I am in favor of the amendment and I want to discuss it.

Mr. GARY. No; I do not want to limit anyone else. I just wanted to make it plain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will have 5 minutes tomorrow and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS] will have the same amount of time to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5607, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND THE WEEK OF MARCH 8

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to announce the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. On tomorrow, as has just been ordered, we will meet at 11 o'clock and proceed to the conclusion of the pending appropriation bill, after which the synthetic-rubber bill (H. R. 5314) will come up for action; and I am quite sure we can dispose of that in due time tomorrow afternoon.

As to the proposed program for next week:

On Monday we will have general debate on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we will continue with the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, followed by H. R. 3227, training and pay of the Organized Reserve Corps; and H. R. 2744, retirement and benefits for the Army of the United States; H. R. 3510, the Alaska airport bill; also, if a rule is granted, House Joint Resolution 323, the oil embargo bill, may be called.

On Thursday we hope to take up the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

On Friday we will continue with the Treasury-Post Office bill if it is not disposed of on Thursday, following which we may take up any unfinished bills and rules which have been listed.

The program for Saturday is undetermined.

Conference reports may be called at any time. I understand that it is probable the conference report dealing with the on-the-job training bill for veterans will be ready next week, and if so it is probable this conference report will be called up.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] may address the House tomorrow for 20 minutes following the disposition of the business of the House and the special orders heretofore granted for that day.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein correspondence with the President and the Civil Service Commission and attached matter.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MACARTHUR: THE MAN OF THE HOUR

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 15 minutes I had for today be vacated, but that I may be permitted to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Congress and the country will be interested in a letter that Gen. Douglas MacArthur sent to the Young Republican organization when they instituted their drive on 1,730 college campuses in an effort to stimulate

interest in good government for our country. The letter follows:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR
THE ALLIED POWERS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPREME COMMANDER,

December 22, 1947.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I am just in receipt of your letter of December 11, with its enclosed pamphlet designed to encourage political thinking and planning by university students. You cannot fail to find the university campus a receptive field for your purpose. The recent war is yet too close for students to forget the combat responsibility which inevitably becomes their lot if statecraft and diplomacy fail to maintain the peace. They thus will readily understand that in youth as in age, in peace as in war, there is a continuing responsibility which falls upon every citizen of the Republic to insure good and wise government dedicated invincibly to the preservation of our free way of life, immutable heritage from the past.

The Republican Party is peculiarly well fitted vigorously to espouse this laudable purpose to further arouse in the youthful mind the all-important concept of public responsibility, for the Republican Party has never deviated from the proposition that all political power resides in the people. It has never failed in its stanch advocacy for the maximum of personal freedom and individual responsibility, and has tenaciously held as a principle inviolate equality of opportunity. Emphasis should, of course, be placed upon the great American cause to be served, rather than the political benefit to be gained. The former is the rallying media which stirs the hearts of all Americans. Leadership, which through courage and vision and a dynamic approach to the issues and problems of the time, will find its own political reward through the following which it immediately commands.

I thank you for bringing your plans to my attention, and wish you and your colleagues every success in this purposeful American endeavor.

Faithfully yours,

Douglas MacARTHUR.

It is interesting to note that approximately 65 percent of the 2,500,000 students in our colleges and universities, most of them World War II veterans, are of voting age. This group is a part of the 47,000,000 young Americans between the ages of 21 and 40 who will be eligible to vote this year. I have long felt that a good program of teaching Americanism in our schools and colleges was needed. College students today are serious minded and realistic. They must realize that the decisions we make here in Congress today will direct the fate of our Nation for many decades to come. The secret peace treaties and pacts made in the last 10 years certainly affect the destinies of our Nation. It is well that not only our young people but all of us be constantly alert in protecting our American institutions.

I have been very much interested in General MacArthur's career as a soldier—his feats and contributions to America. I have felt for some time that he is the one man who could be elected President of the United States and who would render outstanding service to our country. His appeal to the citizens of both parties is enormous and it is not based on sentiment, emotionalism, or hero worship but rather upon the knowledge that he, above anyone else on the

horizon today, is better equipped to assume and fulfill the role as President of the United States.

General MacArthur has already held the highest military office in the United States Army. He served two terms as Chief of Staff under two different Presidents. His past experience in Washington has given him knowledge and insight into all types of foreign diplomatic affairs.

He is a magnetic personality; a born leader of men. He has vision, courage, and understands human nature. He is, by tradition, ability, character, and experience qualified to be President. He is an outstanding figure in public life, a statesman and a diplomat who has the courage of his convictions. He is a student of history and believes in the American people, because he said when he wrote me:

I am a firm believer in the American people; and if given the truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national crisis.

The general would certainly be the candidate of the people. He is not controlled by special interests and he might even be opposed by political parties. Some of the potential candidates for President have not been anxious for the general to return to this country and give testimony before committees of Congress. They realize the American people could well insist that this great man be our next President. I have written many letters and talked with the Senators and my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, urging them to have the general return so that Congress and the people could benefit by his advice on China and Japan. I do not feel that Members of Congress can understand or legislate wisely for Japan without full information from General MacArthur. I have urged the general, as have others, that he accept the invitations and appear before congressional committees upon these important international problems. He will wisely guide our Nation through the rough international seas of this day.

He is the one man who understands Russia and has been able to tell them where to go when they tried to interfere in Japan. General MacArthur served in two wars. In the First World War he received 13 decorations for gallantry under fire. There were 7 citations for valor. He was the youngest Chief of Staff of the United States Army. He commanded the famous Rainbow Division and received the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism against a determined enemy.

Gen. Hugh Johnson once said:

Douglas MacArthur is one of the most brilliant men in public service—one general who will not die in bed if there is half a chance to die elsewhere.

He further stated:

The man is simply born without the emotion of fear. He is generous, affectionate, considerate, and kind.

Senator VANDENBERG, in an article quoted in Collier's magazine on February 12, 1944, entitled, "Why I Am for MacArthur for President," said:

I know that MacArthur is the embodiment of loyalty to our American destinies at any

cost. The proof stands on the records. I know that he is as devoid of political entanglements as he was of reinforcements at Bataan. I know that he would come to the White House with no thought or purpose except to serve America at home and abroad in the climax of his devoted career. Any racketeers of any sort would last about 1 minute in his presence. I know that he has never shirked a tough job in his life or compromised with it. He is granite in the face of duty. I know that his training and experience produce an integrity of character which will persist in any assignment he accepts. I would like to vote for integrity of character. It means more to me than a thousand campaign promises. Isn't that what America needs? He has the know-how because he has dealt with government all his life. More than any other Presidential possibility he would be elected as a great unifying American, who would win his country's unified support by deserving it.

Senator VANDENBERG further said:

Although MacArthur has been a soldier all his life, I never knew a man in whom spiritual values are more predominant. He is definitely more than a soldier. This is important because the family hearthstone means more to us in our ideology than battlefields and it means infinitely more to him. He once said, at a reunion of his Rainbow Division, "No one deserves peace as much as a soldier, for he must pay the greatest penalty in war."

Further quoting Senator VANDENBERG:

I repeat that spiritual values rule his mind. This blossoms in every speech he has ever made and in every statement he ever uttered. I recall his thrilling, sanctified radio message from the hard-pressed Philippines, to the little church in Arkansas where he was confirmed as a boy. The message sent on a beleaguered Easter morning—a message eloquently suggesting that we need God on our side in this titanic struggle and humbly asking for his aid. I have lasting consolation and assurance in this simple Christian's reliance upon divine grace. That is the kind of a President I want, Mr. Editor. I believe General MacArthur has what it takes in full measure. He has the maturity and vast experience. If nominated he will be elected. If elected he will bring a great mind, a great heart, a great capacity, and a great devotion, to the proud leadership of a great Nation.

The Hearst chain of newspapers serving the Nation, on March 1, had the following front-page editorial:

MAC ARTHUR: THE MAN OF THE HOUR

More than at any time since Abraham Lincoln was summoned to the White House to save the Republic, the United States needs a statesman and not a politician at the head of the National Government.

None of the avowed candidates for Presidency meets the public need.

And the responsibilities that lie upon us are too grave and too consequential to be committed into feeble or uncertain hands.

Misled by vainglorious ambitions and false alien ideologies, we have departed dangerously from the sound traditions and the equally sound practices of our successful past.

We have become a debt-ridden commonwealth, with a debased currency, drifting like a rudderless bark in the shoals of inflation toward shipwreck on the rocks of depression.

The seeds of class hatred and class conflict have been sown in our soil and are bearing poisonous fruit.

The tribunals of justice have been debauched; arbitrary administrative edicts are taking the place of just laws justly enforced;

and a vast bureaucracy is being erected over us to devour our substance.

Taxation has been made an instrument of pillage and persecution, so that the accumulation of generative and productive wealth is diminishing; the fountains of philanthropy are vanishing; the creative energies of our people are faltering; and the dependencies of the dole are being substituted for the virtues of self-reliance and self-respect.

Beyond our shores, our so-called diplomacy has been carried on in a disgraceful medley of secrecy and deception and usurped authority, until no man knows what our "foreign policies" are, or what they portend.

And meanwhile, in a world where the embers of unextinguished war still smolder and there is no peace anywhere, our defenses are permitted to decline and decay.

A free republic that is so beset with manifold errors and evils cannot—in Lincoln's historic phrase—"long endure."

The times are indeed critical, calling for saving leadership, and America would be indeed bankrupt if the leadership were lacking.

But fortunately for us and for posterity, the leadership awaits—the kind of virile leadership that democracy requires.

Above any man of his generation, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has demonstrated in many capacities his superlative qualities.

He has the statesman's touch along with the patriot's consecration; and he has the inspired and selfless "gift of command" which extreme exigencies always require.

In every call to duty that has been made upon him he has always responded—and he has never failed.

No difficulty, however great, has ever daunted him.

Knowing that we cannot believe that General MacArthur would fail his beloved country now.

We need him.

We need his experience and his judgment and his superb executive ability at Washington.

If we are to save ourselves from our own follies, we must draft General MacArthur for the Presidency.

For beyond any rivalry and any partisanship and any questioning, Douglas MacArthur is America's "man of the hour."

In June 1947, 16 American newspaper men and women, on a trip around the world, visited General MacArthur in Japan. Frank Gannett, one of the group, reported in part on the visit and dinner with MacArthur as follows:

The story that MacArthur told us was so intensely interesting that we hung on every word. He became eloquent when he talked about the two great needs of the world today—democracy and Christianity.

General MacArthur is deeply religious. He believes that a peace must be made in the hearts and minds of men and not with the sword. He condemns the idea of a preventive war and readily proves that any further world war would be disastrous. He is eloquent in his denunciations of the military minded. He hates war.

Mr. Gannett further stated:

MacArthur believes the sooner we make it possible for Japan to support herself the better it will be. His policy is in contrast with that pursued in Germany and Austria.

The Japanese people have come to adore MacArthur and to have the most friendly feeling toward Americans. The General talked to us for more than 2 hours with such earnestness and such eloquence that we were all deeply moved. I have heard many men in high positions speak on various occasions, but I do not exaggerate when I say that that talk which he gave us that afternoon was the most inspirational, the most stimulating, the most intensely interesting that I

have ever heard. It was the general expression that the afternoon had been a memorable occasion, and we had listened to a great talk from a great leader.

General MacArthur is not a politician and does not desire to be an active candidate for President. I am certain that he will accept the nomination if it is tendered to him at Philadelphia. I believe the American people are ready to shelve the politicians, and it is in their power to do so. They want a man with moral courage, of nonpartisan leadership; a man of sterling diplomatic qualities, firm in his belief in democracy, strong in Christian stability, with a mind that grasps and holds firmly the solution of our economical problems; who possesses the strength and ability of unselfish leadership in domestic problems and world affairs, and whose words of wisdom will give hope and security to every American.

The general has a great public trust. His nobility of character is stamped on his features like a shining light. He is the man of the hour, awaiting the call of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include letters from constituents.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the current issue of Rubber.

Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein the broadcast to which he referred.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order following that of the gentleman from Illinois [MR. SABATH]. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the Pulaski Day proceedings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD following the Pulaski Day proceedings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [MR. SABATH] is recognized for 1 hour.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, two hundred years ago today there was born in

Poland a man to whose memory we have assembled to pay tribute.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, though of noble birth, came to this country to help the American colonists gain their freedom and liberty. This was not strange considering that he had become famous throughout Europe for the defense of the liberties of his native Poland, from whence he had fled when the fortunes of his band of fighters for freedom was at low ebb.

With a price on his head he arrived in Paris, France, and met Benjamin Franklin, United States Ambassador to that country, who, impressed with his views on freedom and liberty, gave him a letter of introduction to Gen. George Washington, wishing him Godspeed to America. Shortly after his arrival he presented himself to General Washington who, impressed with the high recommendation given him and the reports concerning his military ability, gave him a commission in the Continental Army. History records that he fought with great valor and distinction in the battles of Brandywine, Warren Tavern, Germantown, Trenton, and Haddonfield.

With the courage and military genius that he displayed in these battles there followed his promotion to brigadier general and shortly thereafter the formation of his own legion—the Pulaski Legion—composed of volunteers, many of whom, like himself, had come to the shores of our country to actualize their love of freedom and independence. The bravery and the fighting ability of the Pulaski Legion in the battles at Little Egg Harbor, Charleston, and in other engagements, were most noteworthy. In the battle at Savannah, Ga., October 9, 1779, General Pulaski was mortally wounded and died on October 11, 1779, 3 days later.

How fateful were his words as contained in his last message to the Continental Congress when he wrote:

I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America.

The memory of this great champion who made the supreme sacrifice for American freedom and liberty will ever be revered by the people of America.

From Poland came not only Pulaski but Kosciusko, and others, who believed in aiding the peoples everywhere who sought their freedom and independence from oppression and the dictatorial laws of their monarchistic countries.

Our own country, founded upon the principle of offering refuge to those fleeing from oppression and persecution, with freedom of worship, became the haven of the oppressed peoples of the world, and because of that fact today stands as the greatest and most powerful nation in the world.

Being mindful not only of the services rendered by Pulaski, Kosciusko, and many others of Polish birth and descent who came to our country, I was also familiar with their love of freedom and liberty and of their deep loyalty and patriotism; I was familiar with their aims to help their kinfolk in their native Poland to be free of their oppressors—Austria-Hungary, Germany, Prussia, and

Russia—the countries which had subjugated their ancestors in 1793 and divided the Polish kingdom between themselves.

I have followed with a great deal of pleasure and interest the activities of the Polish people from the very beginning of World War I, when thousands of them, together with the Czechs, were emulating Pulaski's aims for freedom and enlisted in large numbers in the Canadian, British, French, and Russian Armies. And the moment America joined the Allies, a large number began to desert from the Austria-Hungary and German Armies and organized regiments in France, Great Britain, and Russia to fight on our side.

Being then a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I was aware of the activities that were under way in Europe looking to the overthrow of Austria-Hungary, and was familiar with the purposes and ambitions of many of those nationalities oppressed by these monarchistic countries.

Therefore, to help the cause I introduced a resolution in the House urging the recognition of the independent Polish regiments.

In the interest of our country and in view of President Wilson's declaration to aid the various aspiring nations in obtaining self-determination, freedom, and liberty, I prevailed upon him not to continue the negotiations for a separate peace with Austria-Hungary, feeling that it was not in accord with his or our country's original assurances to these richly deserving, liberty-seeking people.

Having reports and information from our former Ambassador to the Balkan States, as well as from the forces that were at work in Poland, Bohemia, and several other countries, President Wilson, in view of this evidence which I submitted to him, discontinued the negotiations, feeling that within a short space of time the Austria-Hungary Army, weakened by desertions and discontent, would effect its downfall, which in turn would weaken Germany and cause its early defeat.

True to our assurances for their self-determination, America made possible the uniting of all the Polish people and the creating of the Polish Republic. Thus, when Poland was recognized as an independent state, the purposes, ambitions, and dreams of her people became a reality, and nobody was more overjoyed than I.

Imbued with the regaining of its independence, Poland and its people progressed over the years to take their place as one of the recognized democracies of the world, until that fateful day in September 1939, when the Nazi hordes swarmed over its borders to destroy the freedom and independence which its liberty-loving people so dearly prized. The people of America, with sorrow in their hearts, were aghast at the dastardly attack and wanton destruction wrought upon that wonderful country.

It is my hope and I fervently pray that before long its freedom will again be restored and that it will once more enjoy complete independence without interference or domination by any other nation or nations. To that end I have insisted and shall continue to insist that Russia

or any other nation shall not interfere in the right of the Polish people to have such form of government as they may desire which, to my mind, is a democratic form of government.

For years the Polish people have suffered at the hands of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, mainly in oppression and persecution by the Prussians and Nazis under Hitler, who robbed them of their freedom and liberty.

Today I am greatly alarmed and concerned with the proposal that we permit a rebuilding of its archenemy, Germany.

I have taken the floor of the House to protest giving the German industrial overlords, the corrupt I. G. Farben cartel, and the powerful Krupp interests, who built up Hitler's war machine, an opportunity to rebuild the German war potential so it can again become a threat to the peace of Europe and the whole world, especially to Poland and Czechoslovakia.

I appreciate that the Russian forces drove the Nazis out of Poland, but that in itself does not give them the right to dominate and shape in any manner or degree the destiny of proud, worthy Poland.

The Poles will not stand for any dictatorship from any power. Russia should know this from the history and background of the Polish people. Russia can and will have Polish friendship only when she ceases to interfere in Poland's internal affairs.

I believe the United States should help the Polish people and the Polish Nation with loans and credits to enable them to rebuild their nation that was so terribly destroyed by the Nazis. We should continue to send gift packages and other forms of assistance in every possible way. In this connection much credit is due Mr. Francis X. Swietlik, of Chicago, head of the American Relief for Poland, and Bishop Stephen S. Woznicki, of Detroit, and many others, for their noble and humanitarian efforts in supplying relief to the suffering people of Poland.

We must always remember that, although we may not approve of the present Polish Government, we must not let the Polish people or the Polish Nation suffer. They must be helped, rebuilt, and made strong so that they can again take their proper place with the freedom- and liberty-loving peoples and nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Pulaski is often referred to as "Count Pulaski" in historical works. He was born in Podolia, Poland, at a time when that nation was undergoing a severe internal political battle. With rapacious neighbors beginning to conspire against the freedom of his people, the boy Pulaski was consumed with an early desire to ward off danger, and evinced a keen interest in military affairs at a very young age. Long before he reached his majority Pulaski joined in the guard of Duke Charles, and thus gained a rigorous and practical experience in the art of warfare.

In 1769 he joined his father, Joseph Pulaski, in what was termed "The Confederation of Bar," this confederation being a conjointure of Polish noblemen, each one of whom pledged his time, his fortune, and his life to the salvation of Poland. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the active leaders in the movement. The older leaders were soon dispersed, some going abroad; others were confined in dungeons. Pulaski's father was one of those confined in a dungeon prison, where he later died.

But despite this Casimir carried on, and at the head of a small force of cavalry he performed heroic feats. With his brother he became a constant terror to the Russians, who were trying to capture him. Against overwhelming odds for 4 years this great patriotic organization under this great leader fought to oust the enemies of Poland from his country. But all their efforts proved fruitless. During this time one of General Pulaski's brothers was killed before his eyes, the youngest brother taken into captivity, and many of his countrymen were doomed to misery.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was the leading spirit of his countrymen in this unequal struggle to preserve the country intact. Although but 25 years of age, he was the acknowledged leader and the hero of his countrymen. Headless of his foe, which was much more powerful, he fought with a zeal and tenacity that made him renowned as a cavalry leader throughout the Continent of Europe.

General Pulaski not only lost his father and brother in this glorious attempt to save Poland from the first of her ignoble partitions, but his estates were confiscated and he was proscribed by King Stanislaus and had to travel to Turkey. Soon thereafter, in 1772, Count Casimir Pulaski issued his memorable manifesto, in which he said in part:

I am not astonished that the enemies of my country resolved on her ruin, should direct their shafts against those who most firmly resist their impetuosity, and that they should regard as such the brave Poles whom they have sacrificed and who are still repelling their most cruel attacks. * * * My destiny was clear, when at the age of 21, far from yielding to the amusements of youth, I regarded every moment as lost which was not employed in repelling the enemies of my country. * * * I have endeavored to mark my course by an invincible fortitude. Neither the blood of one of my brothers, which was shed by the enemy before my eyes, nor the cruel servitude of another, nor the sad fate of so many of my relations and compatriots has shaken my patriotism.

Perhaps no better insight into the sturdy character of Pulaski, who is revered both in Europe and America, could be given than the above excerpt from his manifesto. He traveled to Turkey, but, repelled with the feeble notions of liberty entertained by the Sultan, he journeyed on to Marseilles, France, and from there to Paris. It was in the French capital that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin and young America's struggle for independence. Benjamin Franklin, writing from Paris to General Washington on May 29, 1777, said:

Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and con-

duct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into Your Excellency's hands.

General Pulaski landed in America the middle of July 1777, and, after presenting his letters to Washington and Congress, waited for Congress to take action. In the meantime, Washington's army passed through the streets of Philadelphia. Spurred by the sight of marching soldiers, Pulaski, restless and eager to aid our cause, decided not to wait for his commission, but to follow the army as a volunteer. In Europe a member of the nobility, an officer of distinguished prestige, in America a private in the ranks. Such was Pulaski. Not self, but service, was his life's motto.

The night of September 8, 1777, Washington assembled a council of war to decide which position the army should take in defense of Philadelphia. The upland, across the brook of Brandywine, was chosen. The army moved to this position at dawn. The enemy's attack was expected on the 11th and about 9 o'clock of that day the red uniforms appeared. The battle started. The vanguard, under General Maxwell, retreated under heavy pressure. The rest of the army was stretched out lengthwise for a considerable distance along the brook. The right wing was under the command of General Sullivan, and the left wing, to the south, was under the command of General Armstrong.

General Wayne and General Proctor commanded the cannon and the artillery. Washington remained with the reserve, which was commanded by General Greene, and Pulaski was stationed by the side of Washington.

Upon the withdrawal of General Maxwell the British kept up fire, but did not attempt crossing the creek. Washington was about ready to strike a blow at the enemy, but first wanted to be convinced that the opponents' main forces were not circumventing him for an attack at the rear. To that end, a detachment was sent out to explore the region. About 2 o'clock an orderly dispatched the news that the enemy could not be seen on any of the roads on the opposite side of the creek. An order of attack was about to be issued when a man in a cart was noticed waving his hat and striving to reach headquarters. The man turned out to be Squire Cheney, with the startling news that the main forces of the enemy had crossed the Brandywine to the north and were fast approaching the army's rear.

Washington immediately directed the division of Sullivan, together with the brigades of Conway, Stirling, and Stephans to meet the enemy. They hurriedly arrayed themselves for battle, just as the British were spied on the road. Thereupon the British vanguard showed itself on the plain. The American artillery opened fire. Hessian riflemen were playing havoc with the American front ranks. At the same time a column of infantry rushed to the upland occupied by the Americans. The center was holding up under the bombardment but both wings were fleeing. The enemy then con-

centrated on the center which soon wavered. Chaos reigned.

At this juncture Pulaski secured Washington's permission to use his bodyguard, some 30 horse, and launched a furious attack at the pursuers. With great skill he wedged into the side of the pursuing column. Swinging their sabers from left to right, this small detachment brought confusion to the ranks of the enemy. The pursuit was momentarily checked. Pulaski's forces took shelter with General Greene's army and together they held the enemy while the rear of the American Army retreated to Dillworth. There the road narrowed and the Americans gained a vantage point where they could withstand the onslaught of the enemy. Thus Washington's army was saved.

Within 2 months after his arrival, on September 15, 1777, Congress elected Pulaski "commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier."

General Washington's letter to Congress recommending the appointment of Pulaski read as follows:

This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country and has sacrificed his fortune and his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit.

Shortly afterward, Washington's army was saved from an almost inevitable destruction at Warren Tavern, near Philadelphia, only by the war craft of Pulaski. He also engaged in the Battle of Germantown. On the day of the Battle of Germantown he was sorely disappointed and mortified. There were but four regiments of cavalry raised and not one of them completed. Three of them only, such as they were, had joined General Washington's army, and on the day of the battle, guards were furnished out of those regiments to attend on the commander in chief and on other generals. This was a matter of deep regret and bitter chagrin.

When General Washington had taken his winter quarters at Valley Forge, the cavalry were sent over into New Jersey on account of forage and for other service on that side of the Delaware. Pulaski made his headquarters in Trenton.

Weary of the lapse in activity subsequent to these previous battles and dampened by the pettiness of the commander under whom he was stationed, as well as the tardy tactics of Congress in carrying out his suggestions for the improvement of the Infantry, Pulaski expressed a wish to return to Europe. Washington persuaded him to remain, however.

In March 1778 he asked permission from General Washington and Congress to organize an independent corps, later to be known throughout the Colonies as the "Polish Legion." In equipping it he is said to have spent \$50,000 of his own funds. These horsemen, among other arms, bore the famous Polish lances, a new weapon on this continent. Rated as the most expert horseman in the American Cavalry, his service in leading and inspiring the Cavalry was of inestimable value. From the time Pulaski took command it became a notable weapon of offense and defense. It is

entirely possible that without it the cause of independence would not have been won.

Then followed the battle of Charleston, S. C., when the city was sieged by 900 British troops from General Prevost's army. Although not altogether successful in his assault, Pulaski held the city 2 days until the arrival of reinforcements.

Probably Pulaski's most distinguished service was rendered in the siege of Savannah, Ga., although this move was made contrary to the sound advice of Pulaski, who pleaded a delay of a number of days due to their unpreparedness. Pulaski was here made commander of the entire cavalry, both French and American. During the battle their scheme failed. The French became entangled and their Admiral D'Estaing was wounded. Chaos resulted in the ranks. Hoping to rally the men and regain order, Pulaski rushed into the thick of the battle. Leading his men in a desperate charge, he received a wound in his right thigh and was carried from the field of battle fatally wounded. Pulaski died 2 days later while on board the brig *Wasp*, leaving Savannah Harbor on the way to Charleston. According to his friend and companion in arms, Capt. Paul Bentalou, he was buried at sea, and funeral services were held afterward in the city of Charleston.

In this manner, at the age of 31 years, ended the life of one of the most active and greatest patriots of his time. A man well born, of handsome physique and liberal education, who abandoned a life of ease and complacency for a career of unnumbered hardships and much bitterness. His was a proud and magnanimous personality, but he had to contend with petty men and the crudeness of a nation in its genesis. His corps of lancers and light infantry, which were recruited mostly in Baltimore, has since become famous under the name of Pulaski's Legion. He is known as the founder of the American Cavalry. Pulaski, like Washington, could have chosen the easy course. They were both men of large means. But they recognized the responsibility of wealth and rank.

An equestrian statue, which stands between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, commemorates this hero of two hemispheres.

The splendid funeral honors paid by the citizens of Charleston to the memory of the brave Pulaski—the united regrets of the people and of the Army at the loss of an officer no less beloved than he was useful—and the last tribute of respect offered to his memory by Congress have already evinced the sensibilities and gratitude of our Nation. The gallant son of Poland had enthusiastically espoused the cause of America. He served that cause with zeal, ardor, and fidelity.

Pulaski died as he had lived—a hero, but an enemy of kings. Since the time of Pulaski others have come from his native land to mix their blood with the blood of other peoples to make one common country and to build a single destiny. Many Americans of Polish extraction have offered their lives in defense

of this country on many battlefields—in the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and in the great World Wars. The blood of Pulaski still flows in the blood of his countrymen.

To the memory of Pulaski, William K. Palmer dedicated these beautiful words:

Columbia! He died for thee
Cheerfully, and for liberty!
Honored forever more
On this Atlantic shore

Since the American Revolution, many Poles immigrated to the United States. They have given their lives and contributed their sinews and toil for the freedom and development of this great country. They have become an integral part of America; they fought as soldiers of the United States on all battle fronts, as workers in the factories and in essential industries, and as farmers, miners, and lumberjacks. They shared the task in the war production, and as full citizens they hold all kinds of positions in the civic, social, political, cultural life in America. These American citizens of Polish extraction understand the plight of the Polish people; they resent Russian interference in Polish politics; they resent Russian domination or dictatorship over the Polish Nation and the Polish people.

Poland's record as a fighting member of the Allied Nations during the war is unassailable. Poland was the first to take up the fight with whatever weapons were available against the German-Nazi aggression for world domination. During the whole war she fought bravely and actively, and did not shrink from any sacrifice. Poland will not voluntarily give up her independence, freedom, and liberty. Poland fought at a time when other powers were conciliating and making overtures to Hitler.

Yes, Poland experienced more misery and devastation in human lives and material wealth than any other European nation. She lived through a literal inferno of Nazi occupation. To indicate the immensity of the problem facing the Polish people at the time of liberation from the Nazis, here are some figures on Poland's wartime losses: 6,104,990 Polish citizens killed; 10,000 factories and industrial plants destroyed; 300,000 buildings, hundreds of thousands of homes, and 400,000 farms totally or partly left in ruins; 100 percent of the machine-tool industry wiped out; 6,399 damaged schools; 15,900,000 books destroyed; approximately 6,500,000 children in need of medical care, homes, and food.

But, in face of these seemingly unsurmountable problems, the Polish people willingly turned to the enormous task of rebuilding their destroyed cities, renovating their factories, resowing their farmlands, reestablishing their transportation and communication lines, and countless other tasks. The accomplishments of the Polish people are nothing short of remarkable. Emerging from the dark chaos of war, the Polish people, through their undying love for their motherland, have instilled new life in their war-ravaged country.

The reconstruction of their ruined capital, Warsaw, is symbolic of the Polish people's achievements. The Ger-

mans had wantonly destroyed this once glorious city, burning its buildings and killing off the populace. Rising from the burning embers the few remaining Poles proceeded with the work of resurrecting Warsaw. A Supreme Council of Reconstruction, comprised of representatives of social, artistic, technical, and professional groups, was formed. Its task was to mobilize all the spiritual and material resources of the nation for the work of rebuilding the city.

During the past 2 years great strides have been made in rebuilding Warsaw. Electric plants have been rebuilt; the water system has been repaired; radio station reconstructed; surface transportation has been restored; and many other improvements have been instituted.

Warsaw is unlike other ruined cities of Europe. There is a spirit that transcends the sorrow and destruction. On the top of a heap of rubble, where a beautiful edifice once stood, there is now a flower shop. Farther down the street, on tops of similar heaps of crumbled stone, one will find a clothing store, a book mart, or other temporary shops. All over the city people are rebuilding and renovating. The Polish people do not believe in waiting for machinery, equipment, and so forth, they are rebuilding with their hearts and hands. Warsaw will live again, because the people believe in the inherent value of reconstruction; because the people love her dearly; and because the people are enthusiastic about the future of Poland and are willing to sacrifice to achieve a better life.

But, the spirit in Warsaw is not unlike the feeling of all Poland. People are working, learning, creating. They have faith and courage in what they are doing. They will succeed.

One of Poland's greatest achievements to date has been the reconstruction of its transportation and communication system. Before the war Poland had a well-organized railroad system. The Germans did their best during the occupation to change that. They confiscated railroad cars, locomotives, and engines. They destroyed about 30 percent of Poland's railway tracks—10,000 miles, 42 percent of her engines, 92 percent of her passenger cars, and 92 percent of her freight cars. At the end of the war Poland was left with 30 locomotives, 100 passenger cars, and 2,000 freight cars. These, without exception, were antiquated German cars, minus windows and doors, and locomotives which could not travel 100 miles without stopping for repairs.

Such was the legacy of German destruction which the Poles took over in the spring of 1945.

Perhaps the most striking example of the rapidity with which Poland is rebuilding her industries is her coal production. The losses sustained by the Polish coal mines during the war are estimated to be as high as \$700,000,000. Despite this, the Polish people at the beginning of 1946 undertook the gigantic job of rebuilding their coal-producing industry.

So successful have they been that today Poland stands out as the No. 1 supplier of coal in Europe. Her total pro-

duction for 1947 was 60,000,000 tons, of which 27,000,000 tons were exported, as against 45,000,000 tons produced in 1946, of which 13,487,934 tons were exported. These figures have tremendous significance for the economic recovery of the continent. Europe's most urgent need today is coal. Poland, with its mounting coal production, is becoming the one shining light in an otherwise bleak coal picture in Europe.

One reason offered by many people for the increased coal production in Poland as compared to other countries is the high productivity and enthusiasm of the Polish miner—this, despite the fact that the Polish worker receives fewer calories than the German worker.

Poland's coal production would increase many more times if she could receive more modern mining equipment.

Patriotic Americans of Polish extraction request that the Polish nation and the Polish people receive a square deal. They cannot understand why billions of dollars are being appropriated as outright gifts to nations and people who have been our enemies, and the Polish nation and the Polish people, who have always been on our side in every struggle, are being ignored and discriminated against. They request specifically that the Polish nation and the Polish people receive loans and credits on a business basis, and some relief aid for the needy and destitute.

We must not drop the iron curtain on the Polish people who have always been our loyal friends. We should not shunt them aside and deny them even commercial loans that they desperately need in their struggle for reconstruction. Poland today has trade agreements with practically every nation in Europe.

To make factories run, you must have energy. Europe's source of energy is coal. The two greatest suppliers of coal for Europe are the United States of America and Poland. The Ruhr should be No. 1 source of supply. But Ruhr coal is being hoarded for Germany. Only about 5,000,000 tons of this coal was made available for other nations. Seventy-five percent of Polish export coal went to western European nations, such as Austria, eastern Germany, Italy, France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, England, Czechoslovakia. Poland's request for \$60,000,000 to modernize her coal-mining equipment has not been acted upon. Why? Are they just interested in rebuilding Germany?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, appreciating the great services rendered by Gen. Casimir Pulaski and his sacrifice to help our country obtain its freedom and liberty, I heartily subscribe to what has been said of his noble services by all the gentlemen who preceded me.

Pulaski actually gave up his life in battle in order that we might attain our freedom and independence, and I feel that we now, in turn, owe it to Poland, his native country, to help her obtain freedom and independence, to which she is justly entitled.

The Polish people are liberty-loving people who for years were oppressed by

the Prussians and the Russians. After years of struggling, they gained their independence and then were again deprived of it by the Nazis. Now they are being deprived of their freedom for the second time by the Russians, who are taking advantage of their might and strength by interfering in Poland's internal and domestic affairs.

I hope that our Nation, in recognition of the services rendered to us, not only by General Pulaski but by many others of Polish descent who have so illustriously fought in our wars, will give Poland all the aid and assistance possible so that she may again attain her liberty and freedom, which, as I said before, rightfully belongs to her.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans all over the country join their fellow citizens of Polish descent in paying tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, whose name became the symbol of the deeply rooted ties which unite the American and the Polish people.

Pulaski's name became in two centuries the symbol and the banner under which humanity fights for freedom.

The memory of Casimir Pulaski, so widely honored in the United States, has a profound meaning for those who strive to keep alive the devotion of the American people for the ideal of human rights and democracy.

When but a young man of twenty-four, Casimir Pulaski was a veteran of the struggles for freedom, having fought gallantly beside his father in the patriotic uprising of the Poles against their Russian oppressors.

He fought a losing battle with the confederation for 5 years, and when the uprising was crushed he went into exile in France. From there he led an expedition of Poles into Turkey to join that nation in war against the Russians. This venture was doomed from the start for lack of promised support of the French. He was compelled to flee to France again and upon arrival in Marseilles was cast into a debtor's prison for failure to repay debts incurred in organizing the Turkey expedition.

At this time Benjamin Franklin arrived in France from America. Pulaski immediately offered his services to the Revolutionary cause and was accepted. He came to America to fight for the same liberties for which he struggled in Poland—the same liberties cherished by all of us—for which American armed forces have fought in the last two world wars.

Casimir Pulaski fought at Washington's side, first as a brigadier general in command of the Revolutionary cavalry and later as founder and leader of the famous Pulaski Legion. He died nobly in the American cause at the battle of Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

No true American can remain indifferent to the fact that the Poland of Pulaski and Kosciusko cannot speak for herself today. The voice of free Poland has been silenced. Americans of Polish blood are the only ones who can still speak for the enslaved Polish people.

We shall not stop reminding the world that the country whose war record made

her, in President Roosevelt's words, "the inspiration of nations," is now entirely dominated by a hostile, foreign power, that Poland's most worthy sons and daughters are being exterminated or deported, that a foreign, godless, totalitarian philosophy is being forced upon a Christian people, which strains all its moral and material forces in order to sweep out the Soviet puppets who now enforce a rule of terror in that unhappy country.

It is our sacred duty to most solemnly pledge ourselves to the memory of Pulaski, that we will not rest until the promises of freedom and independence for Poland given to the Polish nation during the war while she was fighting and bleeding are redeemed. We shall not rest until Pulaski's motto, "For our freedom and yours," will be fully applied to Poland—the nation which practiced it during 10 centuries of its recorded history.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing in these days of confusion and of fear to recall the life of a man who packed into his short but brilliant career a steadfast devotion to freedom.

I refer to Casimir Pulaski, who battled tyranny both in Poland and America because he believed in that great human aspiration for liberty which is above all divisions of race, color or creed.

Today we honor the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

It is good that we affirm a beginning instead of mourning an end. For the life of Casimir Pulaski was a struggle against fearful odds which never discouraged him. The tyrants of his day are gone, their names forgotten, but his is remembered with affection. Across time and space his name rekindles in us that spirit which never despairs. And we, who owe so much to men like Pulaski, cannot fail to be strengthened and to face up to our present tasks with his courage and his faith.

The headlines of our daily papers point to mounting crisis. And sometimes we feel that we are watching a tragedy which we are powerless to prevent. All over the world we see the middle-aged generation, exhausted by thirty-odd years of war and depression, stand by in apathy, bankrupt in leadership, unable to direct a world which must adapt itself to new conditions or die because it will not live and grow.

On the other hand, we see the young people latching on to the dazzling slogans of a new revolution and recklessly following the Pied Piper, not caring where he may lead them as long as he takes them away from the present which offers no chance for fulfillment.

Is there such an impassable gulf between the two? I think not. A few hundred years from now, as history judges our times, it may be able to establish the proportions of truth and error in each.

But we of the present must have foresight, not hindsight. We are pioneering the way, facing the unknown, and trying

to adjust our way of life to meet changing conditions without sacrificing our fundamental beliefs.

One of those beliefs is freedom, and by that I mean freedom for all and not just for a few.

Pulaski, being one of those men who are ahead of their times, sensed its meaning. He felt that along freedom's trail men would sometimes lose their way and go down blind alleys. Eventually they would find their true course again and go forward to a fuller life, enriched not only by a larger material return for their labors, but rounded out by a spiritual and mental awareness of life's greater meaning.

He knew that freedom might change its appearance but not its substance. Its dignity is rooted in the responsibility which individual men must assume for others as well as for themselves. The social order is imperiled when it is divided into "haves" and "have-nots." Men who live in want and fear are not free men. They are not the instruments of revolution which can lead to terror or progress.

Our Nation came into being through revolution against a system which was not flexible enough to solve the problems of its times in an orderly manner. In place of royalty we put a government of the people. Our forefathers recognized that it must be adaptable to changing needs, evolving like life itself, able to meet and overcome any challenge by an improved response.

If Pulaski were with us, I am sure that his actions would spur us to a more positive course of action. With his courage and resourcefulness, he would rouse us from our mood of indecision.

He would call upon us to build ourselves strong, materially, for one must have physical power to halt aggression. But do not forget that much depends upon the morale of your home base. Extend democracy among the people so that their cooperation is complete and voluntary. Aid the faltering democracies of Europe with the economic transfusion that is the Marshall plan. Use every medium of communications to sell the true facts of our freedom to the world. Alert all to the new techniques of infiltration so that men may save their representative governments from the Trojan horse of communism.

Two hundred years have passed down the river of time since the birth of a human being who had the democratic spirit in abundance.

We honor him not in idle memory but as if we were listening to him in this Chamber as he warns us to meet the challenges of today with resolution and with realism.

This anniversary of Pulaski's birth should be for us the day for reawakening. There is a common bond between the people who enjoy liberty in the United States and those who long to regain it in Poland. Some day we shall be able to help them as Pulaski helped us.

When the volunteer Pulaski arrived in the New World he had his share of disappointments. General Washington did not have the authority to give an officer's commission to the young Pole whose military reputation certainly merited such a badge of leadership. He discovered that

he had to wait until Congress made up its mind.

The Congress of those days talked and talked while disaster hovered near. The war was being lost while the debate went on. The British were marching on Philadelphia. They defeated the Americans at the Battle of Brandywine. When the right wing of the American Army collapsed, the center was endangered. Pulaski could wait no longer. Even without official rank, he could be of help at this desperate moment. He begged of General Washington that he be put in charge of the small headquarters cavalry unit numbering some thirty men.

In this emergency, the hard-pressed commander of the American forces gave his consent. There was no time to wait for Congress to approve.

Pulaski's handful of men charged upon the enemy. The British were thrown off stride by this attack from a defeated and disorganized foe. The brief diversion slowed the British advance and gave Washington the opportunity to save the remnants of his Army.

Out of the gloom surrounding this defeat one encouraging fact stood clear. If we had more men like Pulaski, the battle might not have been lost. Pulaski believed in himself and in his cause. He had that positive faith which communicates itself to others. His was the inspiration of example.

Would that we had more of his type with us today.

His native land has been enslaved again, and many Americans wail and wring their hands and wonder, "What will happen next?"

Czechoslovakia falls and the land-bridge to Poland is gone. In failing to support the independence of Poland, we have placed our own in jeopardy.

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

MR. LANE. I yield.

MR. McCORMACK. I congratulate my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for the able address that he has just made. I join in every word that he has said in honoring this great man who is one of the outstanding figures of all time in the fight for liberty and independence.

MR. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his able contribution.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

MR. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is a privilege and honor to express a few words in commemoration of that great soldier, General Pulaski. We, as a Nation, owe a great debt of gratitude to him for the service he rendered to us. Because of his great love for freedom and liberty, Gen. Casimir Pulaski came to this country to offer his time and talents in our fight for freedom, and he ultimately made the greatest of all sacrifices for his beliefs in surrendering his life at Savannah, Ga.

It is one of the tragedies of history that today General Pulaski's country should be without those liberties for which he fought. The Polish people, like the Irish in their desire for freedom, have suffered persecution perhaps more than any other people in Europe, but they have

always carried in their hearts a devotion to freedom and liberty and justice that surely cannot be suppressed for long. Somehow, sometime, that devotion must be rewarded. The clouds are dark at the present time over Poland and their clearing cannot be seen immediately, but all peoples in the world who love freedom and social justice pray that the day will be hastened when Poland can live again under its own flag. The spirit of General Pulaski should serve as an inspiration to the Polish people and give them the courage to survive their present oppression.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

MR. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, how glaringly vivid the shadowy past, how easily linked to the precarious present.

Countless changes have been wrought by the passage of time but the enemies of freedom remain little disturbed. And today as in the past the countenance of oppression crowds the mirror that would reflect a world at peace.

Today, even while we are paused during these brief consecrated moments to do honor to a valiant gentleman, a hero of another day, we are inescapably brought face to face with the similarity of conditions during the time of Casimir Pulaski and those of the present day.

Fitting it is indeed that we should dwell upon the illustrious deeds of this patriot of two worlds.

Each year this celebrated Chamber resounds with the expression of a people full of gratitude remembering the formative years of an infant republic and paying the profoundest tribute to a man who espoused a cause for which he paid the last and the highest price.

We have heard recounted again and again the story of his brief but active life devoted exclusively to the cause of his native land, Poland, and to the independence of our own Nation.

We know he was born to wealth but chose danger and privation. His sacrifice was complete. He gave unstintingly of time, of heart, and of devotion to principle.

And when our Nation, then young and struggling to gain independence, was engaged in the task of ridding its shores of an oppressor, it found in Pulaski a zealous warrior for its liberty. He came offering all, asking nothing.

With Benjamin Franklin's recommendation, he gained an introduction to Gen. George Washington. The summer of 1777 found him a volunteer in the Army, winning the commendation of the Commander in Chief for his military skill and his gallant conduct. His heroism, his earnest effort, and his constant desire to see the fortunes of a new nation unfold and gather strength for the future, his love of freedom were equally intense and steadfast in the land of his adoption; and the battlefields of America witnessed no lessening of his intrepidity.

Congress commissioned him brigadier general in command of cavalry, and he accomplished much to bring distinction to this branch of service. An experienced officer and a daring horseman, he was the first to hold this rank in the American Cavalry.

Every engagement saw him with that impatient zest for action and every minute that was not given to the cause of liberty irked him.

Came his final day of action at Savannah, and he was then but 31. He found his resting place in a land for whose freedom he fought, but never was to see glorified and great.

To the day of his death, General Pulaski hoped the opportunity would arrive when his hand would strike the blow for the resurrection of his beloved Poland. His expatriation was a bitter experience to him, and it was only the utter futility of resistance in a Poland torn by the vicious enemies along her borders which prompted this course for him.

Were he among the living today, General Pulaski would be welcomed by the ever-mounting number of oppressed peoples who are being shorn of their privileges of liberty. He would be accepted as a leader in a righteous fight against all despots who would deny that freedom is the universal property and the fundamental need of man.

Those who cry out from the deepening dark where the light of liberty is all but extinguished would find in Pulaski a resolute and stalwart champion unflinchingly standing his ground in the face of the engulfing monster we know as communism.

What a fierce and uncompromising opponent for the ruthless horde from Moscow. What a bulwark against the threats of the would-be world masters who are even at this moment engaged in their diabolical game of herding free peoples into one camp under one whip.

Today is only the past brought up-to-date. It is the same story and the characters new, but no less vicious. In the time of Pulaski it was Catherine II and the victim, Poland. This land whose people, long oppressed, knew little freedom is again the stage where is played the all too realistic drama involving the battle of right and wrong.

In that day Poland was the vanguard of civilization and time and time again repulsed the onslaughts directed against Europe.

Today, whether we realize it or not, the United States of America has inherited the unenviable position of standing guard over the destinies of all freedom-loving nations.

What has happened to Poland can also be the fate of America. We must ever be reminded to remain alert. We must never permit the complacent feeling that it cannot happen to us.

History and the exploits of such martyrs of freedom as General Pulaski should serve as beacons for our guidance with the issues of the future.

Let us hope that year after year as the representatives of the people gather here to memorialize the greatness of Pulaski and bear testimony to a Nation's appreciation of the services rendered by him, we as a people, indoctrinated in the ways of freedom, invoke each time the aid of the Almighty to spare us the devastation visited upon other nations and to endow us with the wisdom and the foresight to stand vigilantly prepared against any tyrant.

Let us permit the name of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a patriot of two worlds, to become the watchword for positive action when our own liberties are threatened.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a great Polish patriot, a freedom-loving man, a great soldier, and a defender of free governments. This great soldier volunteered his services to Gen. George Washington, and the American Colonies, in the dark days of the Revolutionary War, when our country was weak and poor and our fate hung in the balance. Shortly after joining Washington's forces, he distinguished himself in many battles. His ability as an outstanding soldier was soon recognized. He was given a command of cavalry and was promoted by Congress to the rank of brigadier general. He fought valiantly in the siege of Savannah, where he was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779, and died 2 days later on the U. S. S. *Wasp* in Savannah Harbor.

He knew what freedom was, for his native land, Poland, had just a few years before been partitioned by Prussia, Austria, and Russia, the very same countries who in our own times have brought about the greatest human suffering the world has ever known. General Pulaski died 168 years ago fighting for freedom when democracy was young, but that struggle for freedom still goes on, and though it may have temporary set-backs, as it has in some countries today and the people are again in subjugation, it will eventually triumph, for the cause is just and, like any other great cause, it cannot be withheld very long from the people. The days are gone when a tyrant can impose his will on any nation for any long period of time. We hear today in our own and in other countries of the world those who are preaching other forms of government, yet there is no country where the people enjoy more freedom, have a higher standard of living than we have. They have nothing to point to except poverty, misery, want, and hardship. It has been said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This is the time for all loyal Americans to rally to the support of our constitutional American form of government to see to it that this priceless treasure of ours, the freedom which we enjoy here, is not jeopardized.

We will not be misled or beguiled by promises such as were made to people of other nations, only to find themselves cheated out of what they possessed and today are actually enslaved.

We honor our great heroes, who through their bravery, foresight, and great sacrifice have bestowed upon us the finest form of government in the world. Our Nation is a beacon light to every freedom-loving person, and so long as our form of government exists, there will always be that hope of the enslaved people of the world, that their cause is not lost and that some day they, too, will become free and independent, a right to which they are justly entitled.

We honor the memory of General Pulaski and a grateful Nation pays tribute to him on the anniversary of his birthday for the great heritage he and other great patriots have bestowed upon us. He sacrificed his life so that we here may enjoy the greatest freedom and independence of any people on earth. Let us become alert and vigilant, so that no foreign ideology of government shall be forced upon us. Let us safeguard the kind of government that George Washington, the Father of our Country, fought so hard to attain and which General Pulaski died for.

We highly appreciate the services he rendered our country, the great sacrifice he made in our cause. We have named highways in his honor, set aside public lands as parks, and named many cities after him. We have erected splendid monuments to his memory. Our people will forever honor his memory as an outstanding American hero.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point of the RECORD on the life and character of Casimir Pulaski, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and all the other Members of the House who paid honor and tribute to a great lover of freedom. Two hundred years ago today there was born in what is today enslaved Poland one of the greatest military and political leaders of our times. A man who has been revered and remembered for as long a period as 200 years in all parts of the world must be known for some very splendid principles.

Casimir Pulaski, together with Kosciusko, has set an example that the world can well emulate today. It is only too bad that the world has not emulated their principles in the past 5 years. Casimir Pulaski was of the firm conviction that if freedom was in danger in one part of the world, freedom was in danger all over the world. In other words, it was his firm conviction and a conviction for which he laid down his life right here in the confines of our own country some 2,500 miles away from his homeland, giving his life freely because he felt in his heart that if the lamp of freedom were ever to be kept lit and burning in Europe that it must be lit and be kept burning within the United States of America. When, therefore, his country became enslaved and he saw no opportunity whatever to bring about freedom within his homeland because of the interference and action, even at that time, of all-powerful Russia, he went over to France and through

Benjamin Franklin got in contact with George Washington and came over to the United States of America with one thing uppermost in his mind, and that was that if freedom could be established within the United States of America the flame of freedom would spread so that eventually it would even take in the confines of his native Poland.

There was one other thing that Casimir Pulaski stood for, that the world could well emulate and that the leaders of the Government of the United States of America should have emulated in the last 5 years; and that is, Gen. Casimir Pulaski had the conviction that no nation could sell out the freedom of its neighbor and keep its own freedom secure. Pulaski was of the conviction that freedom was everybody's battle, and whenever he saw freedom falling in a neighboring country Pulaski was there to give a hand to help them maintain their freedom. Too bad that the United States of America had not followed that example at Yalta, where we absolutely went counter to everything that Gen. Casimir Pulaski stood for. The indulgence of the United States of America, the leadership of the United States of America, in their actions at Yalta was a poor reward for the great freedom-loving people of Poland and the great general and fighter for freedom as was Casimir Pulaski.

It is tragic that today again Poland is enslaved. Poland is enslaved because of the weakness of the leadership of the big powers, particularly the United States of America, in not having courage enough to stand up for what they thought was right and in not wanting to preserve freedom.

For instance, we are sending money and bullets to the people of Greece to keep the Greek people from being taken over by the Communists. Now I feel that the people of Poland and its great patriots like Casimir Pulaski have contributed far more to the freedom of the world than have the people of that remote area. Why did not the United States of America take as active an interest in freedom in Poland as it is now taking in Greece, and send arms and send financial help and send food to the people of Poland to help them maintain their freedom?

It must be remembered that Poland has paid a higher price per capita of population in this war than any country ever paid in the history of the world. Poland in this last war laid down more than 8,000,000 lives. Just think of that. When you consider that Poland before the war was a country of some 32,000,000 people, when it has given in blood and in life 8,000,000 of those 32,000,000, that means that 25 percent of the population of Poland perished in World War II. It would be tragic to see Casimir Pulaski today after the way the United States of America sold out Poland to the beast of communism.

At this time all hearts in America, all the freedom-loving people of America, the freedom-loving people all over the world, are honoring and commemorating the memory of Casimir Pulaski, the man who has set the example to the world that freedom is everybody's fight, that when it is endangered in one part of the

world it is in danger all over the world, and who also set a moral example to the world that you cannot sell out the freedom of your neighbor and keep your own freedom secure.

In closing I want again to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and all of his colleagues who have done such a fine job in commemorating the memory of so great a freedom-loving individual.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, may I say at this time that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] desired to have some time, but unfortunately they are in the hospital and unable to join with the rest of the gentlemen in paying their respects to that great patriot, General Pulaski.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that the Congress set aside this time to do honor to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. General Pulaski was born on March 4, 1748, and today is the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

On February 12, I spoke to the Members of the House about the outstanding patriotic accomplishments of another great Polish hero, Thaddeus Kosciusko, and generally speaking, the same words can be applied to the great Polish patriot, General Pulaski.

Their careers were very similar. America owes a great debt of gratitude to the man whose two hundredth anniversary we are celebrating today. His deeds and services toward aiding young America to establish freedom will forever be perpetuated in the minds of the people of our country. In the dark days of the Revolution, it took courage and bravery and one possessed of the true spirit of a patriot to accomplish the great deeds of heroism accomplished by General Pulaski. His presence as a leader in our Revolutionary Army also brought thousands of his Polish comrades to fight for the cause of American liberty. Today his name lives not only in the hearts of all Americans, but also in the hearts of all Polish people who believe in free, unfettered, and independent government, not only in their adopted home but also for their homeland. The love of self-government and free religious worship flows through the veins of all true Poles. The past centuries have demonstrated that the Polish people will never be submerged permanently by any power, no matter how great, because they have broken the shackles of tyranny before and will do it again. The spirit of America is behind the Polish Nation in its fight to regain its independence and liberty both civic and religious. The spirit of General Pulaski continues to live in the minds and hearts of all the Polish people and I know that the people of America share that spirit and will cooperate and work in harmony today as the pioneer Americans did with General Pulaski and other Poles back in the Revolutionary days.

That spirit will reestablish Poland in its rightful place among all nations—a free, independent self-governing nation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the bicentennial of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

General Pulaski was born of noble birth, March 4, 1748, in one of the blackest periods of Poland's tragic history. It is significant that we come to the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth as Poland is again crushed, as it was in his day, in a cruel conspiracy against the rights of man.

Pulaski fought for freedom in his own land but saw it go down to defeat. He escaped from Poland's conqueror and continued from afar to fight for the land he loved.

In Paris, in 1777 Pulaski met Benjamin Franklin and arranged to come to America. George Washington accepted Pulaski's service and without waiting for a commission the great Polish soldier enlisted in the Army.

Congress subsequently rewarded Pulaski's loyalty and heroism by commissioning him as a brigadier general and Washington made him the first commander of the American cavalry.

His qualities as a leader established, Washington in 1778 designated him as commander of the Pulaski Legion, an independent corps which contributed greatly to the success of the Colonies' cause in the war for independence.

As the heroic leader of this legion Pulaski distinguished himself for his valor and military genius until the time of his fatal wounding, October 9, 1779.

In an ill-fated assault on the city of Savannah Pulaski was hit in the thigh by a grape shot when trying to arrest the retreat of the French columns. On October 11, 1779 he died from the wound on board the U. S. brig *Wasp*.

This loyal son of Poland, unable to save the freedom of Poland, died for that of America.

Such spirit lights the way to liberty in the world.

I am confident his spirit still lives in Poland and somehow, someday will shine through to give his people the liberty and the freedom they as a nation have always cherished—though rarely enjoyed.

Poland's history has been a tragic one—her great sons numerous and always found where people were fighting for the rights of man. Certainly their sacrifices cannot have been in vain. Poland must someday live again as a free nation, where liberty and freedom shall ever be the watchword.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a cause for great pride for every American to take part, even in a small way, in commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski.

But the recollection of this immortal's great deeds will bring a heavy sadness to the heart of every lover of freedom.

General Pulaski occupies a very special place in the hearts of Americans because he contributed so much to the foundation of this Republic. In his heart burned the fierce fire of liberty. Poland was his first love—but wherever people thirsted for justice and liberty there General Pulaski saw his duty.

He was not content to remain in his motherland while the patriots of this infant Republic struggled against the might of the world's greatest empire. He

fled home and safety and helped lead his brave soldiers against the trained armies of Britain. He inspired all with his bravery and courage, with his love of liberty, and his will to win.

Today, throughout the country, Americans of all origins will join with descendants of Poland to pay tribute to his memory. Statues have been erected—public monuments have been dedicated to him. Flowers and flags will be brought forth as emblems of our respect for his memory.

But, tomorrow, perhaps all this will be forgotten and in his motherland history's greatest crime will continue to go unpunished. We shall continue to lament a condition which would have broken the heart of this immortal son of a once-proud and brave people.

I can recall other days in this House when Members rose to acknowledge their deep affection and great respect for the suffering people of Poland. All of us were shocked beyond measure when the armies of fascism drew Polish blood, shattered the proud cities, and scorched its countryside. Americans from all walks of life promised this great wrong would be righted and Poland once again would take her place among the free nations of the world.

Agreements were made between great statesmen, commitments were made that assistance of all kinds would be forthcoming; a great international parliament was created—all these things intended as guarantees that our pledges to Poland's brave dead would be redeemed.

Poland, throughout history, has been stabbed in the back, dismembered, her populations scattered, her cities laid waste. But always there has been the promise of a brighter tomorrow; always there has been the fire of liberty burning in the hearts of her sons and daughters. Always her leaders planned and worked for the day when Poland could again raise her head and assert her independence of foreign domination.

But despite all the noble sacrifices this proud people have made on the altar of freedom, she now lies prostrate, bleeding from many wounds. On her breast is perched the vulture of Red communism, sucking from her veins the last vestiges of her will to resist.

The end of World War II was the hoped-for day of Polish patriots. It was the tomorrow for which they had prayed and fought and died. But days have rolled into months, months into years, and the will to be free is being starved out of Poland as her people struggle for bread and clothing and cover.

This is what the memory of Pulaski must mean to Americans today.

His memory should awaken in all of us a determination to cling fast to the freedom and liberty and justice which is ours—and which Pulaski helped to make possible. That we will rededicate ourselves to making our democracy so function that we can be of some concrete assistance to the freedom-loving people everywhere, and, please God, we can keep alive in the hearts of Poland's brave sons the determination to throw off the yoke of communism which has forced Poland to her knees.

As God is in His Heaven the day will surely come when these brave people, the

sons and daughters of Pulaski, will enjoy their full measure of reward for all their sufferings in freedom's name.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to pay tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

His role in resisting the forces oppressing his beloved Poland has been celebrated by the historians of every freedom-loving nation. Every American schoolboy has been taught the debt of gratitude that our own country owes to the contributions and courage of this great patriot. As we revere his memory, we honor through him that love of liberty and that dauntless spirit, stemming from his Polish heritage, which sent him forth to fight for freedom in the New World.

Through the centuries Poland has had its great leaders—men of extraordinary capabilities, character, and courage. Yet all of the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

At the beginning of modern times all of western Christendom owed a debt of gratitude to Poland when King John Sobieski drove the Turks back from Vienna in 1683 in one of the most decisive victories in history. Had the gallant Sobieski failed, all Europe would have been subjected to a yoke of slavery and Christian culture would have been destroyed.

Poland's contributions to the success of the Allies during World War II, and the fight of her people to preserve western civilization once again as they did in the battle of Vienna in the fifteenth century, make it mandatory that all true Americans support the demands for justice for Poland in the United Nations.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. Poland's contributions to the military success of the United Nations in the drive to final victory and peace, and her sacrifice in the cause of humanity, merit every consideration. We must keep the sacred pledges that were made to Poland, not only because of the debt of gratitude which the other nations of the world owe to Poland, but because of the necessity of obtaining the whole-hearted cooperation of all the smaller nations who look to us for justice.

The Americans of Polish ancestry, who have contributed so much to the development of the United States, I urge you to continue your efforts to restore Poland to its prewar glory. The buoyant idealism and splendid patriotism, together with the deep Christian concept of the right, which have characterized the Polish spirit in the past, have done much for our own country and should certainly do much for devastated Poland.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent. By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and de-

sire to make it free will only enhance their love of America. All of us might well be proud if we could contribute as much as Pulaski did to progress in the United States and peace in the world.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 323—OIL EMBARGO

Mr. HESELTION. Mr. Speaker, since the majority leader has announced that, if a rule is granted, this resolution may be called next week, I think it might be helpful to the Members if I report on the text of the resolution and the committee amendments and discuss briefly some of the reasons why I believe this is meritorious legislation which should be enacted promptly.

As amended, the title of the resolution would be "To prohibit temporarily the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products."

The text follows:

Whereas there are current and anticipated shortages in the United States of petroleum and petroleum products essential to satisfy fuel needs; and

Whereas, while such shortages continue, the health, safety, and welfare of the American people are threatened and industry is severely handicapped in the effort to attain production of commodities necessary (1) to the economic welfare of the United States, and (2) to insure the success of such program as may be adopted for aiding in the economic recovery of Europe; and

Whereas the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has been conducting a study of this problem, and, in its preliminary report to the House on January 26, 1948, stated that the existing and threatened situation "is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country"; Therefore be it

Resolved etc., That during the period of 30 days beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export petroleum or petroleum products from the United States to any foreign country.

Sec. 2. Whoever violates the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 3. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

The committee amendments to the text will be in the first section, where the words "petroleum or petroleum products from the United States to any foreign country" would be stricken and the following would be inserted in lieu thereof:

Kerosene, gas, oil, and distillate fuel oil, or residual fuel oil, from the East coast or Gulf coast of the United States to any foreign country, except that—

(1) exports of any such product necessary for use by the armed services of the United States may be made; and

(2) this joint resolution shall not require reduction of exports so as to reduce the imports into the Dominion of Canada from the United States below the amounts conforming with the voluntary import-reduction program heretofore undertaken by Canadian authorities and Canadian industry.

These amendments would restrict the embargo to what are known as heating oils, would confine the embargo to shipments from the east coast, where such

an embargo is now in effect under a departmental order, and from the Gulf coast, would exempt exports necessary for use by the armed services and would not affect the present voluntary reduction with our Canadian friends.

I doubt if anyone will question the wisdom of these amendments although there may be some doubt as to the extent of the exemption of exports for the use of the armed services. So far as they are needed by our armed services or for legitimate uses in occupation areas, such uses are imperative. But, in the light of the lack of sound screening of requests for use in occupation areas, some objections might be made to a flat exemption. However, these uses have been sharply restricted in the recent revisions. Although they first were submitted as absolute minimum needs, the reductions below those alleged minimums have been so substantial as to lead to a reasonable belief that a realistic minimum has now been established.

It is obvious that upon the passage of this resolution there would be an effective embargo on all shipments of kerosene, gas oil, and distillate fuel oil, or residual fuel oil from east and gulf coast ports in this country for a period of 30 days, with the exceptions noted.

The clear intent and the sole objective of the resolution is to divert to domestic use these critically needed fuel oils so that American homes, industries, churches, hospitals, schools, transportation systems, and other users of heating oils will be guaranteed, so far as humanly possible, against any further shortages during the balance of the heating season.

Some opposition has been expressed on the theory that the situation would straighten itself out and that, in fact, there is no further difficulty now with the coming of spring. These opponents overlook the facts. Although much has been accomplished in the way of diversion of oils through previously announced revisions in the export program and through conservation measures practiced by individuals in these areas, we are still suffering from abnormally low temperatures and are being buffeted by record snowfalls. Over this last week end, parts of New England had to dig out from a fall of between 9 to 12 more inches of snow. This was accompanied by freezing temperatures. A total of 85.5 inches has fallen on the Boston area to date. Only the winter of 1873-74 brought more snow to that area. In other parts of Massachusetts, all time records have been established with snowfalls of more than 131 inches. While I wish we could be as optimistic as some of the opponents of this resolution are, we have to face the facts. We know that our depleted stocks of heating oils are running out. We know that, unless we can secure effective action immediately, we will be in trouble. We can no longer remain patient with the continued refusal of our Department of Commerce to recognize these facts and help us. So far as we are concerned, every hour counts. And we certainly do not mean all this effort to be an idle gesture. It is the only course open to us and we believe it will be effective. In

that connection, we have the testimony of many able men connected with the oil industry who have stated that such an embargo would result in the diversion of the heating oils to our areas.

So that there will be no doubt about the facts, let me quote from a news article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce today:

EAST'S OIL STOCKS DANGEROUSLY LOW

Atlantic coast heating-oil stocks are at dangerously low levels, necessitating continued high production and consumer conservation.

This was the conclusion reached yesterday by the Petroleum Regional Advisory Committee for the east coast after studying a report made by its statistical subcommittee.

The report showed that east-coast heating-oil stocks at 7,940,000 barrels on February 21 were 43 percent below a year ago, a dangerously low level that must be further drawn upon to meet needs even under normal weather.

Kerosene supply, it added, is particularly acute because there is little hope of increased yields. To avoid further deterioration of the kerosene stock situation, the refining subcommittee said it was sending telegrams to refiners to maintain high yields. At the same time, the transportation subcommittee reported that barge movements are now in progress up the Hudson as far as Albany.

Concluding its report, the committee said that consumers must continue to save every possible drop of oil if hardship is to be avoided throughout the remainder of the heating season.

The resolution is based fundamentally upon the fact that a survey was made in other countries, upon instruction by Secretary Marshall, in early February. In his cables, the Secretary stated the domestic situation forcefully and accurately. Those portions of the cables were as follows:

Adverse weather conditions and abnormally low stocks have aggravated critical shortages of all petroleum heating fuels throughout large areas of the United States. The seriousness of these shortages has led the Department of Commerce to reduce first quarter export allocations, effective January 30, 1948, as follows—

Stating the reductions—

Concern is also increasing regarding diminishing United States stocks of aviation gasoline and motor gasoline. The course of events may shortly necessitate revisions of these allocations also. In the light of the revised first quarter allocations and continuing critical United States shortages of petroleum heating oils and aviation gasoline and motor gasoline, the consulate is requested to consult immediately with representatives of the * * * Government to determine what further reductions in the revised first quarter petroleum allocations to * * * can be achieved without probable serious economic disruption. It is urgent that OIT receive your reply not later than Wednesday, February 11, 1948. Information urgently required as to detail of essential end uses of petroleum from United States in China and the effect on the economy of the January 30 cuts and of possible further reductions.

These reports came back to this country. They resulted in a total offered reduction of 1,198,036 barrels of petroleum and petroleum products. Note that these offers were made without probable serious economic disruption.

In the face of this, the Review Committee discussed the possibility of further

reductions on the afternoon of February 18. The following is from their minutes:

There was considerable discussion regarding further reductions in the first quarter 1948 export quotas covering aviation gasoline, other motor gasoline, kerosene, gas oil and distillate fuel oil, and residual fuel oil. OIT explained they had sent cables to our embassies in the countries receiving these products from this country, outlining the seriousness of the domestic supply and asking for a statement as to the minimum quantities which the various countries must have during the first quarter. They also discussed this subject with the foreign missions in Washington.

As a result of replies from these cables, discussions with the foreign missions in Washington, and a study of the unlicensed balances in the first quarter quotas, OIT felt the reductions listed below might be made in view of the serious domestic supply-demand situation.

The total cut recommended was 599,000 barrels. As I said, these countries had reported a total reduction could be achieved without probably serious economic disruption of 1,198,036 barrels. It is significant that this is almost exactly 100 percent more than the recommendation.

On February 19, OIT announced a reduction in the amount of 599,000 barrels. The bulletin included this statement:

It is hoped that it will not be necessary to use all the unallocated amounts. The amounts not used will represent a further saving, it was explained.

Parenthetically the bulletin of February 10 stated:

In order further to insure that no petroleum products in critically short supply are shipped from the area of greatest shortage in the United States, the Department of Commerce has prohibited the use of its petroleum export licenses to clear shipments from east coast ports, the Office of International Trade announced today. * * * Because of continuing petroleum shortages in the United States, importing countries are being asked to make further reductions in their requests for petroleum products in future quarters. In addition, they are being asked to review immediately the first quarter allocations * * * to determine whether further reductions can be achieved during the remaining winter months, OIT officials said.

And in its bulletin of January 2 the OIT stated:

This quota continues the policy of restricting exports of major petroleum products to the maximum extent possible until the current domestic shortages are alleviated.

Consider that last statement for a moment. It insists that this quota continues the policy of restricting these exports to the maximum extent possible. In spite of that, on February 10 this Office reduced exports of kerosene 125,000 barrels, of gas oil and distillate fuel oil 200,000 barrels, and of residual fuel oil 175,000 barrels. Then, on February 19 it reduced kerosene exports by another 106,000 barrels, gas oil and distillate fuel oil by another 5,500 barrels, and residual fuel oil by another 25,000 barrels. This reduction, in heating oils only, of a total of 636,500 barrels within 9 days either belies the statement of January 2 that the export quota then announced constituted a restriction to the maximum extent possible or it demonstrates the kind of faulty judgment which has been

primarily responsible for the existence of even spot shortages in this country this winter.

Nevertheless, when we know that 599,000 barrels of these heating oils are in terminals in the Gulf coast, when we know that we can have ample tankers to transport them north on a few hours' notice, when we know that we have ample terminal storage space in Boston, in Rhode Island, in Connecticut, in New York, in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, in Delaware, in Maryland, in Virginia, in North Carolina, in South Carolina, in Georgia, and on the east coast of Florida. The same thing is undoubtedly true in the Midwest.

Yet the Department of Commerce is adamant in its refusal to either divert the additional 599,000 barrels to the east coast or to the Midwest or to issue the same order as to honoring licenses out of Gulf coast ports until that amount of heating oil shall have cleared for those points. It refuses positively to reduce the reserve item of 774,522 barrels by the amount of 599,000 barrels. In the meantime, since February 27, this office has issued four additional licenses for an additional 17,800-barrel export of these heating oils.

In order that you might have an official statement of the Department's position I requested Assistant Secretary Bruce to send me a message covering it. His telegram has just arrived and it is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives:

Retel the position of the Department of Commerce on export of petroleum products to all destinations remains unchanged. The quantities established as petroleum product export quotas, which include country quotas as well as the reserve item, are the amounts which have been allocated for export and do not exist as a pool from which exports are made. We anticipate making no further reductions in such allocations, including the reserve item, for the remainder of this quarter the reserve item to which you refer is established for emergency uses and to cover the needs of small countries for which no country quotas are established no petroleum products are earmarked under any of these items including the reserve, and holders of licenses must seek them and contract for them where they can. The above does not however refer to exports of crude petroleum which was placed on the positive list on February 17. Already cases of extreme hardship have been referred to us under this ruling which we are taking under consideration, which is the usual procedure when a commodity is first put on the positive list.

DAVID BRUCE,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Let me comment that I know and you know that the quantities do not exist as a pool. The point is that the oil is in existence and, if the Department licenses its exports, the holders of those exports can and will draw on existing stocks of heating oils for overseas shipments. We are not asking that this should not be done. We are asking that domestic needs be recognized and that, until we know we have these additional 599,000 barrels on their way to east coast and midwest terminals, overseas shipments of that oil should not be made. Boiled down we are only asking that our constituents be given equal consideration

with our friends in other countries. They have not been given that consideration up to now. We know they have been in difficulty. We know they may still suffer hardships. We wish to insure against that. We can do so now by passing this resolution.

I submit that a vote for the resolution can only be interpreted as an honest, realistic, and constructive effort to prevent further hardships in this country. I think a vote against the resolution will be interpreted, at least by those who are thereby compelled to endure further hardships, as an indication of indifference to their comfort, their welfare and, perhaps, to their security.

At this point I include a tabulation furnished me by the Office of International Trade covering licenses issued since the date of my last report, which is printed at page 1954 of the RECORD of March 1. Read together they tell the story of the licensees issued up to today in the first quarter. They total 2,812,876 barrels of these heating oils, which is something of a contrast to the 599,000 barrels we insist our American homes and institutions ought to have and can have under this resolution.

Licenses issued for export of petroleum products, Feb. 27-Mar. 4, inclusive

Aviation gasoline (501600):	Barrels
Mexico	500
China	70,000
Total	70,500

Motor gasoline (501700): None.

Kerosene (502700): Liberia 300

Diesel oil (503000):

Honduras	5,000
Mexico	4,500

Residual fuel oil (503100): Mexico 8,000

Crude oil (501100): France 60,000

Note.—Figures in parentheses are schedule B numbers.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 1508

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. HARTLEY] today has filed House Report No. 1508, dealing with the investigation of sworn testimony of Harold Christoffel before that committee that he was not a Communist.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to investigate the matter I wish to state that the said Harold Christoffel has been tried by a jury in the District of Columbia and found guilty of perjury.

This jury verdict is a triumph for sound trade-unionism in America. Sound trade-unionists all over our land are realizing that a labor union cannot cooperate with Communists any more than the Benes government in Czechoslovakia could cooperate with Communists.

Regardless of the merits of the controversy between the union and the Allis-Chalmers Co. in Milwaukee, Wis., the activities of Communist influence in that union perverted the controversy. The UAW-CIO is to be congratulated for ousting Communist influence in that union.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. O'KONSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANE, for Friday, March 5, 1948, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1360. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of claims paid by the United States Atomic Energy Commission during the calendar year 1947 pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1361. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 13 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 14 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 15 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 16 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 17 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HERTER: Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Preliminary Report No. 12 filed pursuant to House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4725. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations;

with an amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4954. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; with amendments (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. Report on investigation of Harold Christoffel and others as to whether perjury was committed; without amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5287. A bill to amend section 58d of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Report No. 1510. Supplemental report to fourth intermediate report regarding investigation of participation of Federal officials of the Department of the Army in publicity and propaganda as it relates to universal military training. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 5706. A bill to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States training center, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 5707. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance for veterans pursuing on-the-job and on-the-farm training courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5708. A bill to exempt civilian members of the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States-Canada, from certain statutory restrictions on outside activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 5709. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Hocking Valley coal region in the State of Ohio for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal and oil shale; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5710. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5711. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 5712. A bill to provide for automatic increases in compensation, in certain cases, for persons with temporary indefinite appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5713. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of

auxiliaries to veterans' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5714. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of the mineral resources of public domain lands not subject to the general mining laws or the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 5715. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage-stamp series in honor of volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of the report and supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5716. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5717. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5718. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Mary Gemma Kawamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 5719. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Boring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBES:

H. R. 5720. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cornelia Mayr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 5721. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5722. A bill for the relief of Cecil L. Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1481. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., urging the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to support certain measures to insure the partition of Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1482. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of members of Olivet Presbyterian Church, of Wilmington, Del., consisting of 51 names, petitioning for aid and long-term plan for the proper education and other phases of care guaranteed by the terms of the treaty with the Navajos; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1483. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rehoboth Beach, Del., consisting of 20 names, petitioning for passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1484. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of Iroquois Post No. 503, American Legion, Loda, Ill., bearing the signatures of 20 residents of Loda, Ill., in support of H. R. 4482, to bar un-American parties from the election ballot; to the Committee on House Administration.

1485. Also, petition of Iroquois Post No. 503, American Legion, Loda, Ill., bearing the signatures of 20 residents of Loda, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation by Congress establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1486. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 63 citizens of the city of Cooperstown, N. Y., in the Thirty-first Congressional District, recommending legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1487. Also, petition containing the signatures of 32 members and friends of Whiteman-Hull-Snyder Unit, No. 1360, American Legion Auxiliary, of Cherry Valley, N. Y., recommending legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1488. By Mr. McGARVEY: Resolution presented by Breen-McCracken Post, No. 270, American Legion, and unanimously adopted by the delegates of the Philadelphia County Council, American Legion, expressing their full agreement with H. R. 4278, a bill establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1489. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national commander, American Legion, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requested approval of the Veterans' Administration 1949 budget as submitted by the President, with added supplemental funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1490. Also, petition of Mrs. Glenn E. Walters, Muncie, Ind., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bills 985 and 1907; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1491. Also, petition of Missouri River States Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to hearings before a joint session of all subcommittees considering appropriations for the Missouri River plan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1492. Also, petition of the Council of Annette Islands Reserve, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting passage of House Joint Resolution 269 and Senate Joint Resolution 162; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1493. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ora L. Leslie and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grain control regarding liquor interests; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1494. Also, petition of Coryl Cattell, New York, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon by the Thomas committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1495. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1496. Also, petition of Charles L. Armstrong, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.