

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 9131. A bill to promote the national defense, and to insure against shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production and stockpiling of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 9132. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prospect for manganese and other resources in certain lands in West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 9133. A bill to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 9134. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, section 251; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9135. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that certain service rendered by disabled retired officers be computed as double time for retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9136. A bill to direct the survey and repair of certain vessels in the national defense reserve fleet; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 9137. A bill to authorize the erection of an addition to the existing Veterans' Administration facility, San Fernando, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 9138. A bill to amend certain provisions of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9139. A bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 9140. A bill to authorize payment of endowment policies of national service life insurance in the form of annuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9141. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 503. Joint resolution to restore to the President all powers of the Price Control Act of 1942, including those of rationing or allocation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to provide that the housing developments known as Westview and Southview in the town of Springfield, Vt., shall for the purposes of the Seventeenth Decennial Census be treated as a part of the village of Springfield, Vt.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACY:

H. J. Res. 505. Joint resolution to provide for voluntary agreements with respect to priority allocation and inventory control of steel and steel products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 694. Resolution to authorize an investigation of profiteering and the cost of living; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 695. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript relative to ac-

celerated mapping and water resources basic-data programs to be printed as a House document; 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. BAILEY:

H. R. 9142. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosie Lu Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 9143. A bill for the relief of Humi Nagano and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9144. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 9145. A bill for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 9146. A bill for the relief of George M. Sanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 9147. A bill for the relief of Jan Krizik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9148. A bill for the relief of Josef Stuchal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Coleman S. Perjessy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 9150. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Margarita Funakura"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 9151. A bill for the relief of Giulio Blengino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 9152. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Kieme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 9153. A bill for the relief of Janina Wojciechowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 9154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hana Bolton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 9155. A bill for the relief of Masaka Tsutsumi; 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:

2259. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of Chelsea Grange; Essex Center Grange, No. 155; Lakeview Grange, Danville; Mirror Lake Grange, No. 393, Berlin; Prospect Grange, No. 331, Lincoln; Sutton Grange, No. 252, Sutton; Vermont and Lyndon Unit, No. 30, American Legion Auxiliary, opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2260. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution unanimously passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit at its regular formal session on July 5, 1950, relative to the Korean situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2261. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Janesville Conservation Club, Janesville, Wis., opposing passage of H. R. 3843, a bill providing for the transfer of some 13,000 acres of submarginal land which contain some of the finest trout streams and some of the best hunting land in the entire

United States to the Stockbridge Indians, because the land is unfit for agriculture and incapable of supporting either red or white men and because the land is part of Wisconsin playground and summer-resort attraction and the gift of said land to the said Stockbridge Indians would close the area for hunting and fishing by the sportsmen of Wisconsin and work a hardship on both the sportsmen and the resort and property owners who depend on the sportsmen for their business, and the State of Wisconsin has spent and is spending huge sums of money to protect the wildlife and plant trout and protect such property from forest fires; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dr. John M. Chang, Ambassador, Korean Embassy, Washington, D. C., transmitting an appeal from the Korean Government relative to the Korean situation and requesting increasing aid during their national crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2263. Also, petition of A. Borelli, secretary, Interparliamentary Travel Association, Genes, France, relative to an invitation to send a delegation from Congress to attend the Interparliamentary Travel Congress to be held in Paris toward the end of next November; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1950

(Legislative day of Saturday, July 1, 1950)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thy name, O Thou Almighty and Everlasting God, for the inspiring struggle which is the story of Thy people to find the way to truth and light. For those who have held high the torch of truth in perilous times and have brought it through to triumph at great costs, we give Thee thanks. Now at the crossroads of history where decisions of mountainous proportions must be made, we pray for that stamina to stand in this hour. When the odds are high let us turn to Thee knowing that truth is rooted and grounded in Thy holy will. Thus, may we not falter, but, with great faith, go forward knowing that—

"Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong:
Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong;
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch over His own."
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 17, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 15, 1950:

S. 3582. An act to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration.

On July 18, 1950:

S. 2086. An act transferring management of certain public lands from the Agriculture Department to the Fort Sill Indian School in Oklahoma for agriculture uses;

S. 2227. An act to amend the act approved July 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 766; 24 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 196b), entitled "An act relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States," by enlarging the classes of persons admissible into St. Elizabeths Hospital and in other respects;

S. 2658. An act to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; and

S. 3635. An act to enable the governments of Alaska, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and low-rent housing activities including the issuance of bonds and other obligations, to amend the low-rent housing enabling statutes for Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5863. A bill for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization;

H. R. 6560. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits;

H. R. 7257. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7260. A bill to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, Northern Division of Illinois;

H. R. 7667. A bill directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho;

H. R. 8236. A bill to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 8619. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8763. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8706. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; and

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capewhart	Hunt	O'Connor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AUDIT REPORT OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting,

Inc., for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the bank for the period January-June, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters which have been addressed to the President and to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which the Commission on Information desires to have serve as its semi-annual report to the Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE—CABLEGRAM FROM PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF ARGENTINE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following cablegram from the President and Secretary of the Argentine Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

JULY 4, 1950.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ALBEN W. BARKLEY:

This new anniversary of your independence finds a great nation true as ever to the ideals of liberty which characterize all the peoples of America. In witness whereof I beg Your Excellency in the name of the Argentine Senate and for myself to convey to your honorable body the sentiments of indestructible solidarity which bind our two countries, as well as our warmest hopes for the definite triumphs of justice and right.

J. H. QUILJANO,
President,

H. REALES,

Secretary, the Senate of Argentina.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FROM MEMBERS OF JAPANESE DIET

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from members of the Japanese Diet delegation to the United States, Tokyo, Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

[Translation]

TOKYO, JAPAN, May 31, 1950.

DEAR SIR: When we, 14 Members of the Japanese Diet delegation, went over to the United States some time ago, through the good will of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and your Government, in order to study democracy in action through the congressional system and State legislatures, a hearty welcome and every facility possible were extended to us, for which we are deeply obliged to you, sir.

As we have achieved our desired aims satisfactorily by obtaining minute knowledge on your Congress and State legislatures through your kind guidance and assistance, we are determined to use that precious knowledge for the further democratization of Japan, and eventually to contribute to the peace of the world.

We have the honor to express hereby our deepfelt respect and our profound gratitude to you, sir, for all the troubles you have

taken for us and the hospitality and guidance you have so generously extended to us at the time.

Yours sincerely,

Takeshi Yamazaki, Chairman; Nobuyuki Iwamoto; Tatsu Sakurauchi; Saburo Shikuma; Hidejro Onogi; Kanae Hatanano; Inejiro Asanuma; Hiroshi Takada; Chusuke Imamura; Takizo Matsumoto; Makoto Oike; Hideaki Kondo; Seichi Shima; Tokujiro Kanamori; Members of the Japanese Diet Delegation to the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Joe W. Looney, and sundry other members of the Cohobus Club of the Christ Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich., relating to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and so forth; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the Fifth Congressional Townsend Club Council of the State of Florida, at Orlando, Fla., relating to action by the conference committee on House bill 6000, to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Harvey W. Budd, of Balboa, C. Z., praying for the enactment of legislation imposing an income tax on employees of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, at Baltimore, Md., protesting against the attack on South Korea by Communist North Korea, and favoring the immediate mobilization of the merchant marine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Detroit Citizens Council for a Democratic Germany, of Detroit, Mich., signed by Bill Kemsley, chairman pro tempore, relating to the appropriation of sufficient funds for reorientation work in occupied Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Pacific Southwest District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League, at Santa Monica, Calif., favoring the restoration to the Senate-amended joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) the provisions extending equality in naturalization to all resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Harry A. Vandt, and sundry other citizens of the State of Kentucky, relating to the establishment of a Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Maul County Chamber of Commerce, Walluku, Maui, T. H., signed by Victor L. Schaefer, Jr., president, praying for the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

FORCIBLE DETENTION OF CERTAIN GREEK CHILDREN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have just received from the Secretary of the New York State Senate a copy of a concurrent resolution approved by both houses of the New York State Legislature calling attention to the kidnaping of 28,000 Greek children by Communist forces and labeling such kidnaping as genocide. I ask that the concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on July 17, 1950, p. 10356, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

FEDERAL AID TO FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT, RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN CONSERVATION CONGRESS, MOSINEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter and a resolution received from the chairman of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress on the subject of support of H. R. 6533, the Dingell bill for Fishery Aid and Management. I absolutely agree with the sentiments expressed in the resolution and I am delighted to note that the Senate Commerce Committee has reported the bill to the Senate. The bill has already been approved by the House of Representatives.

H. R. 6533 is now pending on the Senate Calendar where I trust it will be coming up very promptly and passed by unanimous consent, to be thereafter submitted to the White House and this time I trust that the President will not veto it. I have every reason to feel that it will be enacted into public law at long last.

I believe that Mr. Hemp's letter explaining the background of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the text of his message as well as the text of the resolution adopted by the executive council be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

EXECUTIVE CONSERVATION COUNCIL OF THE WISCONSIN CONSERVATION CONGRESS,

Mostne, Wis., July 14, 1950.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Attached you will find a copy of a resolution concerning the Dingell bill which was passed by the executive conservation council of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress at its meeting held in Madison, Wis., on July 6 and 7, 1950.

For your information I wish to point out that the Wisconsin Conservation Congress consists of 3 delegates from each of the 71 counties of the State of Wisconsin. These delegates are elected at public meetings held in each county, and at the same time hearings are held on game and fish regulations. The regulations are considered at the county meetings as they pertain to each particular county. The delegates elected are instructed to attend the State-wide session, known as the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, so that the regulations may be fitted to the State as a whole, thus making for uniformity and simplicity.

As chairman of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, I respectfully submit this resolution for your information and consideration.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD A. HEMP,

Chairman, Wisconsin Conservation Congress.

Resolution

Whereas the passage of H. R. 6533 known as the Dingell bill is a matter of great concern to the conservationists of Wisconsin; and

Whereas H. R. 6533 has the unanimous approval of the conservationists of the State of Wisconsin; and

Whereas the failure to place this bill on the calendar of the Congress to date is viewed with grave concern and apprehension by the conservationists of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Executive Council of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress, That the Wisconsin delegation in the House of Representatives and the Senate be urged to put forth every effort to bring this bill on the floor of the Congress during the current session and to diligently work for its enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to every Wisconsin Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

LARRY C. WHIFFINS,

Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Executive Council of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress July 7, 1950.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACTIVITIES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most vital pieces of legislation which we have enacted was the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 under which Uncle Sam, in cooperation with the States, performs this vital service for the benefit of farmers and ultimately the consumers of our Nation. It has been my pleasure to act to safeguard the adequate handling of this act by various appropriation bills since then. I yield to no man in my desire for Federal economy, but as I have often pointed out, economy is not a matter to be performed with a meat ax which will wipe out essential as well as nonessential services.

I have in my hand a letter received from a dear friend and distinguished expert, Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Swanton's appeal for sufficient funds for marketing services be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE, Madison, Wis., July 13, 1950.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have been informed that the House has reduced the funds to the Department of Agriculture for the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This 10-percent reduction would jeopardize the research in marketing activities.

We have always felt that a man's judgment is no better than his information and research information is of vital importance and concern to the farmers in Wisconsin.

Our State department of agriculture has been using these funds and a duplicating amount from the State to carry on market information service activities.

Because of the importance of these funds to Wisconsin agriculture, we urge you to do

all in your power to restore the full amount. Your support in this matter is solicited by the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative.

Sincerely yours,

MIL O. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 3129. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Whitford, heirs of Anna Louise Whitford, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 2093).

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

S. 2633. A bill to give effect to the Convention for the Establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna, signed at Mexico City, January 25, 1949, by the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington, May 31, 1949, by the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2094).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 8055. A bill relating to the collection, payment, and dishonor of demand items, and to the revocation of credit for, and payment of, such items, by banks in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2096).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1292. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2097);

S. 2707. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 2098);

S. 3800. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2099); and

S. 3921. A bill to provide for the temporary appointment of referees in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2100).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Dodge County, Wis., without amendment (Rept. No. 2101).

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 410. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; with amendments (Rept. No. 2102).

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN BOUNDARY— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original bill to amend the act of May 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 118), as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican boundary, and I submit a report (No. 2095) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3934) to amend the act of May 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 118), as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican boundary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3928. A bill for the relief of Fred Hess; and

S. 3929. A bill for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3930. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3931. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3932. A bill for the relief of Matei Chica-Cantacuzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3933. A bill for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported Senate bill 3934, to amend the act of May 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 118) as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican boundary, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3935. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO GENERAL AP- PROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 448, line 7, after the word "specified" insert the following: "Provided further, That of this appropriation, \$100,000,000 shall be used only for assistance to Spain, to be extended upon credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 10. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5863. A bill for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization;

H. R. 7260. A bill to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States district court for the southern district, northern division, of Illinois; and

H. R. 8763. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6560. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits;

H. R. 8236. A bill to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash; and

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 7257. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7667. A bill directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 8619. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 8706. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

THE WAR IN KOREA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "All-Out Effort To Back Boys in Korea Urged by SALTONSTALL," written by him and published in the Boston Sunday Herald of July 16, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN BEFORE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS UNION

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LEHMAN before the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, at Atlantic City, N. J., on May 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ILLINOIS EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Republicans for LUCAS," pub-

ished in the Illinois State Register of July 15, 1950, and the other, entitled "Washington's Toughest Spot," published in the Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig of July 9, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

CUT IN FEDERAL SPENDING—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why a \$600,000,000 Slash in Non-war Spending Would Be Good," published in the Baltimore Sun on July 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPENDING BY FARM FAMILIES—SURVEY BY FARM JOURNAL MAGAZINE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a survey by Farm Journal Magazine, regarding spending by farm families, which appears in the Appendix.]

NONVOTERS AND CRIME—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOMERSET (PA.) AMERICAN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nonvoters and Crime," published in the Somerset (Pa.) American of July 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE ARE STILL ARMING RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Are Still Arming Russia," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS H. ROBERTS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Thomas H. Roberts, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. David Chavez, Jr., resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD WEINFELD TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Edward Weinfeld, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Simon H. Rifkind, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement released by me to the press yesterday as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments announcing that the committee expected to complete action on all proposals effectuating recommendations of the Hoover Commission referred to the committee.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, announced today that the committee expected to complete action on all proposals effectuating recommendations of the Hoover Commission referred to the committee, in order to permit action to be taken before adjournment of the Congress.

An executive session of the committee has been set for Thursday, July 20, at which time it is expected action will be taken with reference to reporting out bills dealing with records management improvement in the General Services Administration (S. 3842), and with the bonding of Federal employees (H. R. 8706), the only remaining legislation carrying out Hoover Commission recommendations pending before the committee.

The original bill establishing the General Services Administration was approved by the committee in June 1949 (Public Law No. 152). The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, in recognition of the first anniversary of its enactment, recently stated that: "The new General Services Administration, created from scattered agencies previously existing, already has developed great efficiency in what the Hoover Commission called the 'housekeeping' functions of the Government. Substantial savings are assured as a result of the integration and reorganization of various activities in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations." The pending bill would extend the records and buildings management authority of the Administrator of GSA, and includes amendments which Senator McCLELLAN stated would, in his opinion, permit the Administrator to place the GSA on the most efficient administrative level of any agency in the entire Federal Government.

S. 3842 is endorsed by the General Accounting Office, the Budget Director, and the General Services Administrator. Mr. Emmett J. Leahy, Executive Director of the National Records Management Council, New York, who was Director of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Records Management and author of its report, wrote the chairman of the committee on July 14, as follows:

"I have carefully reviewed S. 3842 and compared it with the letter and spirit of our recommendations for the Hoover Commission. It is gratifying to find that your bill is wholly consistent with our recommendations.

"You and your colleagues on the committee are to be commended by all records management specialists, your constituents, and the general public for the excellent progress you have made toward slashing red tape and clerical costs in the Federal Government. At the same time, you are insuring greater effectiveness of records as tools of Federal management and service.

"It is significant that your action promises to forge the Federal Government far ahead of both private business and State and local governments in the improvement and reduction of clerical operations including record making and record keeping.

"We trust that you and your colleagues will not relent in your efforts to achieve these excellent objectives during the present session of Congress."

When final disposition has been made of this bill and measures relating to the improvement of the fidelity bonding system of Government employees presently being studied by a subcommittee headed by Senator HOER, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will have completed action on all matters pertaining to Hoover Commission recommendations which have been referred to it.

In addition to these measures on which Senate action will be sought, the committee has reported favorably S. 3850, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and S. 3653, a bill providing for reorganization of the financing operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Department of the Treasury, setting up a business-type budget and revolving fund method of financing for the operations of the Bureau, implementing Hoover Commission recommendations in its report on Budgeting and Accounting; and S. 3147, establishing a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, recommended by the Commission in its report on Federal-State Relations, which are now pending on the Senate Calendar.

During the Eighty-first Congress, 34 reorganization plans were referred to the committee. A thirty-fifth plan (No. 8 of 1949, for the reorganization of the National Military Establishment), was incorporated in Public Law 216. Two of the 34 plans referred to the committee were duplicating in overall purposes, No. 1 of 1949, and No. 27 of 1950, elevating the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet status; and No. 1 of 1950, and No. 26 of 1950, effecting reorganizations within the Department of the Treasury. The first two of these plans were rejected; and one (No. 26) will become effective on July 31, objections to the original plan (No. 1) having been removed.

The other five plans rejected (in addition to No. 1 of 1949, No. 27 of 1950, and No. 1 of 1950) were reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture (No. 4 of 1950), Interstate Commerce Commission (No. 7 of 1950), and Federal Communications Commission (No. 11 of 1950), the abolition of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board (No. 12 of 1950), and the transfer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Commerce (No. 24 of 1950). The net result is that in all, six of the total of 34 specific reorganization proposals, involving eight actions, were rejected by the Congress.

The committee will release, soon after the end of the session, a complete résumé of actions taken by the Eighty-first Congress in the implementation of recommendations of the Hoover Commission to supplement previous reports prepared by the committee (S. Rept. No. 1158 and No. 1774), including administrative actions.

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE AT GENEVA, SWITZERLAND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of participating in the International Labor Conference held at Geneva. The report of the United States delegates has been filed for the information of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me covering the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONNOR
COVERING REPORT TO UNITED STATES SENATE
ON THIRTY-THIRD SESSION OF INTERNATIONAL
LABOR CONFERENCE AT GENEVA,
SWITZERLAND, JUNE 7-JULY 1, 1950

It is a welcome pleasure again to report to the Senate on the accomplishments of a session of the International Labor Conference. At the 1950 ILO Conference I had the honor of representing the United States as one of its two Government delegates. The other Government delegate was the Honorable Philip M. Kaiser, Assistant Secretary of Labor. The United States employers' delegate was Mr. C. P. McCormick, of McCormick & Co., Baltimore Md., and the workers' delegate, Mr. Philip Delaney, of the American Federation of Labor. Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Arnold Zempel, of the Department of Labor, were alternate Government delegates. In addition, there were advisers to each of the Government, employer, and worker delegates.

All members of the United States delegation took an active part in the session of the Conference which took place in Geneva, Switzerland, from June 7 through July 1. Mr. McCormick was highly honored by election as one of the three vice presidents of the Conference. The successful work of the entire delegation reflected credit upon the United States.

The International Labor Organization is a specialized agency of the United Nations and is unique among international organizations because of its tripartite membership, its delegations being composed of representatives of governments, employers, and workers. Its function is to study and to undertake action on the international level to elevate labor standards and improve living conditions of workers throughout the world, through measures developed in cooperation by all three groups.

Fifty-two countries were represented at the recent session of the Conference, including two newly elected members—the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and Vietnam. In addition, there were a number of observers—for the Allied High Commission for Germany and the supreme commander for the Allied Powers in Japan, as well as for the Western German Federal Republic and for Japan. The Conference was particularly happy to welcome the representatives of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, General Secretary Oldenbroek, of the Netherlands, and Mr. Alfred Braunthal, of the United States, the chief of its economic and social department. This is the first general Conference of the ILO which it has been possible for representatives of the ICFTU to attend since its organization in London last November. This new free trade-union organization is launching an aggressive constructive world-wide anti-Communist program. It is significant that all segments of American labor are affiliated with this international democratic federation.

In view of the troubled state of the world at this time, it was inevitable that this session of the International Labor Conference should have been disturbed by matters having to do with international politics which are outside its scope. Just after the nomination of Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Minister of Labor for India, as president of this session, the government delegates of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary challenged the seating of representatives from the Chinese Republic, insisting that the Conference should immediately decide that the representatives of the Communist government should be seated instead.

The temporary president of the Conference, Mr. Troclet, of Belgium, ruled that this protest should be referred to the credentials committee. The delegations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary thereupon promptly withdrew from the Conference. Mr. Philip M. Kaiser, Assistant Secretary of Labor in the United States Department of Labor, rose immediately thereafter to second the nomination of Mr. Ram as president of the Conference and pointed out very forcefully that the withdrawal of the Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Polish Governments "obviously contradicts the claim of these governments that they are interested in solving the grave economic and social problems, of primary concern to working men and women, which beset the world today."

The credentials committee recommended that the Conference should take note that under the circumstances, with two governments continuing to contend for authority in China, the only possible solution for the difficulties which had arisen was to recognize that the government of the Chinese Republic had validly nominated representatives of that country to the present session of the Conference. The report of the credentials committee on this subject was accepted by the Conference without discussion.

Toward the end of the session we were all shocked by the news of the invasion of South Korea by armies from the Communist North. There was, of course, no reason for the International Labor Organization to take formal action on this violation of international peace, but I believe the whole United States delegation was very much heartened by the enthusiastic spontaneous reaction of the delegates toward President Truman's prompt support of the resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations to preserve the peace by providing military assistance to South Korea.

The program of the Conference proceeded efficiently and a great deal was accomplished. Much credit is due to the excellent work of the staff of the International Labor Office. Prominent on the agenda were discussions of methods of increasing productivity and of maintaining full employment. These two subjects had been stressed in the comprehensive annual report of Mr. David A. Morse, formerly Under Secretary of Labor in our own country, and now the Director General of the International Labor Office.

In my formal statement on the Director General's report I was happy to inform the Conference of the improvement of the employment situation in the United States since June 1949 and of the extent to which increases in productivity in the United States have been associated with increases in the goods and wages actually available to working men and women and their families in this country. We have found in discussions with many of the delegates and their advisers from other countries that they still fear that increases in productivity per man-hour would not result in any gains to the workers in terms of higher wages and lower prices, and that one outgrowth would be increases in unemployment.

It was possible to demonstrate that our experience has been that real wages have risen as output per man-hour has gone up, that the work week has become shorter, and that the worker's job has become less burdensome and safer because the newer types of machinery are not only more productive but safer to use. In expressing the hope that the ILO may play an important part in raising labor productivity in countries where its assistance is needed, I suggested assistance from governments to develop vocational training programs, efficient organization of the labor market, and studies of job standardization and simplification.

Later in the Conference, our Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, gave the delegates

an account of the measures which were used in our country during 1949 and early 1950 to counteract the recession in employment which came about as a result of postwar inventory adjustments. Secretary Tobin also stressed the desire of the people of the United States for peace throughout the world, and our willingness as demonstrated by the Marshall plan and the point 4 program to make sacrifices to maintain peace. Secretary Tobin's visit strengthened immeasurably the position and influence of the United States in the ILO.

The discussion of unemployment problems in reply to the questions raised in the report of the Director General of the International Labor Office was followed by the adoption of a resolution on the subject by the Conference. This resolution draws the attention of the United Nations, the specialized agencies governments, and employers and workers' organizations to the types of action which the Conference considers should be vigorously pursued for the purpose of eliminating the evil of unemployment. It urges governments to maintain, or to establish as rapidly as national conditions allow, unemployment benefits and allowances; to take action to produce economic and social conditions conducive to full employment through employment services, as well as measures to promote mobility of labor, to train and retrain workers, to improve recruitment policies, and to encourage investments in depressed areas from which it might be undesirable to move workers.

Another new labor standard adopted in final form in this session was a recommendation concerning vocational training of adults, including disabled persons. Mr. Ansel Cleary of the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor acted as chairman of the committee which developed the final draft of this recommendation. The expansion of vocational training programs is of enormous importance in many countries of the world where the consumption level of the workers is low not only because of lack of capital equipment, but also because of shortage of skilled workers. Uneducated and inefficient workers are very frequently dissatisfied workers, and I am sure that this new standard will be of great aid to persons working on technical assistance programs in cooperation with governments wishing to aid their workers to reach higher levels of skill.

In addition there were also discussions of a proposed Convention and recommendation concerning minimum-wage fixing in agriculture; a proposed recommendation concerning collective agreements, and a Convention and/or recommendation regarding equal remuneration for men and women for work of equal value.

When adopted, the Convention and recommendation concerning minimum-wage fixing in agriculture will set standards concerning minimum-wage-fixing machinery in agriculture for governments wishing to set up such machinery.

The proposed recommendation concerning collective agreements covers types of machinery to be established by governments wishing to set up such machinery on collective bargaining, voluntary conciliation, and voluntary arbitration.

The committee on international standards in regard to equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value, of which Miss Frieda Miller, Chief of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, acted as reported, held for further decision the question of whether the international standard should take the form of a convention or a recommendation until the final discussion of the standards at the 1951 session.

The conclusions reached will be forwarded to governments for comment and new drafts will be prepared on the basis of these com-

ments for consideration by the 1951 session where final agreement will be reached.

There was considerable discussion at this conference of the Fact-Finding Commission on Freedom of Association. The governing body, the ILO Conference, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations may refer to the Commission for impartial examination, allegations of infringement of trade-union rights. No complaint will be referred to the Commission without the consent of the government concerned. The Commission will report to the governing body on the results of its work and it will be for the governing body to consider in the first instance what action should be taken on the basis of the report.

I want to assure the members of the Senate of my renewed conviction of the value of the work of the International Labor Organization. In bringing together workers, employers, and governments from so many nations, it provides an opportunity for cooperative effort regarding one of the world's most important problems—that of finding democratic solutions for ignorance, inefficiency, and poverty as they affect workers in industry and agriculture. It is my firm belief that we cannot relax for one moment our efforts on this front. I undertook to give positive assurance to the members of the conference in Geneva that in seeking through the ILO to bring about major improvements in working and living conditions of millions and millions of workers throughout the world, we are advancing along the surest course to world peace.

Russia is seizing every opportunity to thwart the efforts of liberty-loving nations to advance toward the goal of world peace. Further, the Kremlin is deliberately selecting certain groups of human beings for their propaganda of false promises in furthering Communist expansion.

This was plainly evident at the recent General Conference (of International Labor Organization). All of the delegates with whom I conferred at the conference were well aware of the fact that workers are a prime target for Communist infiltration. More than this, the majority of the representatives attending seemed to understand that Communist tactics call for the exploitation of legitimate as well as unfounded worker grievances for their own nefarious political objectives. In view of this, everyone at the conference recognized the tremendous significance of the activities of the International Labor Organization.

As the satellite delegates were staging their walkout in protest against the participation of Nationalist China at Geneva, the United States delegation, together with the representatives from the other democratic nations, threw their wholehearted support behind the activities of the ILO. They recognize that its activities, designed as they are to raise the working and living standards of men and women throughout the world, can make and actually are making a tremendous contribution toward eliminating the causes of unrest and despair which, as we all know, are fertile breeding grounds for communism. It is no surprise that the Soviet Union is continually attacking the ILO.

The Senate will be interested to know that the entire United States delegation—employer, worker, and Government representatives—to this thirty-third International Labor Conference, was 100 percent united in matters of basic principles such as these. There were disagreements as to details, but we presented a united front on our fundamental objectives to the other nations of the world. We used the opportunity afforded by this conference of the Government, employer, and worker representatives of the world to demonstrate by word and deed that the underlying basis of American success is in the

ever-expanding area of cooperation between government, management, and labor for solution of the human problems of twentieth century industrial living.

For this reason, if for no other, the International Labor Organization (except for the United Nations itself), is in my opinion probably the most significant international organization in which we hold membership. I consider it a rare privilege to have been nominated by the President to serve on the United States delegation.

DIVISION OF WATERS OF WATERTON AND BELLY RIVERS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the international Joint Commission recently concluded field hearings at Shelby and Havre, Mont., on the proper division, between the people of the United States and Canada, of the waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, which originate in Glacier National Park, in Montana, and flow across the international border into Canada.

The Honorable R. V. Bottomly, associate justice of the Montana Supreme Court, has written letters to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and to me which contain factual information bearing on this important question, and which constitute a real contribution to an equitable solution of the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that Justice Bottomly's communications on this vitally important subject be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the communications from Justice Bottomly were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
SUPREME COURT,
Helena, June 1, 1950.

Re Waterton-Belly Rivers.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As you know, I have been working for over 2 years on the matter of getting a reference before the International Commission, American-Canadian Border, for a division and settlement of the waters of the Waterton-Belly Rivers.

These two rivers originate in Glacier National Park, in Montana, flow north between two ranges across the international border into Canada. The approximate flow is 400,000 acre-feet. If all this flow could be put on land for irrigation it would mean that it would cover 400,000 acres 1 foot deep. About 1 to 2 inches is all that is needed for irrigation for row crops, but three to five applications are needed during the growing season.

Now the Canadians started some 3 years ago to get going on putting this water on their land. They are now engaged in building a dam on the Belly. They have a canal surveyed to bring the water of the Waterton into the Belly above said dam. Then they will divert the water as far east through Alberta into Saskatchewan. Their Canadian Government has entered into the picture and has authorized expenditures for the whole project.

Our Reclamation Bureau has made some surveys—the idea is to make a treaty with Canada. Then the Bureau, if authorized, would build a high dam on the Belly with Canada and store all this water, then divert our equitable share through a natural sag

or draw, a gravity flow canal into Montana about where Sweet Grass is, then take the water both east and west from there onto the land. Mr. Sloan has said this is the most feasible program.

I do not need to elaborate to you what an asset 200,000 acres of irrigated land would mean to Montana and the Nation in raising food and livestock. I am enclosing a copy of an editorial and news articles on that feature.

Either Canada gets this forever and our acres parch forever or we get an equitable share and we have a producing asset forever.

This matter has been before the International Commission for over a year. It has been charged by some that the Canadians are arbitrary in this matter; that they are dragging their feet and won't agree to anything, hoping to delay the matter without action until they get this water on their land—then it would be practically impossible for the United States to ever get a drop.

I don't think, at least I hope, that this is not the attitude of the Canadians. We have always had the most friendly relations with the Canadians, and I am confident that when we make this matter clear to them they will be fair to us, and the good-neighbor relations between our State and the Canadians across the border will continue as they have in the past.

The Commission is holding two meetings in Montana in June, at Shelby June 12, then at Havre June 17, and two meetings at Canadian points. It is to be hoped that we may be able to work out this problem with our Canadian friends in a spirit of justice and fair play.

The other alternative for us to get this water is to drill an all-American tunnel through the mountains and also build a dam across Waterton Lake along the boundary line and bring the water to our parched land, but this is a very expensive proposition. Nevertheless, it is well known that we do not stop at expense when we recognize that a program is indispensable to the protection of our rights. A bill has been introduced in Congress to drill this tunnel, but I think we should delay action on that measure while we undertake to convince the Canadians of the justice of our position. If the Canadians act fairly in this matter, it will avoid a heavy expense on us which we would have to bear in order to protect our interests.

As you can see, Jim, time is of the essence, and a determination should be made soon if we expect any water. You know Mr. Valance, an attorney in the State Department who handles these matters, is here now gathering information and arranging for the meetings. He is keen and alert to the situation. I hope you can contact him upon his return to Washington after these hearings. I told him that the time had come to act firmly in this matter and let our neighbors across the border understand that we intend to insist on a fair division of this water, and that unless they acquiesce we will be compelled to take such action as is necessary to protect our interests.

I think some speeches should be made in both the House and Senate, explaining this situation in detail so that the public may understand the problem. I have written Senator LANGER as his State is interested in controlling the Red River, another border stream. All these questions clear across the country along the border should be handled together as one problem, not piecemeal. Am enclosing copy of my letter to him.

Thank you to give attention to this, Jim, as it appears to me to be not only an international question but one of the biggest matters for the good of Montana in particular and for the country as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

MAY 27, 1950.

Re Tidelands and Waterton and Belly Rivers.
 Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
 United States Senator,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing to you as I know you always recognize the equities in a case. You may not know but I was one of three attorneys general of the States who fought in every way I could the so-called tidelands steal, which you had a lot to do with in helping to defeat and in sustaining the President's veto. I notice you will again have the matter before you.

Two years ago while I was attorney general I prepared a brief on the subject and, thinking it might be of some use to you, I am enclosing a copy. I have just recently had a letter from Harold Ickes, to whom I had submitted a copy and asked him, if, as an administrator, he thought that my analysis was valid and correct as to the bill now in Congress. He answered, stating that it was as valid today as when written, in his opinion. I would like your reaction to my brief at your convenience.

Now as to the Belly-Waterton Rivers: These rivers arise in Glacier National Park, Mont., flow north into Canada between two ranges, and fed by the perpetual snows, glaciers, and rains, they flow into Canada at the crossing of the international boundary. There is a flow of approximately 400,000 acre-feet.

Montana has hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land, superior soils, just east of the Rocky Mountain range, which with this water would be converted into a perpetual, highly productive garden, producing row crops, fibers, alfalfa, and feed crops for livestock for all time to come.

The Bureau of Reclamation has reported that by building a high dam on the Waterton near Lethbridge, Alberta, diverting the Belly into the Waterton by short canal, the equitable share flowing from the United States could be diverted back into the United States by gravity through a natural depression at a very economical figure.

The other alternative is to drive a tunnel through the mountains and bring the water onto the lands, but at a very high cost. This matter is now before the International Commission for adjustment but the Canadians are arbitrary and are working feverishly to perfect an irrigation works, construct dams, and divert and put all this water on their lands before a decision can be reached through the Commission. The Commissioners are holding two hearings on this matter in Montana, one at Shelby, June 12, and one at Havre, June 17, and two in Canada.

Mr. Valance, attorney for the United States Department in Charge of United States-Canada Border Problems, is now here. I have known him for years. He is keen and knows the works.

I have been working for over 2 years on this matter. The magnitude of this problem is set forth in an enclosed editorial and article.

The reason I am writing is that time is of the essence herein. We don't want to lose this water which is a great national asset as well as a great benefit to Montana, as the editorial sets forth.

Now the Red River in Canada and your State needs controlling. From this side of the international line there isn't much that this country can do, but our Government could participate with Canada in building dams or other works to arrest the flood menace and as a part of the consideration Canada should consent to an equitable division of our Waterton-Belly waters. In other words, it is my theory that all waters of the international border should be considered as one problem clear across the board by the International Commission, instead of piecemeal and dealing with each matter separately.

The Canadians have been very arbitrary in this matter, bluntly telling the United States that if we think we can get this water go ahead and take it. They know the only way we can take it is by tunneling through the mountains. The cost would be terrific unless figured on a hundred-year basis. But with their consent we could, if the Senate approved by treaty, assist in building the high dam near Lethbridge and divert the water to our lands with very moderate expense.

Mr. Valance will return to Washington after these hearings, and I hope you can get together and go over this matter, as both projects are of utmost importance to the States concerned and to the United States also. This has been written hurriedly; hope you get my idea. I am also writing our Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. BOTTOMLY.

JOHN J. MUCCIO, UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO KOREA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a release which the Secretary of State has authorized of a telegram sent by him, by direction of the President, to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea. It gives me a special pleasure to ask for this insertion in the RECORD because of the fact that Ambassador Muccio is a personal friend of mine and a fellow Rhode Islander.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
 July 13, 1950.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has sent the following message to the Honorable John J. Muccio, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Korea:

"The President has asked me to extend to you and to your staff his appreciation and commendation for your courageous and effective performance of duty since the onset of the present emergency in Korea.

"Your prompt and accurate reporting of the situation, the dispatch and efficiency with which you carried out the evacuation of the many American citizens for whom you were responsible, and the confidence which you have inspired in the face of the unprovoked aggression against Korea are in the finest tradition of the Foreign Service."

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate finishes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGGESTED 10-PERCENT ADDITION TO TAXES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes to make a suggestion concerning the war effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the threat of becoming involved in a world war is now greater than the threat that confronted us in 1940. In that year the Congress authorized an expansion of our Military Establishment, provided for a draft of manpower, and passed a special tax bill to help finance that preparedness program.

That tax bill, which I helped frame, provided that commencing the first of the following calendar year and continuing for a period of 5 years all taxpayers should add 10 percent to their tax bills and that the funds so created should be placed in a special trust fund to be used exclusively for military purposes.

In this emergency I suggest reenactment of that law to become effective January 1, 1951, but exempting this time all excise taxes since they are still at the full war rate. Such a tax, applied only to personal and corporate income would raise in special defense money approximately \$2,000,000,000 a year at the current rate of national income. It would not be retroactive on anyone because provision could be made for those reporting on a fiscal year basis to apply the increase only to that portion earned in calendar 1951.

At the present time the top effective personal income rate is 82 percent, but the 10-percent increase would not fall as heavily on those in the top brackets as might appear at first glance because of the law passed several years ago to permit husband and wife to divide the family income. That provision gave substantial tax relief to married persons with joint incomes up to \$400,000. For those in that category the present top effective rate of 82 percent applies only to that portion of income above \$200,000 and the additional 10 percent would not be a 10-percent addition to the rate, but merely 10 percent of the computed tax liability.

I have received letters and have read editorials in the Virginia newspapers indicating that Congress should act promptly to put the Nation on a full war footing. In my opinion, such a step is not now required, and would be calculated to do more harm than good. It was difficult enough to make OPA work during World War II. It was impossible to make it work a year after the war ended. There is an abundance of food, of clothing, and of many other consumer items, and no occasion to ration their distribution. It might be wise to give the President stand-by powers to allocate steel, which is so essential to the war effort, although I am confident that it can be accomplished by a voluntary agreement. It might be advisable to give the Federal Reserve Board stand-by powers to control consumer credit, which now is at an all-time high; but that likewise, to a large extent, could be accomplished by voluntary cooperation between banks and the merchants whose commercial paper they handle.

Undoubtedly, the best and safest way to control the issuance of too much new money through deficit financing and the inflationary pressure of that new money is to absorb at least a part of it through taxation. Aside from that desirable result, it will be inviting ultimate financial disaster if we run the national debt to such large proportions that confidence will be lost in Government bonds. In the budget now pending, there is a potential deficit of four or five billion dollars; and that budget carries no appropriation for more than \$5,000,000,000 of E bonds or savings bonds which will mature next year, the assumption being that those

now holding those bonds will buy new ones. Should that assumption not materialize, a terrific strain would be placed upon the commercial bond market in re-financing that obligation.

Although the time may come when we shall be forced to put our entire economy on a war footing, the first step in that direction undoubtedly is taxes; and many patriotic citizens will gladly pay additional taxes if the law imposing them provides that they shall be sequestered for military purposes only, and not made available for unnecessary domestic spending.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment, which was passed over yesterday, in the Department of Agriculture section of the appropriation bill, on page 221, beginning in line 19.

ENDING THE COLD WAR—IV

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for many weeks past I have addressed the Senate on the subject of winning and ending the cold war. The cold war has now become a hot one, which is the way in which we had every reason to believe the cold war would end, in view of the fact that we never fought it with intelligence and energy. Had we done so, the Politburo would have been weaker at home than it is now, and the free world would have been stronger in this emergency than it now shows itself to be.

We have ahead of us the long, grinding months of making up, by the expenditure of billions of dollars and how many lives we cannot estimate, for the lack of engaging the enemy on the field where he was deployed—the field of the minds and loyalties of men.

In concluding this series of observations I wish to refer briefly to two recent opportunities for successful engagement with the enemy from which some advantage may yet be salvaged, although the full advantage of the opportunity has been lost.

Let me first call attention to the semi-humorous but deadly serious charge of strewing potato bugs over the farms of eastern Germany, which charge, being practically uncontested, was later enlarged to include Czechoslovakia as well. I referred to this in a hearing on Senate Resolution 243 before the Foreign Relations Committee. I said:

Why should not this accusation bring from us an offer to donate free of charge X tons of DDT to the potato growers of East Prussia? This chemical not only killed the bugs in Aroostook County, Maine, but it likewise destroyed other parasites and hindered the spread of most diseases the potato plant is afflicted with.

We have nothing but good wishes and good will for the people of east Germany. Why not express it in this light-hearted and practical way. Undertakings of this sort should be part and parcel of the measures to be undertaken under Senate Resolution 243.

The serious and dangerous undertone to this silly accusation should be clear to

all. Potato bugs and disease germs are too closely parallel to be ignored. To have let the accusation go with a simple denial, and without taking advantage of the possibilities for human appeal in the thing, leads us one step further toward new savageries in modern warfare. But there is still another lost battle of even greater significance.

Mr. President, I refer to a serious and effective offensive on the battlefield of ideas which was launched at the so-called World Peace Congress in Stockholm on March 15-19, 1950, held under the chairmanship of Frederic Joliot-Curie, the French Nobel prize winner. For the record, the American attendance at this so-called Peace Congress should be noted. The delegates were Mr. J. Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and a vice chairman of the conference; the artist Rockwell Kent; the writer Albert Kahn; and Mr. Johannes Steel, vice president of the Progressive Party.

The ingeniousness of the work done by this Peace Congress is to be found in the wording of the manifesto which they produced. I quote:

We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of intimidation and mass extermination of people.

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

We consider that the government which first uses the atomic weapon against any other country will commit a crime against humanity and shall be regarded as a war criminal.

We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this appeal.

Why should not such a manifesto appeal to people all over the world, and why should not millions and millions of people attach their signatures to it?

Mr. President, it was calculated some little time ago that something over 130,000,000 signatures have been attached to this manifesto. Since that time other millions have signed. A news item shortly before the invasion of South Korea indicated that one and one-half million had signed north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The Russians know how to devise a good idea, spread it, broadcast, and make it effective. We do not. As a result, millions of people behind the iron curtain and in the missionary areas where Communist propaganda is at work are led to class Russia as being a peace-loving country, and the United States becomes more firmly settled than ever in the popular mind as being the world's warmonger.

But now let us see where we can get hold of this Russian declaration whose possibilities we could turn to the advantage of the free world. The second paragraph of the manifesto reads:

We demand the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this decision.

Is not this an acceptance of the United Nations plan?

Mr. President, let us take them up. Let us take them up. Let us take them up. Is not that exactly what we have been asking for? Talk about folly—how can we have the folly to allow these millions of signatures to be attached to

a petition for doing what we have been trying to persuade the Russians to do from the very start of our negotiations over the use of the atomic bomb? What is the matter with us? Are we thinking about something else than war or peace? Have we gone into senile decay?

It is not too late now for the State Department, by world-wide broadcast and direct diplomatic action, to take Russia up on her new and our old proposal for the control of the A-bomb.

Mr. President, we wait to see whether that Department remains a dangerous liability or charts for us a new course of effective service to our national interest and to the safety of the free nations of the globe.

So much for opportunities whose full possibilities have been missed but from which some advantage to the free world may still be drawn. In concluding, Mr. President, I wish to refer to earlier proposals of mine which become more timely, more necessary, now that the cold war has reached the boiling point.

Let me first refer to a highly significant piece of information. A friend of mine has in his employ on his farm, a family of Latvian DP's. Their history is incredible. The family itself escaped to Western Germany some little time ago. The father, months before, had been seized and taken to a work camp in far Siberia. From that work camp he escaped and made his way mostly on foot over the thousands of miles of Russia, Poland, and eastern Germany until he crossed the border into Western Germany and rejoined his family. In all those thousands of miles he sought and obtained nightly food and shelter wherever he might chance to find himself. In province after province of Russia itself as well as in Poland and eastern Germany he found everywhere families and farm folk who were willing to give shelter and aid to a fugitive.

What a story this is. It means that all along these weary miles there was no one so convinced of the virtues of the Politburo that it was felt to be a duty to give up a fugitive to the authorities. Only a strong sense of hostility to the existing Russian Government could have persuaded these hundreds of citizens to have risked reprisals and punishment in giving that shelter. Is not this one story, this single incident, and eye-opener as to the mental and spiritual background of the people against which the Russian Government has to operate within its own territories?

Another evidence is to be found in the great numbers of political prisoners which that government has found it necessary to put away from normal living. Reliable estimates have put these numbers at 9,000,000, excluding women and criminals. When we consider that the total adult male population—between the ages of 18 and 55—is somewhere around 90,000,000, we come up with the astonishing figure that about 15 percent of those adult males are in prison camps. Does that indicate that the Russian people are solidly behind the Russian Government?

If it was advisable to get in touch with the Russian people by the Voice of America and by other means while the cold

war was still on, it is a thousand times more advisable now, when our only hope of getting out of this thing without great loss of treasure, lives, and liberties lies in giving the Politburo so much trouble at home as to seriously limit their ability to foment trouble abroad.

From now on the Voice of America must direct itself narrowly and sharply to the present emergency. It must go on the spiritual offensive. It must tell the Russian people that whereas the Western World has been giving freedom to its colonies and conquered peoples, we see their Government rolling over nation after nation, never daring to trust its cause to the choice of the people, but always capturing territory by subversive minorities and force of arms. Against this, in its latest and most flagrant form, the invasion of South Korea, the free world has had to rise in defense of free men everywhere.

The second point which must be hammered home is that there does not exist in the free world, any group anywhere which has anything but friendly feeling for the Russian people. Nowhere is there to be found a nation or a political party or any important individuals who want anything which the Russian people have. What we want for them is the blessings of freedom which we have been enjoying and of which their Government has deprived them and of which it now seeks to deprive the whole world.

We are friends of the Russian people. The insane lust for conquest which possesses their Government is going to impose on the Russian people new hardships, new dangers, new deprivation of the good things of life and of spiritual freedom. Their only enemy is their own Government.

Hitler knew and the Politburo knows how to affect the minds and hearts of men. They did it by the simple telling of simple lies over and over and over again. We can do as much. Rather, we can do more by adopting their technique but with a different message. We can tell the truth in simple, understandable, and straightforward terms over and over and over and over again. The time has come for that.

On this floor in the months past I have from time to time suggested the use of such unconventional means of reaching the Russian people as the employment of free balloons dropping messages of good will over the thousands of square miles of Russian territory. These messages will not lie rotting in the fields and streets. They will be passed from hand to hand. They likewise should be simple, primarily pictorial, and reiterate in varying form but with unvarying persistence the fact that we of the Western World have a common cause with the people of Russia. We are not against them. We are for them. Their hope for the future lies in our success. Our failure condemns them to permanent slavery.

Mr. President, when I have made this suggestion in times past it has been intimated to me strongly that this is not a proper diplomatic procedure—that a Nation which undertakes this is violating the sovereignty of the holy preserves of the Politburo. We have passed the

period of striped-pantie etiquette. When the North Korean armies and armament swept south over the thirty-eighth parallel, these rules of formal procedure went into the ash can. Does the State Department know that yet? If not, someone should tell them.

There is one final and tremendously powerful means of reaching the people of Russia, and of the satellite countries behind the curtain, which remains to be described. There are many thousands of liberty-loving patriots gathered on our side of the curtain. They are biting their nails and eating their hearts out. They will not serve for pay as employees of our Government. They will, with sufficient support and with missions to perform, risk their lives and the lives of their wives and children on missions into the heart of the Politburo country. These men must be put to work.

Mr. President, by means such as I have just described and by other means yet to be devised in the light of developments as they appear, we can shorten the hot war. We can save billions in treasure, and an unknown number of lives of men in our own country and abroad who know what freedom is and who have found its taste so sweet that they are willing to die for it.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

THE KOREAN CRISIS AND MEASURES TO AVOID WORLD WAR III

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we are being rapidly pushed toward a general war that will threaten our national existence. Neither diplomacy, negotiation, nor wishful thinking will avoid it. Our only hope is to show our utmost in strength, and a grim and unfaltering determination to see things through.

In my opinion there are two definite steps that can be taken that will greatly lessen the chances for a general world-wide war, and win it, should that war come anyway. Without these steps being taken, a general war of almost unbearable length and suffering is certain. The first step is all-out support in men and materials in the Korean war by every member of the United Nations who opposes Soviet aggression. The second step is to go on a wartime production basis in the United States. These two moves are dependent one on the other and will present a force in the world never before known.

The United States failed properly to support the League of Nations and we were thus charged with its failure, and the resulting debacle of World War II. Realizing our mistake, and also appreciating new world conditions, we launched forth in an entirely new and strong position in world affairs, and helped formulate the United Nations, and from its beginnings we have supported this great world movement without stint and without trying to play a dominating role. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further, in recognition of the war-depleted conditions of many of our fellow members in the United Nations, we have sponsored for several years, and still sponsor an economic recovery pro-

gram that covers most of western Europe. This has been at a cost of billions of dollars to us. Also, a like program has been extended to other areas of the world. For this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

Further still, in recognition of their present need for assistance, and in reliance on their honor and integrity, we have sponsored and financed a huge military assistance program to all the Atlantic Pact nations and to other extended areas, including Korea. For all of this we do not deserve, nor do we claim any special credit.

At the call of the United Nations we immediately rushed men, planes, goods, and guns to far-distant Korea, to stop the brutal attacks of the communistic hordes. Our money is being spent, our material is being consumed, and more, our men are dying by the day, by the week.

This is the test. Where is the actual support from our United Nations allies? Where is the ground support? Where are even the firm promises of something tangible and definite that can be counted on? Week has followed week, but little definitely has been done, and little has been furnished. The call has gone forth to the United Nations members by Secretary General Lie. What is the response?

I know that over-all plans have to be made and then men and materials available have to be fitted into this plan in the most effective manner and places. This requires time. But firm pledges can be forthcoming immediately. I am not unmindful of the absolute necessity of having strong forces available at other strategic and in highly important areas of the world. As to other members of the United Nations, the impossible is not expected; the unreasonable is not demanded.

However, in this world crisis, no member nation of the United Nations should be the final judge of the extent of their obligations, nor of their ability to perform these obligations.

Each member nation can at least submit all the pertinent facts as to their ability and as to their surrounding situation to the over-all governing authorities of the United Nations, and let this over-all group decide what is reasonable support for each nation to furnish. Regardless of danger spots elsewhere, there would be a tremendous world-wide psychological power behind an all-out, all-flag, united effort in Korea. Let the other member-nation flags be unfurled and take their places alongside the Stars and Stripes, with the blue and white flag of the United Nations.

This is the test. We have met the call. Shall the United Nations continue as a reality, as an active force to be felt, or shall it continue only as a plan on paper? We, the people of the United States, are entitled to know. If we do not have an effective United Nations, then we are entitled to know that also. Then we shall make other plans. In the realm of practical affairs, we shall have little or no choice, except to abandon the United Nations, withdraw our own commitments, and travel along the road, the hard road of mere self-preservation.

But even granting the most hopeful results from the developments from other members of the United Nations, it is still a painful fact that we must go largely on a war economy. Time saved now in doing so will mean blood and misery and lives saved in months and years to come.

We hate controls, we hate regimentation. They hazard our freedom. I appreciate the fact that if we go into controls, it is possible we shall never come out from under controls. But if we do not go in, we may never come through as a nation. I appreciate the fact that in a long war, we could lose our form of government, even if we did not lose the war; and we could well lose the capitalistic system even if we did not lose the war. However, it seems clear to me that in order to preserve this very personal freedom, this capitalistic system, and this, our cherished form of government, it is absolutely necessary to have these hated controls, and the sooner, the better. By controls, I mean the effective control of wages, of prices, of materials, of manpower, and of production, and with an excess-profits tax that actually chokes off excessive war profits.

The industrial production of the United States is the most powerful war factor in the world today. It turned the tide in World War II; to put it in motion will perhaps prevent an all-out world war III. Our failure to meet the obligation of effectively using this production as our most powerful war weapon will be nothing less than criminal negligence.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 221, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the word "authorize" and to insert in line 23 the words "authorized by Congress."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, last night I raised the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to whether the committee amendment would permit the preparation of motion-picture films and other propaganda in behalf of the Brannan plan. I was somewhat concerned about the words "relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department." They might refer to a propaganda program authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture. It seemed to me that we should make it perfectly clear that what we propose to do is with reference to programs authorized by Congress.

I may say that I have checked the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It is true that this proviso has been in every appropriation bill for the past 4 or 5 years. In my opinion, if the committee amendment were not adopted, the power to make

such motion pictures would exist in the Commodity Credit Corporation, anyway, in all probability, so that even if we strike out the amendment I doubt that we would change substantially the powers. But if the Senator from Georgia will be willing, by accepting my amendment, to make it clear, which I understand is his own position, that it is not intended in any way to authorize Brannan-plan propaganda, I myself should have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated on yesterday that it was my construction of the language that it permitted only the dissemination of information authorized by Congress. That is still my construction of the language. I have no objection to the amendment to the committee amendment. I find that films which have been made are those which deal principally with the farm program, such as the dissemination of information through the Extension Service. I think the distinguished Senator from Ohio is unduly suspicious, but I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The point which the Senator from Georgia made last is that to which I was going to refer. As I understand, all these moving-picture films have been with respect to programs which have been authorized directly by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read a list of the motion pictures which have been produced up to this time:

Brucellosis, which portrays methods for eradicating the disease on the farms.

Outbreak, a historical documentary film recording how previous outbreaks of this dread plague have been eradicated and suggesting vigilance against the disease at all times.

Today's Chicks, a film to show the farmer how healthy baby chicks are produced by cooperating hatcherymen under the national poultry improvement plan.

Forest Fire Behavior, a film to convey knowledge of fire behavior and action which may be taken toward control.

Black Stem Rust, a film to explain the nature of stem rust, how it damages small grain, and how it may be controlled through elimination of barberry bushes.

It's No Picnic, dealing with the nature and damage by forest fires, the various causes thereof, and specific ways in which forest fires can be prevented.

Dead Out, a two-reel film on forest burning in the Southeast, showing how to burn brush and grass safely.

Blister Rust Control, a series of six pictures on this disease attacking the pine forests of the country, one picture dealing with the life history of the disease and its control in a general way, and one picture for each of five regions in the country on the value of the pine and the specific problems in each region.

I may say further, Mr. President, that I have an extract from the House report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943 which was passed in the calendar year 1942. It states that the consolidation was a part of the economies to be effected in order to help the war effort, and that it was provided in the bill as an economy measure and not to propagandize the Bran-

nan plan or any other controversial question. However, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if these moving pictures are made solely in the Office of Information. I should like to know whether or not any other moving pictures have been made by any other division besides the Office of Information. Does the Senator have the record on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, up to now all the pictures have been made by the Office of Information.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator positively state that as a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That was my understanding. I do not know it to be a fact.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in this amendment. The House must have stricken out this provision for some reason. I agree it has been in the appropriation bill since 1943. However, this year the House deleted it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House did not strike it out. It went out on a point of order. One Member of the House made a point of order against a number of provisions of the bill, and under the peculiar rules of the House of Representatives they were all subject to the point of order, and they all went out. We restored most of them. This is the only one as to which there has been any controversy up to now.

Mr. WHERRY. At page 267 of the House hearings justification is given for these programs. The Department of Agriculture makes this statement:

The primary functions of the Office of Information are (1) over-all coordination of all information work in the Department and (2) final editing and clearance of all publications and releases of information to the public. The Office provides a service to the Department and its constituent agencies designed to assist farmers, organizations, and institutions interested in agriculture, and the public at large, by providing factual information on results of agricultural research work, trends in agricultural production, prices, and consumption, the scope of agricultural programs and policies, and similar information which will assist farmers and the public to obtain useful knowledge pertaining to the Nation's agriculture.

It goes on to recount the work involved and emphasizes in detail some of it. It seems to me that the language is sufficiently broad to encompass not only the presentation of the Brannan plan, but any other plan which might be hatched by the Department of Agriculture, and it could be publicized not only by the Office of Information but material could be gathered and publicized by other divisions or bureaus, even though the Office of Information did not do so. What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see anything dangerous in the language to which the Senator has referred. When the Department of Agriculture was established it was designed to be an agency for the purpose of disseminating information pertaining to agriculture. That was its

primary purpose. All that has been added to it since then, by way of farm-action programs, has been merely supplemental, because the primary purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to disseminate information pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I agree with him thoroughly in that statement. So far as research is concerned, I want to go as far as we possibly can. In fact, I should like to go even farther than we have gone. I think research results should be publicized throughout the country for the benefit of farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. They certainly are not worth anything if they are not publicized.

Mr. WHERRY. This provision, however, raises an entirely different question. From the language read, which is the justification by the Department, not only the Brannan plan but any other policy which might be advocated by the Department of Agriculture, though not authorized by Congress, could be publicized to the public generally.

I should like to ask the Senator one more question. On page 358 of the House hearings appears a statement to which I should like to call attention. Has the Senator a copy of the House hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry to say that I have not. My assistant is endeavoring to get a copy of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall quote from page 358: "RMA project No. 205. General Economics of Marketing." In 1949 the appropriation was \$13,000. In 1950 the appropriation was \$134,850. I do not have the budget estimate or the amount allocated to 1951. This may be a perfectly legitimate appropriation. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator the reason for the expansion. What is the justification for an increase from \$13,000 in 1949 to \$134,850 in 1950. Does it have anything to do with the information we have been talking about?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe it has the slightest thing to do with it. All research which is carried on by the Research and Marketing Administration must be approved by an outside committee, which is appointed for the purpose of studying the whole research question. It has nothing to do with the Brannan plan, if that is what the Senator has in mind. All research projects which are being carried on in the Department of Agriculture are submitted to the committee. I did not read them to the last detail, but I did scan through the general objectives of the research projects. None of them related to the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think this is very important. Are these moving pictures brought up to date? Have any of them been made since those mentioned in the list the Senator read?

Mr. RUSSELL. The motion pictures set forth in the list constitute the entire number which have been produced since the information appropriations for the various bureaus of the Department were

consolidated, as they were in 1942. I may say to the Senator that if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which I have agreed to accept so far as I could as chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriation, there would be a restriction on all these items which would definitely prevent the publication of any propaganda for the Brannan plan. I have been suspicious that that was the purpose of my friend from Ohio.

Secretary Brannan has defended his plan with great vigor and industry all over the Nation. He has made any number of speeches for it, and there has been some question as to the manner in which some of the audiences were assembled. But I have never yet heard any specific charge that any of the films which have been made were in anywise connected with the Brannan plan. If they had been, when we consider how controversial the Brannan plan is, undoubtedly someone would have written to the Senator from Nebraska or to the Senator from Georgia or some other Senator and said, "I saw a moving picture that is put out to publicize and to support the Brannan plan."

I am not a supporter of the Brannan plan. I am opposed to the philosophy of that plan sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, but I concede to him the right to go anywhere he pleases in the United States and make a speech any time he chooses in support of his plan. It may build up some support for the plan in my own State, and it may heap coals on my back in an endeavor to drive me to support the plan. But that is one of the things we will have to face when we come to it. I am not apprehensive that these films will support the Brannan plan, because I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would adopt that policy, in view of the amendment, and I believe that if he did it would backfire on him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not contending that Secretary Brannan does not have a right to support any plan he desires to, on his own, and to go to the four corners of the United States and speak on it to the public. I am in total agreement with the Senator in that respect. But I do not want the Secretary to use the taxpayers' money in any informational service to publicize a plan he sponsors, unless it is authorized by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Neither do I.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my only apprehension in this matter. I certainly have a right, I believe, to try to make it as clear as I can that we do not want him to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one challenges the Senator's right. I have merely pointed out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio limits this expenditure to programs approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. That leads to the next question. Does it limit it? It limits it, I think, only to the transfers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is all it limits it to.

Mr. WHERRY. How about limiting it to the full amount. It seems to me that if we put a limit of \$300,000 on the

amount which might be transferred from the small agencies to the office of Information, it is just as important to limit the \$1,265,800 which the Office of Information can use for the same purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My amendment deals only with the particular \$300,000 of the committee amendment. I was dealing with the committee amendment only. If the Senator wants a general limitation, I think it should be offered in an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to ask the Senator from Georgia another question. I understand the Senator is not worried about these funds, and I have a wholesome respect for his judgment, as he knows, so that I am inclined to go along with the Senator's statement. But we are writing in an amendment to limit the authorization for these purposes to \$300,000. If that is wise is it not equally wise that possibly an amendment to the general provision should be inserted, affecting programs authorized by the Congress? Would there be any objection to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that would be splitting hairs to the *n*th degree. If it would afford any great solace to the Senator from Nebraska, I would not oppose it, but I think it is utterly unnecessary. No instances have been brought forward where the Secretary has used these particular funds for the purpose of propagandizing for the Brannan plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question? If it is necessary for the \$300,000, is it splitting any more hairs to apply it to the general provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. I accepted the amendment in order to allay the fears of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and others.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator allay my fears by inserting—

Mr. RUSSELL. No; am not willing to say before we reach the point where an amendment would be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator reflect on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly will.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel there is any difference, so far as the funds are concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; and to be perfectly frank, my reason for accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was to expedite the business of the Senate. I do not think the amendment makes a particle of difference one way or the other, but I thought it would be better to accept a harmless amendment than to spend 3 or 4 hours on the floor of the Senate discussing this proposition, and having ghosts raised, and the statement made that all this money was going to be used to propagandize the Brannan plan. I am not for the Brannan plan. I have been opposed to it from the day it was announced, but I am not going around with my lance all set to joust with windmills or to attempt to slay dragons which do not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is building up a pretty big bogeyman for me to slay. I ask, is there any difference

between limiting the \$300,000 and the \$1,265,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Technically, I do not see that there is.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the dragon has already been slain, and I ask the distinguished Senator if he will accept an amendment, when the proper time comes, to offer such an amendment to the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be disposed to, if it would be any gratification to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not want to be committed to it now, until I have an opportunity to read all the language, to see where it is to be in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator, and I hope he will look with favor upon it, because my opinion is that if we are to try to limit the \$300,000 which may be transferred, it is just as important to apply it to the \$1,265,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is necessary in either case.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator, but if it is necessary in one case and the Senator permits the amendment there, I ask the distinguished Senator to accept it in the other case.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to look into it, but the amendment will not be in order until we complete action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he remembers whether there is a limitation on the amount the Commodity Credit Corporation may spend for publicity purposes, and, if so, what the amount is.

Mr. RUSSELL. Answering off the cuff, without guaranteeing the correctness of the statement, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation is included within the \$300,000 limit, and I think that funds could be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation up to that amount.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator say that if this amendment were voted down and the sound pictures were not permitted to be made in the Secretary's office, he could direct them to be made through the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. RUSSELL. They say as much. They say they have ample authority under the law. These funds are concentrated into the \$300,000 for the purpose of simplifying the bookkeeping. This is a limitation. If we vote this provision out of the bill, they could spend any funds that were available for informational purposes. This amendment tends to achieve the result the Senator from Vermont seeks, in that it puts a limitation on the \$300,000, on the funds which can be spent.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Georgia will be proved to be correct in that view, and that the officials will not exceed the authority.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to just one other matter which I think he can clear up. It is in connection with the provision on page 204, line 21, where the language reads:

Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers.

As I understand, the prohibition which was inserted in the law in 1944 prohibits this information for such services at the levels down through the county and the community levels. In last year's appropriation bill, the references to the community and county were omitted. Does the Senator from Georgia understand that the proviso I have just read means that the community and county levels of the PMA are restricted to the answering of inquiries and the supplying of information which properly comes within the scope of their own work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct. The Senator from Vermont knows well that that language has been in the appropriation bills for some 5 or 6 years. I do not recall exactly when it was first inserted.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was slightly changed last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was changed last year, as I recall.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senate undertook to change it, but the House refused to yield, and I think it finally went out of the bill. I do not recall the year, but 5 or 6 years ago the PMA was setting up a great many so-called information centers in its regional and State offices, and a violent controversy arose as between two of the major farm organizations as to the propriety of those offices and the information they were furnishing, one of the farm organizations taking the position that some of the information was designed to aid the other farm organizations. The general complaint was made that it was entirely too expensive. So that limitation was put in originally, as I recall, in the Senate, and it has been in the bill ever since then.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Georgia is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee. It is not intended, is it, that this proviso should authorize the employment of county information specialists or propagandists, as they are commonly called?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly is not intended to employ any propagandists of any kind. It is intended to limit it to actual information as to farming information for the counties. Where they have the clear crop system in counties thousands of questions arise that are necessary to be answered, answers are compelled to be made, and we do not want to shut the farmer off if he will in-

cur a penalty by overplanting by as little as 1 acre.

Mr. AIKEN. I was sure that is what the Senator from Georgia intended. I am happy he has made that point plain. I also want to assure the Senator from Georgia that no one is more concerned in making the PMA and other good agricultural programs work than is the Senator from Vermont. But we all know of instances of efforts being made to use local committees for political purposes, and I for one want to stop that practice so far as possible, regardless of in whose interests they may be used.

Mr. RUSSELL. If any program should be kept on a nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis it is the farm program. In my judgment the use of any county committee or the use of any farm program for partisan political purposes would be highly reprehensible, whether it was done to help a Republican, or Democrat, or Progressive, or States Righter, I might add.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that concludes the committee amendments to this chapter of the bill. There are some three amendments which have been printed. I have discussed them with their authors and I should like to receive unanimous consent that the printed amendments to this chapter be considered at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator consider my amendment in that group?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to obtain some information on the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to object to the Senator's request because I should like to help expedite action upon the bill. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. All committee amendments must be acted upon first, unless unanimous consent is obtained to take up other amendments out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the rule under which the Senate is now operating.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as we have proceeded in that manner with respect to the preceding chapters of the bill, it seems to me we should continue to follow that course unless the amendments in question are very slight. What is proposed to be done by the amendments in question?

Mr. RUSSELL. One of the amendments is to be proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has one, which has been the subject of discussion, and I have obtained information with respect to it. The other one is to be offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. That is a printed amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the amendment dealing with meat inspection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I have had an opportunity to investigate those three amendments. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska intends to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know why my amendment would require very much investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it will require much investigation, but I should like to read amendments before I accept them. I should like to read the Senator's amendment before accepting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to have my amendment offered last, and the Senator can withhold his consent to my amendment until he has had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska has a perfect right to object if he desires. What I just proposed was merely to accommodate Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the request of the Senator from Georgia that, by unanimous consent, the Senate proceed to take up the printed amendments which will be offered from the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I desire to be constructive about this matter. I am not acting in an arbitrary manner in order to have my amendment accepted. I should like to know, if I can be informed, what the first amendment would do. I know what the last amendment would do. I do not think it would be necessary to have a quorum call to let other Senators know what is to be taken up for consideration. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] what his amendment is.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I will explain all three printed amendments. The first amendment, proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, does not in any wise affect the amount of the appropriated funds. It does permit the Soil Conservation Service, in areas where work is now being carried on, to operate in connection with some lands which are not now eligible because they lie between private lands on which they are doing work and public lands in the area of a stream. The amendment would permit them to complete some phases of the projects which are essential to the operation of the whole. It involves no increase in expenditures. It merely clarifies the authority of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are the projects located?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think they are located in Texas and Oklahoma. That is my recollection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are 11 States involved: the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, and California.

Mr. WHERRY. Would this be the beginning merely, and would completion of the work entail some appropriations next year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may, I shall make a brief

statement. In the 1946 flood control act, section 13 authorized certain work on, I believe, 11 different projects. That included the projects recommended by the Department of Agriculture. In some of those projects they did not go far enough to permit of treatment of ditches and gulleys. My amendment gives the Department the right to treat ditches and gulleys.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. President. What is the next amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has an amendment which will increase the appropriation for research by \$35,000, so as to deal with an outbreak of a disease attacking the spruce and the beech trees in the White Mountains, as I understand. The Senator from New Hampshire does not have a budget estimate, but we have in the form of dead chestnut trees so many monuments to the delay in proceeding to attack these diseases at their source that I told the Senator from New Hampshire I was willing to accept his amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, Mr. President, to the consideration of the three amendments which have been referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request for consideration of the three amendments? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not confer with the junior Senator from Nebraska? I should be glad to show him where in the bill I wish the language of my amendment to be inserted. I should like to do that so he may decide whether he will accept my amendment after the three others have been considered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my differentiation between these three amendments and the Senator's amendment is not due to any desire to resist the Senator's amendment. It is due to the fact that these three amendments have been printed. If the Senator offers his amendment, other amendments will be offered from the floor, and if we are to accept any such floor amendments we should accept all of them at one time so as not to make fish of one and fowl of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did not for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] exactly what he is speaking of now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio was not printed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The parliamentary situation in respect to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was entirely different. His amendment was an amendment to a committee amendment which had to be passed upon. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to offer an amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which is not in order; whereas the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was in order, and there was

nothing the Senator from Georgia could have done to prevent the Senator from Ohio from offering his amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. But the Senator from Georgia has made a unanimous consent request for consideration of amendments which he will take to conference. I simply ask that my amendment also be taken to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I told the Senator from Nebraska I was disposed to accept his amendment, but I should like to look into such matters and at least reasonably understand what I am doing at the time I accept amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Georgia needs no advice with respect to what he is doing. He is one of our most able Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose I should accept the Senator's amendment after that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I can see no difference between the one and the others. I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would accept my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first printed amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas is as follows:

On page 200, line 14, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of \$7,880,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement explanatory of the amendment which has just been adopted.

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

1. The amendment is recommended.
2. The Flood Control Act of 1936 provides that improvement of rivers and other waterways for flood control shall be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Army Engineers and that measures for run-off and water-flow retention and soil erosion prevention on watersheds should be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Obviously it was the intention of Congress at the time the Flood Control Act of 1936 was passed that work on main streams would be done by the Army Engineers and soil conservation and erosion work on the watersheds would be done by the Department of Agriculture. If this is true, the work authorized in the above amendment is already covered by general authorization.

3. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 11 watershed programs were specifically authorized for the Department of Agriculture and survey reports were adopted on each of them. Some of these reports such as the Little Sioux Watershed in Iowa, the Los Angeles watershed in California, and so forth, specifically called for authority for gully con-

trol, flood water detention, and floodway structures. Some of the other reports such as the Coosa River watershed in Georgia and the Trinity River watershed in Texas did not provide for gully control, flood water detention, and floodway structures specifically, and these measures are now found to be necessary. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has held that these survey reports have the force of law and since the authority for floodway structures, and so forth is omitted from them, the Department of Agriculture, even though it has general authority in the Flood Control Act of 1936 over the alluvial lands, does not have authority beyond that specifically written into the survey reports on the 11 programs set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

4. Of the \$9,880,000 included in the omnibus appropriation bill for flood-control work of the Department of Agriculture, the department intends to expend approximately \$4,300,000 for gully control, flood water detention, and floodway structures in the alluvial lands. Some of the expenditures are already authorized in the survey reports covering the projects, but unless this amendment is adopted money for this purpose will not be available for such work in the Potomac River watershed, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; Coosa River watershed, Georgia and Tennessee, the Middle Colorado River watershed, Texas; the Trinity River watershed, Texas; and the Washita River watershed, Oklahoma and Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. BRIDGES is as follows:

On page 196, line 6, strike out "\$2,995,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,030,000, of which \$55,000 shall be available for such investigations and experiments at Bartlett Experimental Forest only."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, unless some member of the committee objects, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment coming under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

On page 179, line 15, strike out "\$7,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,952,500."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has stated that he thinks adoption of this amendment is necessary. I was of the opinion that it was not. In the absence of full information, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me inquire what the amendment will do.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment will add \$2,500 to the \$12,800,000 provided for meat inspection, to allow a part-time

inspector at Seattle, Wash., where there is no meat inspector at the present time, according to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment also relates to transfers of livestock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it relates to the transfer of cattle brought in from Canada; in other words, it relates to the international trade in cattle from Canada.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it seems to me that the additional amount provided by the amendment is not sufficient. Furthermore, it seems to me the subject matter of the amendment should have been handled by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place. If the necessary amounts are not studied and recommended by the committee in the course of its consideration of the bill in the first place, then we are mistaken in everything we do in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I may make an observation at this point, let me say that it seems that under the amendment the inspection service relates to cattle in international shipment, for which it is claimed that sufficient authority is not available. Of course the amendment will not cure the difficulty if there is a lack of statutory authority.

Mr. CORDON. Of course not.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate would have to recede under the circumstances, when the amendment came before the conferees.

However, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] formerly the Secretary of Agriculture, has said that he thinks adoption of the amendment is necessary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the addition of \$2,500 to the appropriation for meat inspection in order to make possible the employment of a meat inspector at Seattle, Wash., or at any other place, so far as that is concerned, where it is necessary. However, it is perfectly apparent to all Senators on the floor of the Senate, I think, that the addition of \$2,500 for that purpose does not carry any statutory authority that is not available in the bill at the present time. The amendment would simply add \$2,500 to the \$12,800,000, as I recall, which already is available.

It seems to me that, if there is going to be any presumption in favor of any committee and its work in attempting to reach logical conclusions with respect to appropriations, the time to commence to do so is now. If the amendment was necessary, it should have been presented to the committee, and the committee should have been given an opportunity to consider it and to act upon it.

So I object to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make an explanation?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the shortage of inspectors for animals and also for plants imported into this country is not confined to the State of Washington alone. Trouble has been encountered in many sections of the country as well. It is due primarily, I would say, to the limitation on the number of hours during which an inspector can work. So, along the borders, instead of perhaps going out after supper and inspecting a truckload or a carload of cattle coming into the country, the inspectors are prohibited from doing so at the present time.

There has been a great deal of trouble along the Vermont border and along the coast of Florida in this respect. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and I introduced a bill which would permit the Federal Government to allow the inspectors to work overtime, and, I suppose, to give them overtime pay, and then to recover the cost from the importers, who originally made this complaint, and who seemed willing to pay the additional cost incurred in that way. It was not a matter of cost, but a matter of accommodation, because sometimes the shipments would reach the border a few minutes after the inspector was required to stop work, according to the law; and the result would be that the cattle would have to be kept there all night until the inspector came on duty the next day.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously reported the bill favorably the other day, and it is now on the calendar. The bill was previously approved by the Department of Agriculture.

So far as I know, there is no opposition to this proposal. Its enactment would alleviate much of the trouble which has been referred to by the Senator from Washington, so far as the shipment of cattle across the border is concerned.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; if I now have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to correct a statement I made a few moments ago. The Senator from Washington in discussing his amendment referred to it as a meat-inspection amendment. I thought he was referring to meat inspection at a stockyard; and yesterday I stated that I could not possibly understand how it made any difference whether a cow came from the moon or from Canada or from elsewhere, once the cow was slaughtered.

However, apparently the Senator was speaking of part-time inspectors on the border, rather than meat inspectors at slaughtering houses, because I find that the amendment does not relate to the \$12,800,000 which is available for meat inspection, but relates to the \$7,950,000 for the control and eradication of animal diseases, which means the inspection of animals on the hoof as they come across the border, to see whether they are free from disease.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. No amount of appropriation would permit inspection after hours, so long as the inspectors cannot work after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Even if 20 inspectors

were available at a certain point, if they had to stop work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the difficulty would continue.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I indicated my objection to adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent. I was under a wrong impression, also, with reference to the identity of the portion of the bill proposed to be amended. Inasmuch as this amendment relates to the eradication and control of animal diseases, it is acceptable to me; I have no objection to it.

However, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to how the legal authority to act in the way suggested, if that authority does not now exist, can be conferred by means of this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it can. In my own judgment, I doubt very seriously that it can. My doubt is increased by the fact that the committee clerk has handed me a statement from the Department of Agriculture, which I shall now read:

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Animal Industry]

The amendment offered by Senator Magnuson increasing by \$2,500 the item "Animal disease control and eradication" under the head "Salaries and expenses, Animal Industry," would provide for part-time service of an inspector at Seattle, Wash., for public stockyards inspection work. Under present import regulations, cattle imported from Canada for slaughter may be consigned to a public stockyard for sale, otherwise they must be consigned directly to a slaughtering establishment. Public stockyards are those yards covered by Federal inspection of livestock received at such yards. Seattle is not now a public stockyard.

If Seattle is not a public stockyard, I have very grave doubt that the Department could assign an inspector to it to enforce Federal regulations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator from Georgia advise the Senator from Oregon as to how a stockyard can become a public stockyard?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think a stockyard becomes a public stockyard when it is posted and brought under the operation of the inspection item.

Mr. CORDON. Is there a Federal law on the subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I might clear up the statement of the Department of Agriculture in regard to a public stockyard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to clear up that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not a public stockyard in the sense that it is operated by a public body. It is operated by the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the stockyard, though all other slaughter-

ing houses in the area use the stockyard. It is operated technically and jointly by all of them, but it is under the management of the slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, and it is called the Union Stockyards. Anyone may ship to it. It is a sort of cooperative undertaking, managed, however, by the one slaughterhouse which is adjacent to the yard, because it happens to be located on the railroad sidings.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I not understand the Senator from Washington to say there was a shortage of border inspection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, this has nothing to do with border inspection.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not located on the border?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to read a letter I have received from the persons affected. I placed it in the RECORD yesterday. The letter is very short, and if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I should like to read it. It poses a problem, similar to the question here. The letter was addressed to me under date of June 30, by the Seattle Packing Co., which operates the yard in question, and it reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Although the Department of Agriculture recognizes the need for restoring Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards, it is unable to do so because of a shortage of funds. The Department estimates, however, that only \$2,500 is needed to restore the Federal inspection at Seattle as only the part-time services of one veterinarian is required. It is, therefore, suggested that you obtain an appropriation of \$2,500 for this purpose. This is important to the Northwest for the following reasons:

Increased control of livestock diseases is a protection to the general public. With Federal inspection the Seattle Union Stockyards would be assured that a veterinarian would be in charge and that adequate inspection with regard to communicable diseases would be in effect.

Livestock producers will be better served under Federal inspection. At the present time the Northwest is served by only two federally inspected yards. These are located at Spokane and Portland. Under State law, health requirements are enforced by the brand division, which require that all female stock be tested and tagged when sold, except when sold to a packer for slaughter or for resale at a federally inspected yard.

Since a federally inspected yard has a veterinarian on duty, the additional expense and delay required by testing female cattle is avoided. Inasmuch as the Seattle Union Stockyards are not now inspected, livestock producers tend to make their shipments either to Spokane or to Portland.

Slaughter in the Northwest area would increase. Since reductions in the tariff on meat from Canada to the United States from 6 to 3 cents per pound, effective January 1, 1948, and the termination of shipments from Canada to the United Kingdom, meat importations to the United States have been greatly increased. Due to higher wage rates, expenses, etc., in the United States, most of this importation is now in the form of meat that is dressed. It would be desirable to have it come in the form of livestock so that the slaughter and processing could be performed here. Federal inspection at the Seattle Union Stockyards would therefore greatly facilitate the movement of livestock from Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend a moment, the

Chair observes that there is no opposition, apparently, to the pending amendment. The chairman of the subcommittee has accepted it. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Oregon has withdrawn his objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a judge once said to me, "When the court is with you, sit down." I shall now follow that very wise counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on page 179, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes, for the time being, the amendments to chapter VI, and brings us to chapter VII, the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to chapter VI, the agricultural bill. I stepped off the floor of the Senate a moment, and while I was gone the chapter was evidently finished. My understanding from the distinguished Senator from Georgia had been that, if I requested unanimous consent, he would not object to the consideration of an amendment which I desired to offer, on page 220, in line 22, after the word "work", to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the proposed amendment would add to or take from the provision. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will temporarily return to the consideration of chapter VI, and will consider an amendment to be offered from the floor by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propose the following amendment: On page 220, line 22, after the word "work", to insert "and programs authorized by Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of chapter VII, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will want to impose upon the patience of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. We are now taking up the chapter on the Department of the Interior, are we not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators wanted me to notify them when this chapter was reached. If the distinguished Senator will permit me, and if he will yield for a quorum call, I think we at least ought to have a quorum call. Senators will then be on notice.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capewhart	Hunt	O'Connor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworschak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Eaton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have before me a scholarly study dealing with the Recognition of Governments, with special consideration of the current problem with regard to governments in China. The paper was written by Stanley K. Hornbeck and was presented at the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Society of International Law in Washington, on April 29, 1950. The paper will be printed in the proceedings of the society, but its application to recent action in the United Nations Security Council on the Korean situation makes the study particularly timely now. To make it available to Congress now, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Hornbeck is well known for his long service in the Department of State as Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs and as United States Ambassador to the Netherlands.

After presenting the main principles of recognition of governments as developed by authoritative scholars, Mr. Hornbeck makes a reasoned and valuable application of them to the specific question of how the United States ought to deal with the attempt of Communist China to have its government recognized in the place of the Nationalist Republic of China. In the course of his paper Mr. Hornbeck gives strong reasons and argument why the United States need not and should not recognize the Communist Government of China at this time.

Mr. Hornbeck developed this material before the recent outbreak in Korea. Proceedings in the Security Council on the Korean situation offer powerful support to the wisdom of Mr. Hornbeck's conclusions. If the United States had recognized Communist China when we were pressed to do so, and if Communist

China was then seated in the Security Council as Russia has tried to bring about by a form of parliamentary blackmail, the Security Council would have been prevented from taking the prompt and decisive action it did take in the Korean situation.

As far back as January 17 of this year I developed this question of recognition in great detail. On this floor I stated:

Recognition of Red China by any country which has been engaged in the fight to contain world communism is surrender on another front of the cold war. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1950, p. 471.)

Had we recognized Red China at that time, the tragedy would have proved to be a double one. First, it would have been a spiritual blow to the hopes of all people of the world, particularly those in southeastern Asia, who look to us for leadership in the effort to resist the inroads of communism. Second, it would have made it possible for Red China to paralyze the Security Council by veto while the North Korean Communist invaders achieved another territorial outpost in the advance of communism.

All the reasons I advanced against recognition of Communist China are reinforced by Mr. Hornbeck's excellent paper and by the crucial events in recent world history. It is to make this record complete that I have asked to have Stanley Hornbeck's paper printed at this time.

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

For the purposes of this part of this morning's discussion we shall consider only one of the various situations in which the question of according recognition arises; namely, that in which declaration and claim are made that there has come to power in place of an old government a new government.

A particular case is presented currently with regard to China, and to that particular case we shall in due course give particular attention. From and by developments in China there has been and is presented the question: Shall or should the United States accord recognition to the government recently proclaimed at Peking as the Government of the People's Republic of China? (For convenience, as we proceed, that Government will be called China's Communist Government, and the Government which the United States recognized in 1928 and still recognizes will be called China's National Government.)

It is important that the phenomenon of taking cognizance of be clearly distinguished from and be not confused with that of according recognition. Recognition is a matter of affirmative official action, involving an exercise of judgment and affecting status and relationships.

Consensus of legal opinion runs to the effect that there exists no absolute legal obligation on the part of any government to accord recognition to another; and, conversely, no clearly defined legal right on the part of any government to receive recognition from another. There is some dissent, but none in which it is contended that there exists an unqualified duty or an unqualified right. In practice, decisions to accord or to withhold recognition are made by the Executive and are based largely on political (including economic) as distinguished from legal considerations.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1792: "It accords with our principles to acknowledge any government to be rightful which is

formed by the will of the nation, substantially declared." (Moore: Digest, I, 120.) This sounds very simple. But think of its implications in practice. What is meant by the words "formed by"? What are the tests of the "will of the nation"? What constitutes "substantial" declaration? In some cases, all very easy; in many cases, more than difficult.

Those words of Jefferson were written a long time ago. They were not Jefferson's only words regarding recognition. Jefferson spoke of "our principles," not of a duty or a right.

In practice, the seemingly simple test of origin by the substantially declared will of the people has seldom been deemed conclusive; there have been applied along with or even without it other tests. The tests most often mentioned relate to: (a) effectiveness of authority; (b) ability or capacity to fulfill international obligations; and (c) disposition or willingness to adhere to international obligations, both of treaty and of law.

Professor Lauterpacht, affirming existence of a duty, says:

"When [the new government] enjoys, with a reasonable prospect of permanency, the habitual, willing obedience of the bulk of the population, outside states are under a legal duty to recognize it in that capacity." (Lauterpacht: Recognition in International Law, 1947, pp. 87-88.)

There is a good deal of qualification in that statement.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in the course of a communication to Mr. Tinkham, Member of Congress, May 18, 1936, wrote: "It is the rule of the United States 'to defer recognition * * * [of a new government] until it shall appear that it is in possession of the machinery of the state, administering the government with the assent of the people thereof and without substantial resistance to its authority, and that it is in position to fulfill all the international obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon a sovereign state under treaties and international law.' You will appreciate that the length of time necessary for a new government to satisfy our government upon these points will vary to a great extent as cases vary." (Hackworth, Digest, I, 174, quoted in Hyde, 2d revised ed., 1947, pp. 159-160.)

Professor Hyde says:

"No difficulty presents itself when a change is wrought through normal processes and the result is accepted as a mere incident in the life or growth of the state concerned. The situation may be obscure, however, when a contest for governmental control is waged by force of arms or by other processes not contemplated by local laws; the completeness of the success of a contestant may be fairly open to doubt for a protracted period, and even after its adherents assume to exercise the functions of government. In such cases foreign states may, and oftentimes do, withhold recognition until they are themselves assured where the victory really lies. The sufficiency of such assurance depends obviously upon the circumstances of the particular case. * * * As international law imposes no obligation upon a state to accord recognition to a new government * * * at any particular time, the bare withholding of it [recognition] is a matter of policy." (Hyde, 2d ed., I, pp. 159-160.)

Where there exist, as in China today, two contending regimes, one long since recognized and for many years in good standing, the other merely and newly claimant, it stands to reason that the problem presented to other countries is more complicated than is that presented in cases where an older regime has been destroyed or has disappeared and a new regime exercises nation-wide and unchallenged authority in its place. Toward an old regime still extant, third parties have more of obligation than they have toward a new

regime not wholly and undisputedly established.

Lauterpacht says:

"So long as the lawful government offers resistance which is not ostensibly hopeless or purely nominal, the de jure recognition of the revolutionary party as a government constitutes premature recognition which the lawful government is entitled to regard as an act of intervention contrary to international law. * * * Premature recognition is a tortious act against the legal government; it is a breach of international law. * * * Such abuse of the power of recognition is vividly illustrated by the recognition by Germany and Italy of the Spanish insurgents in the early stages of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. * * * It is not for outside states to administer to the de jure government the coup de grâce by transferring full sovereignty to the victorious opponent." (Lauterpacht, 1947, 94-96.)

Judge John Bassett Moore stated in the Digest (vol. I, p. 73): "Premature recognition constitutes an act of intervention, committed in favor of insurgents or of a conqueror."

Recognition may or may not be, to use a British phrasing, "a mark of approbation," but an according of recognition to a new regime, with a corollary withdrawal of recognition from an old, certainly constitutes a choosing as between the two. It may not signify moral approval of the new, but it certainly signifies transfer of legal approval from the old to the new: it takes from the old and gives to the new the stamp of political acceptability and a certification of legal acceptance.

In the situation which now prevails in China, an according of recognition to the Communist regime involves withdrawal of recognition from the National Government. As the Chinese Ambassador to Great Britain stated to the Foreign Office official who informed him of the British Government's intention to recognize the Communist regime, the according to that recognition amounted to a "burying-alive," in British-Chinese relations, of the National Government. Such action should under no circumstances be taken without a very thorough weighing of all available facts and all conceivable implications and possible consequences.

Recognition is not an essential for maintenance of contact and carrying on of business, nor does it, when given, ensure or insure either of these.

Merchants of many countries carried on business with the Chinese, and "foreign" missionaries worked in China long before there were effected between their Governments and the Government of China arrangements constituting or implying reciprocal recognition. Later, after formal diplomatic relations had been established, the existence of these relations and the agencies thereof by no means sufficed, in numerous instances, adequately to safeguard the rights, including even that of life, of "foreigners" in China or of Chinese nationals abroad.

When the United States of America came into existence, the Russian Government refrained for many years from recognizing this country. When the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics came into existence, we refrained for many years from recognizing its government. There was, however, in each case, contact and carrying on of business.

In 1920, Secretary of State Colby wrote:

"That the present rulers of Russia do not rule by the will or the consent of any considerable proportion of the Russian people is an incontestable fact. * * *

"* * * the existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention, underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful

relations, whether of nations or of individuals.

"In the view of this Government, there cannot be any common ground upon which it can stand with a power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense. * * * We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a Government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them." (Colby, letter to Italian Ambassador, May 10, 1920; Foreign Relations, 1920, III, 463ff.)

In 1923, Secretary of State Hughes wrote: "When there is a question as to the will of the nation it has generally been regarded as a wise precaution to give sufficient time to enable a new regime to prove its stability and the apparent acquiescence of the people in the exercise of the authority it has assumed. * * *

"In the case of the existing regime in Russia, there has not only been * * * tyrannical procedure * * * which has caused the question of the submission or acquiescence of the Russian people to remain an open one, but also a repudiation of the obligations inherent in international intercourse and a defiance of the principles upon which it alone can be conducted.

"What is most serious is that there is conclusive evidence that those in control at Moscow have not given up their original purpose of destroying existing governments throughout the world. * * *

"While this spirit of destruction * * * remains unaltered the question of recognition by our Government * * * cannot be determined by mere economic considerations * * * or simply by a consideration of the probable stability of the regime in question. There cannot be intercourse among nations any more than among individuals except upon assumption of good faith. * * * The sentiment of our people is not deemed to be favorable to the acceptance into political fellowship of this regime so long as it denies the essential basis of intercourse and cherishes, as an ultimate * * * aim, the destruction of the free institutions which we have laboriously built up, containing as they do the necessary assurances of the freedom of labor upon which our prosperity must depend. * * *

"We are unable * * * to find any reasons for separating (i. e., differentiating) the regime and its purpose from those who animate it and control it and direct it so as to further their aims." (Hughes letter to Samuel Gompers July 19, 1923. See Hyde, 2d edition, I, 170-1.)

The United States withheld recognition of the Soviet Government until a new administration here had become convinced that that government met most of the standard tests of what constitutes a recognizable government and that it would be reasonable and advantageous to accord it recognition. Then we laid down conditions; we asked and we were given pledges. And, even at that, we were deceived. The Russian Soviet Government has disregarded both its general legal obligations and its particular pledges, including those made then to us and those made before and since to us and to other countries.

There is little if any warrant for an expectation that, with or without recognition and with or without pledges, the performance of the Communist regime in China will differ very greatly from the performances of the Communist regimes in Russia and in other Communist countries. All Communists are committed to the destruction of persons and peoples, institutions and agencies which stand in the way of world dom-

ination by communism. The Chinese Communists, whether they are or are not controlled by the Kremlin, are allies of the Moscow regime. They imitate the Russian Soviet system, they use its methods and they follow the made-in-Moscow party line.

There is seldom need for hurrying to recognize. Occasionally, there may be an advantage or a fancied advantage to be gained by quick action. There was a chance of advantage in our prompt recognition of the Kerensky regime in Russia. Our resent recognition of the Bao Dai regime in Indochina may or may not prove to have served useful purposes. Generally speaking, however, the more hurried is recognition, the more speculative is that action.

There was pressure a few months ago, both in official and in unofficial quarters, for quick recognition of the Communist regime in China. When that regime declared itself a government, the Soviet Union gave it recognition at once and 10 other Communist countries promptly followed suit. There was pressure for early and concerted recognition by several non-Communist States. Burma, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon soon fell in line. After them, the United Kingdom. Of the 25 governments which have thus far (up to April 29, 1950) accorded recognition, 12 are Communist, 7 others are Asiatic, 6 others are European. The Government of the United Kingdom is the only one that represents an English-speaking people. Latest on the list, chronologically, are Viet Minh, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. Conspicuously absent from the list are the United States, Canada, and all other countries of the Western Hemisphere, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the United States of Indonesia, Ireland (Eire), France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

Reasons publicly given by high officials of the United Kingdom for that government's action ran to the effect that by prompt recognition they expected to gain commercial, political, and cultural advantages. Thus far there do not seem to have accrued any such advantages.

Arguments advanced in the United States by advocates of early recognition have been similar to those which prevailed in the United Kingdom but with emphasis on points to the effect that the Communist government represents the people of China; that, toward befriending that people, we must recognize and assist that regime; and that, by so doing, we will drive a wedge between China and Russia. During recent months the Chinese Communist leaders have, by their own acts and utterances, substantially undermined these contentions.

There is little that the United States might with any warrant expect to gain by a precipitate recognition of a regime which, committed to the destruction of freedom, has declared the United States next in line after Chiang Kai-shek among the objects of its political enmity. There also is little that we need expect to lose by pursuing in this connection a policy of wait and see. Our financial investment in China is not large. Our trade with China is not vital. Our cultural investment is substantial and our influence has been of consequence. But, with or without recognition, the Communist regime may be expected to deal arbitrarily with all of these.

There exists, however, a situation which makes the question of what to do about the National Government and the Communist regime in China a lively and a thorny issue; controversy has developed regarding representation of China on the Security Council and elsewhere in the United Nations. The Chinese Communist regime demands that it be admitted and the representation of the National Government be expelled. The Soviet Union supports that twofold demand and is trying, with its walkout and boycott

tactics, to blackmail the United Nations into compliance with it. The United Nations, embarrassed first by the Chinese National Government's preferring of charges against the Soviet Union, and embarrassed further now by the Chinese Communist Government's demands and the pressure applied by the Soviet Government in support thereof, is greatly concerned about the menace to it of this Soviet pressure, more concerned, it would seem, than it has thus far shown itself to be about the menace to the world of Soviet pressures of the past 5 years in China and against a government there which the Soviet Government had expressly pledged itself, in special agreements, to support.

In and regarding this situation, the Government of the United States has taken an affirmative position toward sidetracking consideration of the Chinese Government's charges against the Soviet Union and has taken an essentially negative position toward the question of representation of China in the United Nations. Its spokesmen have declared that its delegation will vote against recognition by the United Nations of the Communist regime but will not resort to the veto and will accept such verdict as may be arrived at by the votes of the majority.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has formulated and has actively propagated a proposal that the United Nations pass upon the question of Chinese representation to and within it without reference to the policies or action of its member states individually in regard to recognition, and that the United Nations make its test that of exercise of "effective authority within the territory of the state" and "habitual obedience by the bulk of the population."

Adoption of that proposal by the United Nations would presumably lead to unseating the representation of the National Government and seating a representation of the Communist Government. Notwithstanding the fact that the National Government still has complete control over the whole of Formosa, which long was and presumably now is Chinese territory, with an area greater than that of Maryland and Delaware combined and a population almost equal in numbers to that of Australia, and that the Communist regime's authority is still disputed at various points on the mainland, it is mathematically true that the Communist regime does now exercise authority, extensively speaking, over most of the territory of China.

The principle of seating on the basis of mere possession of power would be consistent with policies of neutrality, nonintervention, and noninvolvement, but not with pursuit of the objective of maintaining peace with justice between and among nations.

The test of effective control is one part, but only one, of the three-part standard test of qualification for recognition. Were the United Nations to adopt the principle that effective control suffices for seating in the Security Council, and were it then to seat a representative of China's Communist regime, it would thereby be certifying to all concerned that in its view that regime has effective control and is ipso facto qualified for acceptance. It would set a precedent implying that it does not expect to concern itself, and the world need not, with questions of the origin or the character or the policies of regimes which, having acquired substantial control of a preponderance of territory, claim the right to speak exclusively for the whole of nations thus affected.

Decisions to those effects by the United Nations would put states which have not recognized China's Communist government, especially the United States, in an awkward position. It would compel them either to abandon their present positions vis-à-vis China's National Government or to develop within and for themselves split political personalities.

In brief, by adoption of Mr. Lie's proposal the United Nations might presumably effect a relaxation of the immediate Soviet pressure upon it; would, by establishing an ill-omened precedent, invite resort by successful aggressors to further such pressures at their convenience; would create for many of its members new perplexities; and would add to the bewilderment and apprehension of multitudes of men of good will who, observing the strength of the modern tendency toward solutions of fancied expediency, are being driven to wonder what faith can with warrant be placed in treaties, conventions, charters, and international law as instruments for the safeguarding of the rights and interests of nations and of peoples and of persons.

Yet, within the Lie proposal there is a germ of a possibly good idea. Might not the members of the family of nations to advantage delegate to the United Nations, by some orderly process, the function of recognition? Might not this be practicable if there first were formulated and adopted, to be followed by the United Nations in its performance of that function, a set of rules, including criteria, toward according or withholding of recognition? Might not some such steps tend to take questions of recognition out of politics, to relieve many governments of one category of embarrassing and time-consuming problems, and to reduce or eliminate one of the all too many causes of friction and contention between and among states, governments, and peoples?

The idea of a collective decision in regard to recognition is not new. It has been propounded from time to time and in various versions.

Left to themselves, individuals, governments, nations, and the United Nations see China in a great variety of lights and see in China and regarding China very different actualities and possibilities. And no wonder. To most people China, old China, has always been more or less a mystery. Today's Communist China is so different from anything with which the Occident has been really familiar that the more we see and hear of it, the more we feel like saying, with the countryman at the zoo, "There ain't no such animal."

For, as Professor Steiner, after an intensive study of its foreign policy, has recently concluded: "Communist China typifies a new kind of state, organized and motivated by a revolutionary ethic thoroughly incompatible with the existing structure of international law and relations. It struggles to attain unbridled freedom of action for the implementation of doctrines which can no longer be exposed to objective scrutiny and evaluation. If it accepts restraint, it does so from political and tactical considerations alone and not from any sense of legal obligation under international law. International law does not even receive its lip service." (Steiner, H. Arthur, *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 44, January 1950, p. 99.)

How can any responsible government, committed to the principles and policies which have been and which are those of the United States, seeking to act intelligently and reasonably, with the real long swing interests of its own and other peoples on its mind and in its heart and in its hands, expect or be expected to accord recognition to such a political prodigy without having first devoted ample time to study of its origin and to observation of its structure, its activities, its habits, its affiliations and its proclivities?

For the United States the question what to do about China's Communist regime is only one of many questions currently implicit in the problem of relations with China and China's neighbors. This question should, then, be considered in the light of other and larger questions, our over-all objectives in regard to China, our objectives

in regard to the Far East as a whole, our objectives in regard to the world as a whole. A decision to recognize the Communist government in China, made and implemented independently of decisions with regard to those questions and problems, might easily add to, rather than reduce, the sum total of our difficulties in pursuit of and regarding our major and constant objectives of peace, justice, and security.

Getting down to fundamentals: We recognized the National Government of China 22 years ago. That government is still extant and we still recognize it. That government made resistance even as did we to Japanese totalitarian aggression. That government is making resistance, even as are we, to Communist totalitarian aggression. In the conflict between democracy and totalitarianism in which we are reluctantly but inescapably engaged, it can be no help to us to have that government disappear.

A decision on the part of the United States to recognize the Communist regime in China would require first a decision to terminate our recognition of the National Government. Implementing of such a decision would involve, constitute, and signify complete abandonment by the United States of the National Government and should imply and involve intention on the part of the United States to refrain from any encouragement of resistance to the authority in China of the government thereupon or thereafter recognized by us in place of the government thus "buried alive."

Such a taking and giving, such a transfer of legal approval, by the American Government, under now prevailing circumstances, would signify to the Chinese people, to many other peoples, and to more than a few of our own people, that in this critical case the United States prefers acceptance of a Communist domination achieved by force to a continuance of resistance thereto by a government which has declined or has been unable to comply with American advice or demands or both.

What may have been in mind when it was stated in the white book that we believe that ultimately the civilization and individualism of China will "reassert themselves and . . . throw off the foreign yoke" and that we "should encourage all developments in China which . . . work toward this end" is a fair subject for conjecture.

In the light of our traditional policies, especially of developments therein since 1928 and particularly of those since 1944, it would seem that we, the United States, should be among the last of the democracies to certify China's National Government legally defunct. And in the light of our current policies and of the recent utterances and acts of the Chinese Communist authorities we certainly should be among the last to certify China's Communist regime the government of China.

In that context and as matters stand, there persist a number of serious questions not lightly to be answered or to be brushed aside:

Can we afford to abandon a friendly government to the fashioning of whose predicament we have contributed, while that government still lives and still is resisting a common enemy?

Can we afford to add, by such an act, to the doubts regarding our standards and our reliability which already exist in the minds of various peoples whom we exhort to stand with us in a common effort to combat communism and produce conditions of national and international security?

Can we afford not only to withhold support but to withdraw recognition from a government which is actively and tenaciously resisting, with armed force, the advance of communism? Were we to follow such courses now, how could we reasonably

expect opportunity to develop wherein we would even up by encouraging and supporting revolt in that area at some future moment?

Can we afford, taking into account all known factors, to invest heavily in support of resistance to the menace of communism in western Europe and at some points in eastern Asia and elsewhere and at the same time to declare disqualified a government actively engaged in resistance to an armed subjugation by communism of the most vital area and the most durably influential nation in eastern Asia?

Can we afford to accept, by facilitating the completion of the Communist conquest of China and consolidation by the Communists of their position in that pivotal and crucial area, the increase which will inevitably result therefrom of Communist pressure upon and against other areas in the Far East in which we have interests and involvements, especially Japan, Korea, and the Philippines?

Can we afford to accept by default the loss of the advantage which it might be to us to have remain alive in China at least a nucleus of organized resistance, some element allied with us in the common cause of resistance by freemen and free peoples to the armed advance of communism?

With regard to China's Communist government, we owe to China as a state and, therefore, to any authorities functioning in or for any part of China, respect on our part for the international legal obligations that are ours toward China. That is all that we owe. There exists no law or rule which requires that we accord recognition. There do exist tests which we have been in the habit of applying of qualification for recognition. This Communist government does not pass these tests. There are conceivably some problematic advantages which we might lose by not recognizing it. There is much that we would almost surely lose by recognizing it now.

With or without recognition a new government displacing or claiming to have displaced an old owes to the world respect for the international legal obligations of the state which it governs or proposes to govern. Thus far this Communist government in China has shown itself little or not at all inclined to respect those obligations.

In our pursuing of the courses which we have followed in relations with and regarding China during the years since 1944 we have incurred enormous losses. Now, in attempting to answer the question what to do about this Communist government we have a choice between evils. Either way, we stand to incur further losses. Recognition of that government, if now accorded, would constitute an acknowledgment and confirmation of losses up to date, but it would not put an end to our losing. There is only one possible course, pursuit of which might possibly, on balance, do that.

Recognition can be accorded at any time, and easily. Recognition once given can only with difficulty be withdrawn.

In the light of all these many considerations, it seems the better part of wisdom to scrutinize very carefully and, therefore, with deliberation, any proposal for transfer of recognition from an old government still extant to any new government which has just begun to function. This, especially when the old government has long shown itself favorably disposed toward us and to the world at large and the new government has, in word and in deed, shown itself hostile to us—to our ideals and practices. It is believed, then, that in this China case, we should take no action toward withdrawal, transfer, or according of recognition unless and until it becomes crystal clear that we have less to lose by such action than by continuing to stand, look, and listen. Meanwhile, as the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, said 4 weeks ago (April 5), the United

States continues to recognize the National Government, and it would be "premature" (that was Mr. Acheson's word) to consider now any shifting of that position. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 382. An act for the relief of Wong Suey Wing;

S. 841. An act for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian;

S. 1262. An act for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra;

S. 1779. An act for the relief of Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers;

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Francisco Gonzalez Perez;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos);

S. 2296. An act for the relief of Maria Cicerelli; and

S. 2676. An act for the relief of Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina.

The message also announced that the House had agreed, without amendment, to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

A PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair understands the Senator from Arizona to request that he may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire without his losing the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, gallant American fighting men are dying in Korea. Vastly outnumbered by a foe which despises the value of human life, our forces are fighting a delaying action. Why do they fight, Mr. President? To restore the peace?

Mr. President, 5 years ago our fighting men laid down their arms. They had fought World War II. Their gallantry had won that war. The sacrifices of those who fought, the sacrifices of those who died, the sacrifices of those they left behind, had been made for one purpose: Peace.

America fought World War II to gain but one objective: Permanent Peace. Our fighting men had a right to expect that the cause they advanced would be carried forward, that the world would know the beginning of Permanent Peace.

Peace is worth fighting for, Mr. President. But there are reports from Korea of bitterness and frustration. Our fighting men know of the epic failure of our efforts to establish a lasting peace. It is small wonder if there are some who feel bitter.

The essence of government is to foresee the future. This administration, like the preceding administration, has failed. This Nation cannot afford further failure. We must know where we are going. We must chart a course. We must take heed of our failures and profit from

our experience or disaster will overwhelm us.

I happen to be a United States Senator who can make this speech. For 14 years, as a Member of the United States Senate, I have consistently held the same course. Since 1937 I have urged, I have argued, I have pleaded. I have said, "Resist small aggression before it becomes large aggression." I have said, "Quench the bonfire before it becomes a major conflagration."

I voted against passage of the Neutrality Act, that law which prevented us from sending assistance to those who opposed Hitler and his fellow conspirators against the peace. I was one of six Senators to vote against this law in March 1937.

By my votes and by my speeches, which are in the RECORD, I supported Selective Service, Lend-Lease, and each and every program to maintain and extend our military strength, to build our Army, Navy, and Air Force. All these programs, and a multitude of others, had my support. Sometimes the number of Senators to agree with my position was pitifully small. But Hitler and Mussolini were on the march and the Japanese war lords were sounding the war drums.

After World War II, I joined with that group of Senators which enacted the ECA program, the North Atlantic Pact, and the arms-implementation program, and other legislation. This time the danger was Soviet expansion.

At times it has been an unpopular position. Individuals lobbying against preparedness have spat on me. My life was threatened as I prepared to speak on the afternoon of December 7, 1941, because I had been labeled a war-monger.

It was a hollow triumph to find that I was right before Pearl Harbor. It is equally hollow, now, to find that I have been right about Russia.

Even as a political opponent of this administration, I certainly can find no pleasure in reciting the foolishly optimistic words which administration leaders have uttered in the last year. It is hard to believe, in the light of what they have said, that they knew the truth. Yet it is impossible to believe they did not know the truth. I knew what was happening. Many other Senators have known what was happening. A substantial part of the general public has known what was happening.

It is only with regret that I review these statements; regret born of the despair I feel as our casualty lists mount in Korea—casualties which could so readily have been avoided.

It was less than 1 year ago that the State Department issued the infamous "China white paper," a product of the thinking of Philip C. Jessup—our Ambassador-at-Large—whose personal prejudices, and those of his associates in the State Department against the Republic of China, are too well known to require further comment. Incidentally, my colleagues will recall that Jessup's last trip to south Asia was delayed while he testified for Alger Hiss. This white paper, a monstrous excuse for losing the key to the Orient, was issued on August 5, 1949. The next day the senior Sena-

tor from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had read enough of it to call for a new policy in China.

It was only last December 23 that the State Department issued the secret memorandum instructing our diplomats in the Far East to write off the island of Formosa as of no strategic importance. This moved the last Republican President, Herbert Hoover, to raise his statesman's voice in protest. He suggested, only last January 2, that the Navy should be used, if necessary, to defend Formosa. His suggestion was endorsed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and others.

The secret memorandum of December 23, 1949, indicates how our foreign policy has shifted to suit the whims of Joseph Stalin. Formosa had no importance to the United States in December 1949. But on June 3, 1945, when the Communists had no designs on Formosa, our State Department issued an official bulletin which commented as follows, with regard to Formosa:

With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position. (State Department bulletin, dated June 3, 1945, vol. 12, No. 310, p. 1019.)

On January 12, Secretary Acheson warned against "foolish adventures" in the Far East. Dean Acheson's policy had other advocates. President Truman at a press conference on January 5 released State Department bulletin, volume 22, No. 550, dated January 16, 1950, which said on page 79:

The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China.

Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.

Another Democratic spokesman got into the act on January 9. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said on the Senate floor:

No, Mr. President, I shall not favor sending a single American boy with a gun in his hand to Formosa to settle a civil war six or seven thousand miles away from his home, in order to appease the political ambitions and the oratorical frothings of Senators.

This was the line. Senators could not be appeased. Joe Stalin was the man to appease.

As the Chinese Communists move up to the Korean front in support of Korean Communists, how ridiculous these recent words from the lips and pens of our leaders.

But that is not all. So determined were these men to pursue this policy of appeasement that they have failed to provide our soldiers with the minimum equipment they now need to defend themselves. Not only did our leaders mislead us, they made statements about it. Again, it is certainly with no sense of pleasure that I quote.

In the March 3 edition of the New York Herald Tribune, President Truman is quoted as follows:

The President added that never in the history of the United States had its defenses

been in such good shape except when actually at war.

Secretary Johnson chimed in on March 13 when he testified before a Senate appropriations subcommittee:

The Army is stronger today than at any time since the end of the war. * * * And as for the Air Force, it is in the highest state of combat readiness since the war.

On May 5 it was President Truman again. His statement as published in the New York Herald Tribune of that date was:

He (President Truman) is not alarmed over the possibility of a shooting war with Russia, and backed up his optimism with disclosure that next year's defense budget will be smaller than the one Congress is now working on. * * * He told his weekly news conference the cold war situation is better now than it was in 1946.

On June 2, just 23 days before the Korean outbreak, the Baltimore Sun quotes President Truman, at his weekly news conference, as saying that he does not expect war. "In fact," he is quoted as saying, "the world is closer now to permanent peace than at any time in the last 5 years."

The administration said these things. Whether the administration believed them or not, I do not know. I knew better, and I assume the President's sources of information are better than mine.

The fact is, we are not prepared for a showdown in Korea or anywhere else. Although we have been appropriating about \$15,000,000,000 a year for our defense establishment, we find we have too little. The administration has set its sights too low insofar as our arms programs have been concerned. Each military appropriation of the last 3 years has been the subject of administrative economy cuts. They did not even spend the money the Congress voted for the arms programs. The only approach to economy made by our governmental planners has been in the field of preparedness.

While we made these false economies on our national defense budget, we have spent billions of dollars in the last 5 years to buy surplus commodities and to maintain artificially high food prices. We have accumulated an unbelievable food surplus, but no surplus of tanks or planes. Commodity surpluses are no good to the men in Korea. It is not possible to stop Communist tanks with surplus potatoes or surplus peanuts.

The theory of the hand-out state is now seen in its true perspective. We had a choice of providing adequate military security or providing hand-out billions. We chose to spend our money for hand-outs. We bought votes instead of bullets. Our leadership took the easy way. Now we must live the hard way and it will be that much harder.

I want to make the position of this Republican Senator crystal clear. I am for our men in Korea. They are facing overwhelming odds. They see our bazooka shells and our artillery making hits on Russian tanks. They see these hits bouncing off the Russian armor like marbles. They see the tanks plunge ahead. No wonder front-line reporters

write of bitterness and despair in the hearts of some of our men.

I have no doubt this is the so-called German scientist program coming home to roost. At some future time I intend to tell the Senate how the program of President Truman and our military leaders, aimed at bringing over 1,000 German scientists to the United States after World War II, was scotched by one man in the State Department. The program was less than one-fourth effective. This man boasted that the scientist program might be approved by the President of the United States and the Cabinet, but it was not approved by him. He stopped it. The German brains went to Russia. Now, the Russian tanks have impenetrable armor. And that man is still employed in the State Department of the United States.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, with the senior Senator from New Hampshire, when the evidence about the stopping of these scientists was produced, I should like to ask him whether it was not true that the man who claimed to have the capacity to stop the bringing of these German scientists into this country was operating in the Security Division of the State Department.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding. I do not know that he is still in the Security Division of the State Department, but I understand he is still in the State Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is in the State Department at the present time?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is true, is it not, that evidence was given before the committee at that time, that there was delay in the examination of the loyalty files, and that changes had been made in different boards, because of which delay had resulted for months with respect to examination of the loyalty files?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is absolutely correct. Such evidence was given at that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was there not some evidence that the same man who boasted about his capacity to thwart the desires of the President of the United States had some responsibility for those delays?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; he certainly did.

Mr. President, I desire to make it perfectly clear that the military leaders wanted to have the German scientists brought here, the President wanted them brought here, but one man in the State Department, who is still in the State Department, according to my understanding, boasted that he would stop such a program regardless of what the President of the United States wanted or what any member of the Cabinet wanted.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he believes that the shipment of war materials from the countries of western

Europe to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain has in any way contributed to the war armament our boys are now being required to meet in Korea?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it undoubtedly has. If we were so careless as to allow our citizens or our allies to ship material of military significance to Russia or the satellite countries, we are certainly, to that extent, guilty of having contributed to the present military situation.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if it is not true that we learn from the reports from the front in Korea that the Russian tanks are superior to any tanks we have in the field?

Mr. BRIDGES. Such reports come to us.

Mr. KEM. In that connection is it not significant that the shipments of machine tools from the United Kingdom into Russia in the first 4 months of 1950 were 10 times the amount of the shipments of such machine tools in the corresponding period in 1949?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that those are official figures obtained from the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand they are official figures obtained from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KEM. What sort of business is it for us to be furnishing England steel and industrial equipment and having England in turn shipping it to Russia for sale?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot understand it. As the Senator knows, it was announced in the afternoon newspapers that Great Britain has finally stopped sending oil and gasoline to the Communists in Korea.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. After that question has been raised on the floor for the past several years by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and especially by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and also in some measure by the junior Senator from Nebraska, the question has been asked: What about it?

Yesterday the junior Senator from Nebraska, as the Senator from New Hampshire may remember, asked the question whether we should continue to give ECA aid to the various beneficiary countries and permit them to continue to sell strategic materials to Russian satellite countries, which strategic materials finally reach their destination in the hands of the Russian Government?

I have here an Associated Press article dated London, July 18, in which the following appears:

British services operating in the Far East decided to take over all stocks of oil there for their own uses.

I submit to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that if shipments of oil should be discontinued to Red China, we should stop allocating to ECA countries strategic materials which may find their way to Russian satellite coun-

tries and thus jeopardize our national defense, handicap us in fighting an all-out war, and hurt our chances not only of national defense but of winning a victory in such a war.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator say the same thing with respect to steel and rubber? We are supplying all kinds of articles to the ECA countries for their peacetime requirements at a time when there is no longer involved the question of the dollar gap. It is a question of whether we can allocate these materials to the ECA countries when it is necessary for us to use such materials properly to defend ourselves, and send war materials to the front lines, where they are so badly needed by the boys who are giving up their lives to defend us on foreign soil.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have in my hand today's afternoon newspaper in which there is an article headed "British Stop Sending Oil to Chinese Reds; Services Take It Over." Perhaps that is the article to which the Senator from Nebraska previously referred.

Mr. WHERRY. It is. I ask the Senator if he will place it in the Record at this point as a part of his remarks?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Evening Star of today to which I have just referred may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

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

BRITISH STOP SENDING OIL TO CHINESE REDS; SERVICES TAKE IT OVER—ARMED FORCES TO USE SHELL CO. STOCKS FOR KOREA OPERATIONS

LONDON, July 18.—A Foreign Office spokesman announced today that Britain has stopped all oil shipments to Red China.

British services operating in the Far East decided to take over all stocks of oil there for their own uses. Their needs have increased because of operations undertaken in carrying out the United Nations Security Council resolution for bringing back peace to Korea, the spokesman said.

Britain earlier this month turned down an American suggestion that oil shipments to Red China be limited. The Foreign Office spokesman at that time said only oil for civilian consumption was going to Red China.

The spokesman said only one British company—Shell—has been selling out to the Chinese Communists. In the first 6 months of this year, he said, total supplies amounted to 26,000 tons—less than a tenth of China's civilian requirements.

The spokesman added:

"The question of the future supply of oil products to China has, however, become academic, since the British service departments (army, navy, air force), acting in terms of the United Nations Security Council resolution on Korea, have decided to take over all stocks of oil held by the Shell Co. in the theater."

The fuel in stock in the Far East will be used by the British fleet and, presumably, by British planes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The article says the British have stopped all oil shipments to Red China. But the Russian tanks, the Communist tanks used by the North Koreans, which have moved down into South Korea and which are causing us so much trouble, and are taking the lives

of American boys, were running on the gasoline supplied by a supposed ally of ours. The situation being such as it is, such shipments of oil should have been stopped before this. The shipment of such oil was a terrible thing. I am very happy that finally the British, as of this afternoon, have announced that they have decided to stop such shipments of oil.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if the United Nations machinery, under which we apparently have gone into Korea, should not have been invoked immediately to prevent members of the United Nations from participating in or carrying out such an arrangement as the Senator is referring to, namely, permitting business as usual to continue with respect to strategic materials and war supplies, and certainly oils and gas and all such materials?

Mr. BRIDGES. Since we are now acting as a part of the United Nations police force, so to speak, in Korea, and so forth, and when the United Nations is calling upon other nations to cooperate in furnishing war material and armed forces, certainly, as the Senator from Kansas well knows, it is just as important that supplies and equipment shall go to the forces sent to Korea, as is the sending of the forces themselves. Therefore, in getting at the root of the trouble, certainly the United Nations should come into play in that respect. I think the Senator from Kansas is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, the matter of the German scientists was very important. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and many other Senators who were interested in that situation at the time it was being considered, remember what took place. We sat in committee and heard a man testify that this individual said he did not care what the program of the President of the United States or of the Cabinet was, that he was going to block the coming into the United States of German scientists. As the result of this attitude on the part of some of our civilians, against the advice of the President and the military authorities, the entry into the United States of a sufficient number of scientists was blocked, and Russia obtained the bulk of them. We obtained only a few.

Let us face the cold, grim, bloody facts. America is in a shooting war. The cold war is over. This may be the opening skirmish of World War III. Americans can honestly face these facts. Americans can be realistic.

Or we can continue to hide our heads in the sand, utter pious hopes for the success of the United Nations under Trygve Lie, who has played the Communist tune, and continue to soften our people with more handouts.

The clouds of World War II gathered on the distant horizon of Ethiopia. They appeared to be a far distant storm. The clouds rolled closer—enveloped Czechoslovakia. We took no extraordinary

precautions as the tempest approached nearer and nearer. Then when the storm broke at Pearl Harbor we spent agonizing months while American men struggled with too little too late. After a lag, while men died needlessly, we caught up with the military potential of our enemies and succeeded in defeating them.

It is the elementary precept of war that you must get there first with the most.

Let us have no more too little too late. Let us not be again lulled by the false hopes raised by false promises.

The Soviet Union has had every opportunity for 17 years to become an honorable member of the community of nations. The Soviet Union was accepted as a full partner of the Allied effort in World War II. The Soviet Union was a full partner in planning for the peace. At no time during the last 17 years, at no time during the course of a partnership which was wholly unwarranted and utterly unearned, in fact, at no time since the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917, has the Soviet Union deviated from the Marx-Lenin-Stalin preachment of unremitting war against the non-Communist world. Their bloody, godless, criminal conspiracy goes ever forward.

It must be clear to everyone that ultimately America has but two choices. We can fight communism and destroy it or we can surrender to communism and be enslaved. There is no middle course. There has been no middle course. There is no slight hope for a middle course.

There will be peace overtures. There will be deals. Tools of Soviet aggression will come forward with proposals to end the Korean war. Such gestures are intended only to further soften the United States. If we accept them, we merely give communism more time to revamp its schedule for conquest.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator has heard of India's suggestion to Stalin that one of the peace moves be that we admit Red China into the United Nations as one of the members of the Security Council, in place of Nationalist China, and that thereafter there would be a negotiation for peace in Korea.

Does not the Senator realize that if that appeasement step were taken, it would be but the first of a series of big payoffs to the Kremlin for their blackmailing, following their withdrawal from the United Nations on the ground that they would not be in the United Nations if they could not have Red China sit beside them in the Security Council? Does not the Senator realize that once we paid that first blackmail, ever afterwards we would be at the absolute mercy of Red China, as a close ally and satellite of the Kremlin? Does not the Senator also realize that in that case, whenever Joe Stalin and his Kremlin decided to move out of the United Nations, he would always have Red China in the Security Council of the United Nations, to block any step which was not a procedural matter, and when Red

China wanted to step out of the United Nations and again blackmail the United States and the other free nations of the world, Red China would have the Red Kremlin in the United Nations, where it could veto any step which was attempted to be taken in behalf of freedom and peace in the world?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is absolutely correct in saying that if we yielded on that point, we would simply be paying the first installment of blackmail. The Senator has stated the case very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. And, of course, once a first installment of blackmail is paid, thereafter it is necessary to follow the first payment with more or less continuous payments of blackmail, extending endlessly into the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, there is no end to blackmail.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that the Kremlin was astounded by our resistance in Korea. Stalin certainly had no right to expect resistance. His stooges in the United States had reported this country would continue appeasement.

Stalin had only to look at our record. Each time communism has tested us we have retreated, we have equivocated, we have found excuses, we have made excuses. We have sacrificed possible allies to appease Stalin's unremitting appetite for conquest. From the record, how on earth could Stalin anticipate that we would send American men to fight his colonials in Korea? It seems clear that Korea is a most unlikely place to make a stand.

It is equally clear to me that Stalin will not start the final phase of world war III, the assault on North America, until he is ready. Stalin prefers to wait until his satellites have overwhelmed their neighbors. Stalin intends to fight this war with Koreans, Chinese, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Bulgars, or any other colonials he can press into service. Stalin will furnish military supplies and military commanders for his puppets, but his own Russian divisions will be reserved for the final grand assault. Meanwhile he will attempt, by attrition, to wear away our resistance.

I propose that we face facts, Mr. President. This is real war. This is no police action. This is grim and bloody warfare.

We can start to fight this war now. We are 15 months behind Russia at this moment. We can begin to live hard and work hard, and we still have a fighting chance to win. I say let us get on with it.

Our choice is clear. We can continue the soft course of hand-outs to buy votes or we can take the hard choice of providing men to fight and funds to buy guns, instead of surpluses.

We require firm, consistent leadership. The responsibility for providing that leadership rests on the administration.

There must be an end to this quibbling and bickering. There can be no more glowing statements for political advantage. Now, if ever, our leadership must close ranks.

President Truman has now repudiated appeasement. His advisers must do like-

wise. If we can get the wise and positive leadership which we require we can establish a truly bipartisan effort in the perils which lie ahead. There can be no rubber stamp. There can be no headstrong, stubborn, or petty men in the councils of our leaders.

On March 24, 1948, I spoke on the floor of the Senate. I offered a 17-point program to stop Communist aggression. Most of those points are as valid today as they were over 2 years ago.

Today I offer an expanded program based on my original suggestions. I sincerely urge the President of the United States to adopt it as a program for saving the America we know.

Our first and foremost consideration is to arm the United States. Everything else, at this hour in our history, assumes secondary importance. Our men are making a valiant effort to hold a beachhead in Korea. They may fail. But if they succeed they will need reinforcements which will strip our home defenses. These things, in my judgment, Mr. President, we must do, and without delay.

First. Call the National Guard to the Federal service at once.

Second. Mobilize needed members of the active Reserve.

Third. Draft manpower to place our inactive paper Reserve on active-duty status.

Fourth. Establish an American radar network at once.

Fifth. Train and equip a home-defense Air Force.

Sixth. Mobilize full-speed, around-the-clock, industrial production to provide military equipment of the best type available. Weapons on paper or drawing boards are of no immediate use. The American people are ready to use steel for tanks instead of for automobiles.

Seventh. Establish and activate a civilian-defense program. It is almost criminal to have advanced 5 years into the atomic era without having such a program in full force and effect.

Eighth. Congress should at once prepare legislation to provide 100-percent mobilization of our people and our resources for enactment within hours when and if it is needed. This program should be aimed solely at achieving the safety and security of the United States. It is no place for dreamy planners to impose the controls which will lead this Nation to socialism. It cannot be a program for losing the freedom we seek to assure.

Ninth. Congress should make real and earnest efforts to balance our Federal budget. Hand-out programs should be ruthlessly abolished. Money saved should be applied to defense spending. The lower House should consider a wholly revised tax program.

Tenth. Register all Communists in the United States. President Truman should call for immediate enactment of the so-called Mundt-Ferguson bill. When Communists in Korea tie the hands and feet of American boys and shoot them in the face, we can no longer coddle the Communist fifth column in the United States.

Eleventh. Clean out the State Department. This is highly important. The small chance we have to postpone the full-scale encounter with Russia, until we are ready, depends on the skill of our diplomats. For many years our State Department has been infiltrated with men who either have unbelievably poor judgment or whose loyalty is open to serious question. It is not simply a matter of sweeping the front stoop by firing the top officials. It is a matter of a complete housecleaning. President Truman owes it to himself and his country to have the best possible advice on all levels.

The need for the housecleaning can no longer be ignored. In 1939 Stalin ruled 180,000,000 people. Today he rules 800,000,000 people. Our foreign policy of appeasement has resulted in stark disaster. The architects of failure must be swept out of office.

When an Army officer loses a battalion, he is relieved of command, in disgrace. When a naval officer loses his ship or runs it aground in the mud, he is court-martialed. But when foreign-policy advisers lose a whole continent, they are applauded or even promoted.

Mr. President, I have felt all along that there must be security risks in the State Department. I do not know the extent of these risks or of their disloyalty. Apparently, the Senate is not going to learn much about it as a result of any investigation by this Congress. But obviously, the great bulk of employees in the State Department are loyal Americans. These persons do not pose any security problem.

But I do not like the way the State Department, collectively, thinks. American thinking has never been defensive. American thinking has always been aggressive. Traditionally, our country never has sought merely to keep aggressors quietly appeased. Traditionally, our policy has been to do something about it.

We do not exercise world leadership by "waiting for the dust to settle." I believe it is essentially un-American to "wait for the situation to clarify." These phrases mean nothing, except that we do not know what we are doing or what we are trying to do. That is not the way Americans think. Americans are imaginative, forward looking. Americans have ideas. Americans get things done. America should embark on a diplomatic offensive to cut the ground out from under Communist diplomacy.

The State Department needs a real house cleaning. This is not a job of sweeping the dust under the rug with a whisk broom, or airing out the house by opening the front door and sweeping the front steps. This job calls for yellow soap, a scrubbing brush, and plenty of elbow grease, from the basement to the attic. It should be finished off with a first-class cyanide fumigating job.

We can do this for our fighting men in Korea without spending a cent. It could be accomplished long before effective reinforcements get to Korea. It would give our military morale a terrific boost. Let us clean house, Mr. President.

Twelfth. Improve and expand our intelligence operation. Foreign intelligence is almost new to Americans. We

cannot expect results overnight. But it is time we called on patriots of the highest order to infiltrate Communist countries, lose their identity as Americans and, if necessary, live the rest of their lives as nameless and anonymous heroes of America's fight for freedom.

Thirteenth. Mobilize anti-Communists everywhere. This is another must. There is trained manpower immediately available. It is insanity to pick and choose our allies, when our American boys are desperately outnumbered on the battlefield. To implement this program, I urge the immediate mobilization of anti-Communist forces everywhere.

Fourteenth. Immediately deny Soviet and satellite ships access to American harbors, except under closest inspection; and establish a shore patrol to identify strange vessels which may bring atomic warfare to our coast.

Fifteenth. Make use of the Chinese Republican Army, which has several divisions of well-trained, tough, experienced troops, much closer to Korea than our forces in the United States. The Republic of China is a permanent charter member of the United Nations. The Chinese Nationalists' offer of 35,000 men should be accepted at once.

The theory that such acceptance might induce Chinese Communists to enter the Korean war is academic. The Chinese Communists already are in the front lines in Korea. Chiang is reported to have over 1,000,000 guerrillas on the mainland. We need their help, too.

Sixteenth. Immediately name top-flight anti-Communist diplomats to all trouble spots. I make particular reference to Formosa, where, as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has pointed out, we are represented by a consul instead of an Ambassador. It is unthinkable that we should diplomatically insult our best friends.

Seventeenth. Make Spain a full partner in the fight against communism. Our first move should be to reestablish normal diplomatic relations. Our second move should be to establish air bases in Spain. Such bases are essential to the defense of western Europe.

Spain should be invited to join the Atlantic Pact. The Spanish infantry ranks with the finest in Europe. We should equip Spanish troops and use them in the fight, if their assistance is offered.

Parenthetically, I may add that in this show-down conflict there are only two sides—Communist and anti-Communist. I am no longer impressed with arguments as to the religious or political backgrounds of governments. We have Socialist governments as full partners in this venture. They are anti-Communist, so I accept them as allies.

Conversely, Russia has subdued democratic peoples and uses them. The artillery turned on our boys in Korea comes, in part, I am informed, from the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia, a satellite which once made great strides toward democracy.

We must be practical. We are facing history's gravest threat to our freedoms. To me it seems completely reasonable that we should marshal as much help

as possible. We should ask ourselves two questions: Does Spain oppose communism? Will the Spanish fight communism? The answer to both questions is "Yes."

Eighteenth. Serious consideration should be given the proposal endorsed by the American Federation of Labor to the effect that we arm and train persons in European displaced-persons camps. These stateless souls have a tremendous stake in freedom. They are the victims of communism as well as nazism. When the Russian sweep to the West comes, we should at least provide them a means of defending themselves.

Nineteenth. It has been suggested in some quarters that we should arm the Japanese people. I would accept General MacArthur's judgment on this phase of our total preparedness program. He should be asked for his opinion, and we should act on his advice. My latest information from an authoritative source was that he opposed arming and training Japanese divisions. That was some time ago, and his attitude may have changed. But we should make inquiry. I am sure my attitude has changed, but I am not in the position to speak with his authority on this subject.

Twentieth. Establish immediate quid pro quo relations with Russia and all satellite nations. This means that we allow Stalin and his associates the same diplomatic privileges which he extends to the United States, not a jot more. Unrestricted relations with Stalin and his slave states can only mean additional espionage cells in the United States.

Twenty-first. Stop all trade between the Soviet Union and its satellites, with the United States and its allies, which, directly or indirectly, has military significance. Obviously, the east-west trade, which the State Department has been promoting in Europe, has had a tendency to siphon off ECA aid and bolster the eastern European economy. Obviously, it should be stopped.

Twenty-second. Strengthen our overseas propaganda. This can be a powerful weapon in our total effort. We need a much better and more effective program of truth. We need more vigorous, resourceful, and effective personnel to carry it out. We must tell the 800,000,000 common people behind the iron curtain that we are their friends. We must tell them that the issue is joined, and that we shall render as much assistance as is possible to any attempt to throw off the yoke of Communist aggression.

Twenty-third. Advise nations outside the Communist orbit that our resources are not without limit; that they are definitely limited; that we will not assist countries which continue to pamper and coddle a fifth column; and that it is time to stand up and be counted. We must tell them this, and we must mean it.

Twenty-fourth. We must give realistic support to the United Nations. There is still hope that this organization may become the instrument for peace in which so many have placed their hopes.

Twenty-fifth. We must reestablish a sound bipartisan foreign policy. While the minority party must retain its right to be critical of the administration when

it deserves criticism, I believe in times such as this we should call the best men of both parties to our councils of state. This requires a sound and well-understood system of prior consultation before decisions are made or announced. By this means Americans can give wholehearted support to our all-out efforts for peace and freedom.

The American people are ready, President Truman. They are ready for a sound, consistent, realistic program. We ask you to give it to them.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to submit a report, which I ask to have printed as a Senate document, and I also offer two resolutions for appropriate reference.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator that I desire a quorum call, because I know there are several Senators who want to discuss it with him before he submits the report.

Mr. TYDINGS. To discuss what?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To discuss the question before the Senator submits the report.

As I understand, the Senator has just asked to submit a report, to be printed as a Senate document. May I ask, is that the report from the so-called McCarthy committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senate committee has instructed me to submit a report, and I have submitted it.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield. I do not quite get what the Senator's point is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Sitting temporarily in the chair of the minority leader, the Senator from Massachusetts has been asked to obtain a quorum call, in order to notify Senators, when the Senator from Maryland makes such a request. All I am asking of the Senator from Maryland is—

Mr. TYDINGS. I have the floor by courtesy of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. My understanding was, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield, that when the Senator from Maryland inquired of me, he was merely going to submit a formal report to the Senate, and that he did not intend to discuss it.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There would be no occasion for any discussion, because, when directed by a committee to submit a report, a Senator submits it.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, sitting in the chair of the minority leader, I have been asked that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be given an

opportunity to be on floor if and when the Senator from Maryland made his report. I am trying to carry out my duty. All I ask is that I be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum or that the Senator from Maryland delay until I can get the Senator from Wisconsin to the floor.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts, and, of course, also the Senator from Wisconsin. What I did, however, was simply to send the report forward. It will require action by the Committee on Printing before anything can be done with reference to it. I have simply filed it. I have been instructed by the committee to file it, and I can do that whether there is a quorum or whether there is not.

So far as the resolutions are concerned, they will be referred to the appropriate committees and will come back to the floor approved or disapproved, and then the whole controversy can break out.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not in mind what the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to do, but he asked me to give him an opportunity to be on the floor, possibly to interrogate the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator from Arizona if he can give me some idea when I may have an opportunity to present the matter, because I have a great deal of work to do, and I do not want to remain here all day and then possibly not have an opportunity to present the report.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that I have asked the Senator from Wisconsin to come to the floor at once.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, the report when made is automatically printed—

Mr. TYDINGS. It has already been printed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is for the benefit of the subcommittee. The report, I understand, does not have all the data in it which it had when the subcommittee presented it to the full committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the exception of two paragraphs.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that some remarks derogatory of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] were stricken from it.

Mr. TYDINGS. They were not stricken from it. I should like to set the Senator straight on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. We have to guess at these things when we do not know. I should like to ask the Senator this question: If there is anything in the report regarding any Senator—and there might be—is it only fair that in a report of

this type the Senator from Maryland serve notice now that he is going to file it and let Senators have copies of it? I have not seen it myself. I saw the first page or two when we were busy considering appropriation items. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the actual filing of the report be delayed until Senators can take a look at it? I want to be fair about it, and not unreasonable.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is perfectly within reason in making his request.

Let me make an inquiry of the Senator from Arizona. It is my understanding that what I have done will not bring about the printing of the report. I have simply filed it, and there will be no action as to printing it until the Committee on Printing presents a resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. If more than the usual number, which is approximately 1,500 copies, are to be printed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not arguing about the number.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I want to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. I ask the Senator from Arizona if this is not the situation: All I have done has been to file the report. The number of copies which can be printed without filing the report are already authorized, or can be. But when I file the report there can be no more copies printed until the Joint Committee on Printing reports a resolution favoring the printing of additional copies.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which is usually approximately 1,500 copies.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is what I do not like to see done. There might be something else stricken from the report voluntarily by the committee, if some Senator raised some point regarding the report. But before any copies are printed I ask if there cannot be a delay. The report is filed, so that automatically it comes on for printing. I should like to ask that no copies be printed for 24 hours or 48 hours, if that is not an unreasonable request, so that each Senator can take a look at the report; and if there is something in it which he feels should not be printed, he can go to the chairman of the committee and talk to him about it, and the committee might, by agreement, delete it. If 1,500 copies are printed, there might as well be 150,000 copies printed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. They have already been printed for the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. But this report has not been printed.

Mr. TYDINGS. It cannot be without a resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. I am a member of the committee, and I shall be called upon to pass on the question. But a few copies can be printed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning received the report from its subcommittee. It directed the subcommittee to file the report. There is no

stopping the subcommittee from filing the report—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not telling me anything that I do not already know.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me finish. If additional copies are desired, it will require a resolution of the Senate. The Senator from Maryland has said he would be glad to withhold filing the report until the Senator from Wisconsin can be present.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator make it, let us say, 24 or 48 hours, so that we can see a copy of the report?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us get the situation straightened out, because I do not want to leave the Senate under any misapprehension or have any misunderstanding about it later.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, if I am not correctly stating the situation when I say, first, that there is printed automatically a number of copies when a subcommittee makes a report to the full committee—

Mr. HAYDEN. That number is around 1,500.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have forgotten what the number is; but what I am doing is filing the report with resolutions to print additional copies. No additional copies, as I understand, can be printed until the committee meets and considers the resolutions and makes a recommendation. I want to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska, and I shall not press the committee or demand further action until the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators have had a chance to look at the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is all I wanted. I am not quarreling about the copies which have already been printed for the subcommittee. I am simply asking, and the Senator from Maryland has agreed, to delay printing any copies of the report until we can take a look at the report, consult with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and arrive at some date when the report will be printed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I again say to the Senator, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that the only way by which additional copies can be printed would be by the adoption of a resolution to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. But this report is different, in some respects, from the one which has already been printed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And this is the report which I am asking be held up.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Maryland has agreed to that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question.

I noted in the statement of the Senator from Maryland, and I was very much gratified, because it had been a matter of discussion, that two or three of the passages referring to two members of the subcommittee had been deleted from the report with the advice of the chairman of the committee, but I have taken the position very firmly that, in my judg-

ment, the Senator from Maryland was not cognizant of two sentences which were in the report when it was made and signed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may have read it, but I have no recollection of it. The report was written and rewritten several times. Corrections were made in it. My recollection is that when I saw the report I did not see the two sentences referred to. However, I do not think the two sentences were inaccurate.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not question that fact.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think they were derogatory. I think they stated the facts. However, I thought courtesy of a senatorial nature perhaps would best dictate their elimination. When they were called to my attention, I suggested that the two sentences be eliminated.

Mr. BREWSTER. That brings me to one further point. Since the Senator from Maryland says he was not conscious of the fact that those two passages were in the report, I wonder whether in a 200-page report there may not be similar passages with which the Senator from Maryland is not familiar and which may be called to his attention if the request of the minority leader is granted. In that event, the Senator from Maryland may wish to reconsider such passages as to the propriety or desirability of their inclusion in the report.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there are any other such passages in the report. I believe I have read the reports 2 or 3 times. I have read it twice since it was printed. I have no recollection of seeing any passages of a nature which I thought advisable to remove. So far as I am concerned, the passages which were deleted were accurate. There was no reason why they should not have stayed in the report. However, we have a certain amount of comity in doing things, and I thought the sentences contained an inference which I did not believe to be in the best interests of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask another question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask this question in the light of the Senator's last observation. I thought I understood what had been done. However, I had no more than sat down when someone came over and said that I did not have a correct understanding of the situation. Therefore, I should like to ask one more question of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Maryland is withholding the filing of the report of the committee and the resolution until we have had a chance to look over the subcommittee's report.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I tried to make that plain so that we could avoid any misunderstanding on the subject. I shall go over it again. I have filed the report with the Senate. However, no extra copies of the report can be printed—

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute. The Senator has asked me a question. No

extra copies of the report can be printed until the Senator from Arizona calls his committee together, the committee approves a resolution, and the resolution is adopted by the Senate. I have no intention of pressing for the adoption of the resolution, or any other action on it, except to have the resolution lie on the desk.

Mr. HAYDEN. I misunderstood the Senator from Maryland. I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that he was temporarily withholding the filing of the report.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to withhold filing it in order to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. HAYDEN. However, the Senator from Maryland has a perfect right to file it at any time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am filing it, but I am not pressing it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that he would withhold filing the report. When a report is filed it must be printed as filed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask another question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. When a report is filed, how many copies are printed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Fifteen hundred.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am making.

Mr. TYDINGS. No other copies will be printed, however, so far as I know.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. The appropriations bill is before the Senate, and is being interfered with. It is being interfered with at the wrong time. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been requested. The Senator from Arizona has the floor. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Can a Senator grant the floor to another Senator?

Mr. HAYDEN. I had the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I do not mind going back to the regular order. First, I should like to ask most respectfully for unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Maryland may withhold the filing of his report, because the filing of the report means the printing of 1,500 copies. I ask that he withhold the filing of the report until Senators have had an opportunity to study the report of the subcommittee.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I tried to tell the Senator, so far as I know, not a single copy can be printed in addition to the copies that have been printed unless the Committee on Rules and Administration acts on these resolutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is in error in that respect. The subcommittee report was printed for the information of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It was submitted to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. They authorized the Senator from Maryland to file it as a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. He can do that at his convenience. He can do it at any time. He has a perfect right to do it now. He has been directed to file it, but as to when he should do it is a matter which lies in his own judgment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that he was temporarily withholding the filing of his report. I know he can file it at any time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I shall hold it up for 24 hours, until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask one more question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the effect of any of this on the right of any minority subcommittee member to file individual views.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has been agreed to in the subcommittee. The minority views will be printed separately.

RADIO STATION KLZ, AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it goes without saying that I have always championed those members of the broadcasting industry who have fulfilled the precept of "operating in the public interest, convenience, and necessity." Accordingly, I should like at this time to call the attention of the members of this body to the work of Station KLZ, at Denver, managed by a very able gentleman who enjoys the esteem of his fellow broadcasters throughout the country, Hugh B. Terry.

Hugh Terry was the sole American broadcasting representative at the UNESCO radio parley at Paris in May 1949. In addition, in 1948 he was named "layman of the year" by the Colorado State Medical Society, for his contributions in providing a better understanding of health problems. Variety magazine named him "Showmanager of the Year," in 1949. Mr. Terry has a long and useful record as a member of Denver's community life, including his service as president of the Denver Rotary Club, and his direction of the Community Chest drive and the State cancer drive. He is currently a member of Denver's board of health and hospitals.

Again, in 1950, Terry distinguishes his station by the inauguration of a new radio series called Let's Talk It Over, wherein he and members of his staff speak every week to the KLZ listening audience about problems of broadcasting. He invites listeners to address to him their comments, criticisms, and suggestions; and then he proceeds to answer them on the program. On his first program, for example, Terry discussed the reasons why the Denver market has no television. He did so in a simple, down-to-earth style, devoid of undue technical references—a program that was a public service at its best.

I feel his radio series, Let's Talk It Over, is a concrete example of a program in which a metropolitan station makes a positive effort to bring the

listeners more closely and more fully into the operation of the station. It indicates a solid desire to have programs which are sincerely in the public interest. The history of Station KLZ, as evidenced by the numerous awards it has received in the past decade, is a record of splendid public service. The new series, Let's Talk It Over, represents a continuation of that high public-service consciousness. As evidence of that, let me call to the attention of the members of this body an article by Ken White, a member of the Denver Post staff, which appeared on June 6, 1950. Because Mr. White so forcibly explains the high purpose of this series, I ask that his article of that date be inserted as a part of this RECORD.

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

[From the Denver Post of June 6, 1950]
KEN WHITE ON THE AIR—HOWS AND WHEREFORES

Hugh Terry, the boss wrangler over at KLZ, has started himself a radio program which can do a lot to help people understand how a radio station—any radio station—operates, week in and week out; why it can and does put certain things on the air; why it makes schedule changes which frequently are confusing to the listener.

Terry calls his program Let's Talk It Over. The first broadcast was heard last Saturday at 12:15 p. m. The KLZ veep and general manager says he wants to make it a talk-it-over feature in the true sense of the word. He wants listeners to ask anything they please about radio, and particularly about KLZ. He'll answer, with the help of his department heads.

Terry is a pretty straight talker, and I believe he'll answer criticism, if any, of KLZ's operations about as objectively as any station manager could be expected to. Nothing he might say would merit respect, otherwise.

He also, by the way, is an accomplished mike performer. Knowing his subject, he didn't bother with a script on the first program—dealing with television prospects—and the colloquy with Matt McEniry, the announcer, profited from the resulting naturalness.

No matter the point of control, radio is a pretty remote business.

Stations traditionally take their punishment and praise in silence. They profit from some of both; actually try, most of them, to be guided by what they hear from listeners.

Individual performers reach listeners, but at management level there's traditionally an aloofness that makes it difficult for listeners to feel anything for a station's call letters.

Often stations get criticism anonymous and otherwise; that is unfair—not unfair intentionally but because listeners lack information on which to base criticism. To them many a change that can be defended as necessary—if a station tells them about it—seems merely high-handed affront. Programs go in, programs go out, favorites disappear. Not always is the originating or relaying station to blame, as Terry will try to make clear.

He will, of course, take a realistic approach—a radio station makes its money by programming programs that bring in money.

If it has a conscience, it tries to program some programs of limited appeal which it believes are in the public interest.

If its manager is crazy, he believes he can please everybody at the same time. Hugh Terry is not crazy.

He feels he's programming the way he should; will explain on Let's Talk It Over

why things are done the way they are, up there in the Shirley-Savoy.

Not that he'll be talking defensively all the time. Doubtless many letters merely will ask for clarification of various procedures.

By contributing to a better understanding of radio, via this program, Terry will win friends for the station—friends who will feel closer to it—and to other stations, as well, perhaps.

UNITED STATES SUFFERING DEFEAT ON PSYCHOLOGICAL FRONT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Suffering Defeat Throughout World on Psychological Front; Bold Action Held Needed by Truman To Organize Peace Information Office." The article is by David Lawrence, and is of such importance that I think it should be printed in the RECORD, so that all Members of Congress may read it.

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

UNITED STATES SUFFERING DEFEAT THROUGHOUT WORLD ON PSYCHOLOGICAL FRONT—BOLD ACTION HELD NEEDED BY TRUMAN TO ORGANIZE PEACE INFORMATION OFFICE

(By David Lawrence)

Much worse than the set-backs on the Korean front are the defeats being suffered throughout the world on the psychological front both by the United States and the United Nations.

Never, it might be said, in so grave an international situation has there been such a conspicuous lack of imagination and such timidity as is being exhibited by the United States Government in fighting the psychological war.

The Soviet Union has grasped the initiative and has made flank attacks around the United States in the propaganda battles in Asia as well as in Europe.

The lazy answer to this is that the United States hasn't provided the funds—the Marshall plan of ideas, as Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, calls it. But the truth is that even if \$100,000,000 is appropriated, it would be ineffective if our Government fails to express itself forthrightly in the propaganda field.

THREE WEEKS OF INACTIVITY

More than 3 weeks have passed since the Kremlin put the North Korean government up to an aggression that has startled the world. The United States and the United Nations responded with military effort, as yet unsuccessful, but at the same time the Soviet triumphantly grasped the initiative on the propaganda side. The Russians accuse the United Nations along with the United States of sanctioning aggression. Peace petitions are being circulated with tens of thousands of signatures by the Communists in a publicity stunt which is not being combated effectively by the western democracies.

In the face of the plain aggression in Korea, nobody in our Government or in the UN has officially, formally, and loudly called Moscow the aggressor. The United Nations, moreover, has invited American boys to be killed but politely hesitates to warn the nations helping to kill American boys that those nations are aggressors, too. While it is obvious that no nation can be asked to supply military help against its will, it is traitorous for any member of the United Nations at the same time to be supplying arms and military power to the country which is fighting the United Nations forces.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON of Michigan has pointed this up in a speech in the Senate in

which he demands that the Washington Government request the UN to adopt a resolution warning any nation helping the North Koreans that it will be regarded as a partner in the aggression.

The UN got considerable prestige by adopting a resolution calling for military forces to resist aggression in Korea, but it will rapidly lose that prestige if it stands idly by and lets the Kremlin supply munitions to the North Koreans in an obvious attempt to defeat the United Nations forces, including the United States.

POLICY MAKERS FLOUNDER

The propaganda war is being poorly handled not because there are not enough technicians to do the job or because there are inadequate transmission facilities. It is falling down because nobody in the Truman administration with authority to act has vision enough to realize what a propaganda war means. It doesn't mean just a battery of mimeograph machines and a \$7,000,000 building in New York. It means that the men who make policy—men with the courage of their convictions—must call a spade a spade in public. The policy makers are floundering. Three weeks of valuable time have been lost while the American Government cravenly refrains from denouncing the Kremlin leaders as the true aggressors. The answer usually heard is that this might offend the Kremlin—as if "appeasement" is the way out of Korea.

What is needed is a new executive board or commission of three eminent men to give full time to the work and be responsible directly to the President and not to any Cabinet officer. The head of the Office of War Information was responsible in World War II directly to the President. He must be free again to tell the President what any member of the Cabinet is doing or failing to do that is hurting on the psychological side of warfare. He must be free to speak out in the meetings of the National Security Council, of which he should be a member. The task cannot be performed by a subordinate unit in the State Department. The top level officers of that institution are too busy writing legal notes in the field of diplomacy and too much steeped in traditions and forms to use the vocabulary of propaganda war.

America is losing on the military side in Korea but not for long. America is losing, however, on the psychological front and there is no sign of any turn in the tide. It will take bold action by the President to organize an Office of Peace Information and to give it the proper instructions to engage in a world-wide crusade of truth.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 940. An act to authorize construction of the Eklutna project, hydroelectric generating plant and transmission facilities in connection therewith, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5866. An act to adjust and define the boundary between Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee-Pisgah-Nantahala National Forests and for other purposes.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the committee amendments to chapter VII, making appropriations for the Interior Department, I wish to make a brief statement respecting this chapter as reported to the Senate.

The House considered budget estimates totaling \$669,251,505, approving appropriations in the amount of \$522,134,130. After the bill passed the House, supplemental estimates in the amount of \$5,720,000 were received by the Senate, increasing the total 1951 budget estimates to \$674,971,505.

Although the Senate committee approved \$5,698,000 of the \$5,720,000 in supplemental estimates, the total of chapter VII as reported to the Senate is \$617,006,030, or \$5,128,100 less than chapter VII as passed by the House and \$57,935,475 less than the 1951 estimates. Percentage-wise, the total approved by the Senate committee is eight-tenths of 1 percent under the House total and eight and fifty-nine hundredths percent below the 1951 estimates.

Of the \$617,006,030 in cash appropriations approved by the committee, approximately \$65,000,000 is for the liquidation of prior contract authority.

The total new contract authority for the Interior Department as reported by the Appropriations Committee is in the amount of \$37,830,000, which amount is \$420,000 less than the amount allowed by the House, \$6,920,000 less than the 1951 budget estimates, and which is \$27,421,700 less than contract authority granted for the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, I may say that some of the reductions were larger than I personally felt should have been made. On the other hand, some of the reductions were not so large as some members of the subcommittee felt should have been made. In this respect, the bill is a compromise and represents a very honest and earnest effort on the part of the subcommittee to make the reductions in the amounts and in the specific appropriations where it was felt reductions could best be made. As I have stated, the final result is a bill which in cash is \$5,128,100 under the House bill, despite the inclusion of \$5,698,000 in supplementals not considered by the House, and \$57,965,475 under the 1951 budget estimates, and in contract authority chapter VII is \$420,000 under the House bill and \$6,920,000 under the 1951 budget estimates.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Of the \$617,006,030 recommended by the committee, \$324,104,000 is for the Bureau of Reclamation, and this amount includes \$5,445,000 in supplemental estimates not considered by the House.

There are no new projects included in the 1951 budget estimates or in the committee's recommendations. The amount of \$324,104,000 recommended by the committee, although it includes \$5,445,000 in supplemental estimates, is \$1,004,000 under the House bill, \$35,214,500 under the 1951 estimates, and is \$32,650,510 less than was appropriated to the Reclamation Bureau in the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, I may mention, in this connection, because the larger reductions

of the bill come out of the Bureau of Reclamation appropriations, that it is a result of an effort on the part of the subcommittee, and the committee having the bill in charge, to take into consideration the effect in dollars of the Taber-Thomas amendment as adopted by the House of Representatives.

The bill as it passed the House was sent to the Department of the Interior with the request that they examine it to determine how much money they would lose if the Taber-Thomas amendment were put into effect, and having determined that amount, to see if a similar sum approximately as great could be taken from the bill where it would hurt, but would not hurt so much; and that is what we have accomplished.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. It is, however, a fact, is it not, that the Interior Department, in carrying out the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, did so by reducing construction items, and not by reducing other activities included in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not entirely correct, but largely so.

Mr. CORDON. To what extent is it in error?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is in error in that there are some reductions made that are not in construction items, but the primary effect is upon the construction items, and it was possible for the reason that upon examination of the carry-over of unexpended balances on some of the projects it was felt it would be safe to make the reductions in those places.

Mr. CORDON. Will the chairman of the subcommittee at the appropriate time advise the Senate as to the reductions voluntarily made by the Interior Department in items other than construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to do so, because I have a tabulation which covers the entire amount.

Mr. CORDON. Is the tabulation in shape so that it might be placed in the RECORD today for the benefit of the Senate tomorrow? It would be helpful in studying the effects of the bill, particularly with respect to activities other than the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, which, as I recall, has taken all the cuts. The Senator advises there are other matters. I was not aware of them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will ask the clerk to make a search through the table and advise the Senator later in that regard.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

For the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the committee recommends appropriations in the amount of \$80,746,055, which amount is \$3,953,055 in excess of the House allowance but which is \$5,250,320 less than the 1951 budget estimates.

The larger increases recommended by the committee are for restoring funds for California Indians, all of which had been deleted by the House, additional funds to meet deficiencies in State educational contracts for the education of Indian children, additional funds for In-

dian school construction, and improvement of roads on Indian reservations.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would it not be well to advise the Senate with respect to the necessity of restoring the amounts in connection with the activities having to do with the Indians in California, where a cut was made by the House which eliminated all funds for those Indians, and the cut was made under a misapprehension both as to the fact and the law?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it appears from the record that three gentlemen appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations asserting that they represented the Indians in California, and that the Indians in California wanted no assistance whatever from the United States. Taking them at their word, the House committee struck out, anywhere in the bill under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, any item affecting the Indians in California. It was stated in the report that the House eliminated \$2,554,975 from the budget estimates. When the matter came before our committee the Representatives in Congress from California appeared, the Senators from California appeared, the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs appeared, and it was determined definitely that the gentlemen who assumed to speak for the Indians of California had no authority whatsoever to speak for them. For that reason we have restored proportionately the money recommended in the budget estimate for the Indians of California. Where a reduction was made a proportionate reduction was made in the California Indian appropriation.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Another large item in the bill is for the Bonneville Power Administration, for which the committee recommends appropriations totaling \$44,000,000 and contract authority in the amount of \$20,000,000.

The amount recommended by the committee for construction, \$39,500,000, is \$2,000,000 less than the amount approved by the House and \$2,500,000 less than the 1951 estimate.

For operation and maintenance the committee approved \$4,500,000, which amount is \$500,000 less than the House allowance and \$750,000 less than the budget estimate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Of the \$617,006,030 total appropriation proposed by the committee, a total of \$53,588,285 is for government in the Territories, including the administration of Alaska, Hawaii, Virgin Islands, and Guam, construction of roads in Alaska, and the continued rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad.

The total of \$53,588,285 recommended by the committee is \$3,741,215 less than the total of \$57,329,500 approved by the House, and is \$5,189,315 less than the 1951 budget estimates of \$58,777,600.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In making his statement the Senator referred to the ex-

penditures by the Government for the Territories, and he mentioned Hawaii, Alaska, and Guam, but did not mention Puerto Rico. Was there any particular significance to that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. In the case of Puerto Rico all of the internal-revenue collections go to the Territory, and that amount is sufficient to support the government of the Territory, and an appropriation is not required from the Treasury of the United States. It is different in the case of the Virgin Islands. Since I have mentioned the Virgin Islands, I should say they have been paid for two or three times over by the internal-revenue collections on the rum produced there, all of which revenue goes into the Treasury of the United States. On the other hand, it appears each year as though we are making a donation or gift to the island. If the same rule applied to the Virgin Islands as is applied to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands would have a magnificent surplus in the Treasury.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it should be pointed out, so that the public may know, because of the importance of Alaska as a strategic outpost of this country, that what the Senator is discussing is the internal appropriations, and that it has nothing to do with the millions which have been appropriated for military expenditures, which also includes the improvement of roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. What we include in the pending bill is for continuing the improvement and operation of the Alaskan Railroad and many highway items, but it does not apply to military construction in any sense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But in some cases the military construction and the money appropriated in the pending bill almost overlap.

Mr. HAYDEN. The military authorities strongly recommended placing the railroad in good operating condition. But we do it in this bill rather than in some other bill.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

With respect to the Southwestern Power Administration, I am glad to report to the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, and the private power companies in Oklahoma have agreed upon a means of integrating the hydroelectric power produced at Government dams with steam power produced by the private utilities in a manner which will provide for servicing public bodies with Government power as contemplated by section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act and which will serve as a pattern for similar contracts with public utilities in the southwest power area.

Senators will remember that last year there was considerable controversy in this body as to what should be done with respect to appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration. The Senate decided in that respect, as it did with respect to the Reclamation Service,

that in order to negotiate upon an equal footing with the private utilities, the Southwestern Power Administration should be supplied with sufficient funds so if satisfactory wheeling or integrating contracts could not be made, that the necessary transmission lines would be constructed by the Southwestern Power Administration. I expressed the opinion at that time that if the money were granted and placed in the hands of the Southwestern Power Administration, it would be possible to work out such an agreement with the private power companies there that the money would not actually have to be expended.

I felt that the tendency was growing, particularly in the southern area of the United States, for all private power companies and the public power development to live and to let live. I illustrated that by the fact that the Alabama Power Co., the Mississippi Power Co., and the Georgia Power Co. refused to join in the fight on the Tennessee Valley Authority steam plant, showing that they were getting along very well in that area in the matter of power, and that they would not participate in a fight of that kind. I believed that if we gave the Southwestern Power Administration ample money to carry on a program if necessary, it would prove not to be necessary, and that is exactly what has happened in that area. They have come to an agreement.

I think perhaps the best way to describe that agreement is to quote from the words of Mr. Douglas G. Wright, the Southwestern Power Administrator, in an address delivered at Muskogee, Okla., dedicating the SPA building there on July 15, 1950. Mr. Wright said:

There isn't any point in rehashing all of the things which have gone before us. But this is probably one of the greatest weeks in the history of Oklahoma. Oklahoma has found the way, through a perfectly freely arrived at bargain. The American way of bargaining, where we fought like the very devil. Where we pushed and shoved—where we used every kind of a force known.

Pushing one way, and then another, we finally arrived at an agreement. An agreement with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma which placed Oklahoma in the No. 1 spot in the Nation, in my judgment, in power potential. Oklahoma today has available the resources of the \$130,000,000 Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., the \$100,000,000 Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, and at least a \$250,000,000 Government development program, to utilize for any power need she can think of.

Her consumers have achieved what I have been pleased to call the No. 1 freedom of power. This is, namely, your right to decide where you will get your electric power, what you will do with it as you use it, and whether or not you will own any part of the facilities which serve you.

He further said:

Under that contract, the utility companies have agreed with the Government that the consumer does have the No. 1 liberty—the right to decide where he buys his electric power, and what he does with it after he buys it. We have agreed to that.

Secondly, the companies and the Government have agreed that the Government has the right to sell its power to whomever it desires, on whatever terms it desires.

And, third, we have agreed that the companies have the right to sell their power to

whomever they desire, on whatever terms they desire.

Then he adds:

We had a perfect marriage. It was love at first sight. The only trouble was nobody could figure out who should provide the dowry. Both sides wanted the dowry in this case. Well, we finally settled it in the American way. Each side gets part of the dowry. And you people who use power are going to get the benefit from all of this integration.

I think Mr. Wright is to be congratulated upon the conclusion of this very fine contract.

In that connection I desire to say that I have observed this matter very closely from time to time, and I found that the power companies in Oklahoma at all times were actually engaged in a serious effort to come together and to arrive at an agreement. There was no backing or filling and no dodging. I was convinced all along, although there were some who were not so convinced, that where there was the spirit to come to an accord an accord would be reached.

I particularly want to state that R. K. Lane, of the Oklahoma Public Service Co., impressed me as being a man who, standing stoutly for the interests of the people who invested their money in his company, yet realized that cooperating with the Government in an effort of this kind gained profit to them, and that it could be done in a way that was entirely in keeping with the present public-power policies announced by the Congress.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. To clarify a point in my own mind I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about the committee report which discusses briefly the SPA continuing fund. I refer to the language of the committee report found at page 130 of the report to accompany House bill 7786, as follows:

The subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations conducted joint hearings with the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, which handles the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, on the use of the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration for the purpose of aiding in the construction and operation of facilities for producing and transmitting power for the use of public bodies and cooperatives. This program involves the expenditure of loans of considerable amounts by the REA to a combination of local cooperatives and the lease of the facilities by the Southwestern Power Administration. The continuing fund is being used for this purpose to an extent not contemplated at the time SPA was created. The committee feels that the utmost care should be exercised by those administering this fund to avoid its use in any instance where it is not absolutely necessary to enable public bodies and cooperatives to secure sufficient power to supply customers. It is not the intent of the committee that the continuing fund be used directly or indirectly in the construction or operation of power-producing facilities and transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to the cooperatives and public bodies.

It is my understanding that one of the purposes of the continuing fund was to

facilitate the interchange of power between SPA and other suppliers in our area, and the marketing of power by SPA.

If I remember rightly, the fund was first set up at the time SPA entered into the Texas contract with the power company down there. The interchange of power is, as I understand, an important part of that arrangement and it is good deal both for SPA and the power company.

Now that the Southwestern Power Administration and the Oklahoma Utilities have signed an operating contract, to which the chairman of the subcommittee has so eloquently and forcefully referred, the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration must be used to make that contract operative. It is my understanding that because of the assurance that this contract would be signed, the Appropriations Committee was able to reduce the request of SPA for funds, actual and contractual, by approximately \$6,000,000. This saving results because the lines and facilities of the Oklahoma utility companies will be available for transmission of power to SPA customers, but the continuing fund is necessary for such an arrangement.

Mr. President, I assume that the language relating to the SPA continuing fund in the report was not intended to interfere in any way with the type of arrangement contained in the contracts which have been entered into by SPA and the utilities on the one hand, and on the other hand by SPA and the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma and nearby States, and which were described before the committee during the hearings.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if I am correct in that assumption.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The Oklahoma situation is this: All the representatives of the REA's in Oklahoma who talked to me said that they were hopeful and anxious that an integrating contract might be made between the private power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration. They felt that was to their advantage in the area. On the other hand, I have heard no complaint from any private power company in Oklahoma as to the arrangement made by the Southwestern Power Administration with the REA development in that area.

The Senator is perfectly correct. It is just as important, so far as a revolving fund is concerned, that money be made available to meet balances of payments from time to time, either with the private power companies or with the Rural Electrification Administration. That is the purpose.

What we criticized in the report were developments above and beyond that, in other sections of the country. However, so far as Oklahoma is concerned, no one has complained about what has been done by the REA in that area, either publicly or privately. I understand that the arrangement is entirely satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. KERR. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee very much.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Arizona will remember, I am sure, that this controversy has been before the Congress, and especially before the Senate subcommittee, for some 3 or 4 years.

I think the Senator also will remember that recently the Southwestern Power Administration made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. So far as I am aware—and I think the Senator from Arizona knows more about this matter than I do—that contract is working satisfactorily.

Is it not a fact that the contract which has recently been made is a replica of the Texas Power & Light Co. contract, but is adapted especially to conditions in Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between the Texas Power & Light contract and the Oklahoma contract is that in the Texas agreement nothing was said or done and no arrangements were made in regard to supplying power to municipalities, whereas in the case of the Oklahoma contract a municipality or the Rural Electrification Administration or the Government itself—any or all of them—get the combined service of the company's power and of the Government's development of power, by means of the integration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Am I correct in saying that the present Oklahoma contract is more favorable both to the Government and to consumers, the consumers being, first, the REA and preferred customers under the Flood Control Act of 1944?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the real difficulty, namely, to see that there was no distinction as between preferred customers, as set forth under the water power act—that is to say, regardless of whether it was a municipality or a Rural Electrification cooperative or the Government itself or any public agency. It was necessary to see that all were treated alike.

That was not the case under the Texas contract, because, as a matter of fact, there were no municipalities there that wanted any power, and that question did not arise as an issue. However, it was bound to arise in Oklahoma. It has been solved to the satisfaction both of the Southwestern Power Administration and to the private power companies.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that under the Oklahoma contract the Government is able to sell to the existing utilities all the power it can produce, both firm power, secondary power, and even dump power?

Mr. HAYDEN. The situation in that area, so far as hydroelectric power is concerned, is somewhat different from the situation elsewhere, where the Government is producing large quantities of firm power. If my recollection is correct, there are approximately eight rivers which are to have flood-control dams built on them. Those rivers vary in flow a great deal. For that reason, as the dry season comes on, the volume of water in the reservoir lowers, and the amount of firm power which can be developed lessens. If ideally situated, it is possible

to fit that fluctuating power into a steam-plant system, whereas if the fluctuating hydro-electric power were not available, the steam plant system would have to have stand-by steam plants, and large amounts of money would have to be invested for that purpose.

So this arrangement—utilizing the Government power, which is mainly uniform—integrates that power into the system of the private power companies. Then when the Government takes out power to supply to its preferred customers, it is firm power, available 24 hours a day and every day the year 'round.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As a matter of fact, the State of Oklahoma has a great many rivers which are fed by flash floods coming from northwest Arkansas, southwest Missouri, southern Kansas, southeast Colorado, northeast New Mexico, and western Texas. Those floods flow into the rivers which carry the water across my State, and eventually the water goes either into the Arkansas River, which flows through Arkansas, or into the Red River, which flows through Louisiana.

In our State there are no rivers which are constant in flow. So the only water we have, as a rule, is the water coming from the so-called flash floods.

Therefore, in order to provide power, we must catch the water in reservoirs, and must hold it there. By doing so, we serve flood control, and later on we run the water through turbines and create electricity.

My point is that under the Oklahoma contract the Government is able to sell all the power it can create, both firm power, secondary power, and dump power, because the utilities can take the power when it is available, and at such times they can close down their steam plants to some extent and can depend on the use of the floodwaters. Then when the floods have abated and are over, the private power companies can fire up their steam plants and can begin to operate again on the basis of steam power.

So this system enables us to get the greatest possible amount of revenue; and at the same time, according to the Southwestern Power Administration's announcement, the rate will be 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, which is the second cheapest rate in the entire country, so I am advised.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the rate to public bodies in Oklahoma will be among the very lowest in the United States, and that it is advantageous to pursue this course, as demonstrated by the testimony of Mr. Wright, who justified our action in recommending that, under this bill, \$6,000,000 be taken from the cash and contract authority. His testimony further is that it means a saving of at least \$850,000 a year during the years to come; and as he so aptly pointed out in his remarks, that saving inures to the benefit of the consumers of power in the Oklahoma area.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a fact, I believe—and I think the Senator from Arizona will confirm what I say—that by virtue of this contract, the Government will be able to avoid the appro-

priation of vast sums of money for the building of transmission lines; but, instead, the Government will be able to use the existing transmission lines for transmitting the power, and thus will make the saving. There will be a saving to the Government, and also, as I think the Senator will agree, all money invested in transmission lines eventually must be repaid by the consumers of electricity.

Mr. HAYDEN. Wherever a transmission line is built, either by a private utility or by the Government, the rate for electricity must be fixed at such a point as to make it possible in the course of time, to amortize the payments for the transmission line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think time will demonstrate the wisdom of the Oklahoma contract, in that both parties will be benefited—a somewhat unusual situation under a contract. The Government will be benefited, and also the consumers will be benefited, because both will have the advantage of the second cheapest power rate in the entire country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Government had uniform, fluctuating power, which by itself could not bring a very good price. The private power companies had steam plants which they would have to maintain in excess capacity for stand-by service, but which they are not now required to build or to maintain, because they can obtain the Government power. So one hand washed the other.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For some time the Members of the Senate who handle the Interior Department appropriation bill in the Appropriations Committee have been very anxious to hold hearings to develop a Federal public power policy. Does not the Senator from Arizona believe that the Oklahoma contract, together with the Texas Power and Light contract, go a long way toward developing a national policy?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think they will be highly valuable in that respect.

I may add that the same policy which we adopted, as applied to the United States Reclamation Service, has borne good fruit. First we provided in the bill money with which to construct transmission lines from the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. That area is divided between the Reclamation Service, on the eastern slope, and the Bonneville Power Administration, on the western slope. The power company violently opposed the construction of any transmission line into Anaconda, but we provided for it.

As a result, they got together with the Bonneville Power Administration, and made a contract which is entirely satisfactory both to the Government and to the company.

In Colorado there has been considerable difficulty. My information from the Reclamation Service is that there has been agreement in principle upon a wheeling arrangement which is entirely satisfactory. There remains in Montana one difficulty, which I shall discuss a little later, with respect to a transmission line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will

permit a further observation, let me say that I wish to pay my respects to the administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, who has been working on this matter for all these years. I think it is to him that we must give credit for doing the detailed headwork in the preparation of both the Texas Power and Light Co. contract and the so-called Oklahoma contract. I believe he has rendered a signal service to the public, and especially to the electric industry, by the development of those two contracts.

I also wish to pay my compliments and respects to the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because he has been intensely interested all these years in trying to work out something which will relieve his committee and the Congress of the necessity of guessing as to appropriations for these purposes.

With these contracts in existence, so far as these two States and the Southwest are concerned, we have a pattern, and if the private companies are unwilling or for any reason refuse to build the lines which are necessary, I think it is understood that the Congress will be called upon to build them. As one member of the committee, so long as I am here, I shall be very glad to go along and help build such lines. So I pay that compliment to the chairman of the subcommittee, because I give him credit for working out this matter to a very high degree.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at this point I should like to offer for the RECORD a brief statement. It is a part of a speech I made at the dedication of the Dennison Dam, which took place on July 1, 1944. That was before section 5 of the Flood Control Act was enacted. I ask permission to incorporate that very brief statement at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

How will this power be distributed?
Public power, as a rule, is produced as a by-product of flood-control, reclamation, and navigation developments.

The Government should not, in my judgment, enter the field of power development in such a manner as to destroy the value of existing power facilities which have served and are serving the wants and needs of the people.

It seems to me that a cooperative plan of power development and distribution may be worked out whereby the people in the cities and on the farms may receive the benefits of such power at reasonable rates.

Such a plan should embrace a program wherein the Government may create the electrical energy and the existing distributing systems may take the current at the point of manufacture and thereby both the Government and the existing systems may profit by such cooperative plan of operation.

Former Senator James P. Pope, now a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has just made the following statement:

"There is no doubt but that this cooperative effort, which makes for efficiency, economy, and better service, is here to stay and will play an increasingly important part in the future development of the public and private power industry."

Unless this policy is adopted the Government will be forced to build stand-by steam plants and in addition will have to build transmission and distributing lines in order to deliver the electricity to the consumers.

The Government is interested in making a success of its flood control, reclamation, and navigation power developments.

The public is interested in securing electricity at a reasonable price.

These two interests can be harmonized and adjusted to the benefit of both the Government and the consumers.

This is one of the problems that must be solved and when it is solved it must take into consideration the injury done by removing property from taxation and then it must give credit to the values which may be created as the direct result of the making available of an abundance of cheap power.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Arizona, in describing the Hungry Horse project, the point which the Senator was trying to make was that if this appropriation had not been made, the chances of getting private power companies and others together on a power contract would not have been so good as they were when the Southwestern Power Administration or the Government had the authority to do it if the others did not.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the policy we adopted last year, and I am going to say it has proved to be practical and sound. In each case, when the private power company learned that if it did not make a contract satisfactory to the Government, the Government would build transmission lines to serve its own customers, they then arrived at a settlement which was mutually satisfactory.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I was very much interested in a question which the junior Sena-

tor from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] asked the Senator from Arizona with reference to the language on page 130 of the committee report dealing with the Southwestern Power Administration. I was very much pleased, I may say, with the answer of the Senator from Arizona. I was not at all surprised, but I was pleased that he made the answer he did, because, as he indicated in his answer to single out REA co-ops and deny them the advantages of arrangements involving the use of the SPA continuing fund, while permitting its use to make payments to private power companies under the Texas and Oklahoma contracts, would be rank discrimination against the REA co-ops.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Wright made it perfectly clear in his testimony that this revolving fund was just as necessary in order to do business with the private power companies as it was to do business with the REA's or for the REA's to do business with the private companies.

Mr. HILL. Certainly the committee had no intention whatever of saying anything or doing anything that would discriminate against the REA cooperatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they were to be treated alike.

Mr. HILL. Exactly alike.

SUMMARY TABLES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire now to conclude my remarks by saying that I have covered the larger items included in the bill, and without taking the time of the Senate to discuss the committee's recommendations on appropriations for all of the bureaus and services in the Interior Department, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain summary data and tables included in the committee's report, which set forth the over-all action of the committee on chapter VII and its recommendations with respect to each bureau and service.

There being no objection, the following summary, data, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Cash appropriations

Budget estimates, House action, and Senate committee recommendations

CASH APPROPRIATIONS	
Amount of bill as passed by House	\$622,134,130
Amount of decrease by Senate (net) after including \$5,698,000 of supplemental estimates sent to Senate after bill passed House	5,128,100
Total of bill as reported to Senate	617,006,030
Amount of 1951 budget estimates:	
Regular estimates	669,251,505
Supplemental estimates (S. Docs. 154, 157, and 186)	5,720,000
Total regular and supplemental estimates	674,971,505
Amount of 1950 appropriations	590,203,947
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the regular and supplemental estimates for 1951	\$57,965,475
Exceeds appropriations for 1950	26,802,083

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS	
Amount of contract authorizations included in bill as passed by House	\$38,250,000
Amount of reduction in contract authorizations by Senate (net)	420,000
Total of contract authorizations as reported to Senate	37,830,000
Amount of 1951 budget estimates for contract authorizations	44,750,000
Amount of contract authorizations, 1950	65,251,700
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the 1951 budget estimates for contract authorizations	6,920,000
Under the 1950 contract authorizations	27,421,700

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

The table following shows the over-all action on chapter VII of the bill setting forth the 1951 budget estimates, the amounts allowed by the House, and the amounts recommended by the Senate committee:

Office or bureau	1950 appropriation	1951 budget estimate	Recommended in House bill, 1951	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+), decrease (-), House bill compared with estimates		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with 1950 appropriations		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with estimates		Increase (+), decrease (-), Senate committee bill compared with House bill	
					Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Office of the Secretary	\$6,178,075	\$14,251,800	\$14,075,000	\$11,974,000	-\$176,800	0.12	+\$5,795,925	93.81	-\$2,277,800	15.98	-\$2,101,000	14.92
Commission of Fine Arts	12,000	12,530	12,530	12,530			+530	4.41				
Bonneville Power Administration	30,284,500	47,250,000	46,500,000	44,000,000	-750,000	1.58	+13,715,500	29.02	-3,250,000	6.87	-2,500,000	5.37
Bureau of Land Management	6,580,200	9,650,000	7,356,800	7,927,810	-2,293,200	23.76	+1,347,610	13.96	-1,722,190	17.84	+571,010	7.76
Bureau of Indian Affairs	59,605,246	85,996,375	76,793,000	80,746,055	-9,203,375	10.70	+21,140,809	35.46	-5,250,320	6.10	+3,953,055	5.14
Bureau of Reclamation	356,754,510	359,318,500	325,108,000	324,104,000	-34,210,500	9.52	-32,650,510	9.15	-35,214,500	9.80	-1,004,000	.30
Geological Survey	16,044,400	20,275,000	19,129,000	19,382,000	-1,146,000	5.65	+3,337,600	20.80	-893,000	4.40	+253,000	1.32
Bureau of Mines	24,046,500	25,208,700	24,235,600	24,131,100	-973,100	3.86	+84,600	.35	-1,077,600	4.48	-104,500	.43
National Park Service	29,749,950	39,406,500	36,745,200	36,118,300	-2,661,300	6.75	+6,368,350	21.40	-3,288,200	8.34	-626,900	1.70
Fish and Wildlife Service	12,936,500	14,350,500	14,375,500	14,547,950	+25,000	.17	+1,611,450	12.45	+197,450	1.37	+172,450	1.19
Government in the Territories	45,736,066	58,777,600	57,329,500	53,588,285	-1,448,100	2.46	+7,852,219	17.16	-5,189,315	8.82	-3,741,215	6.52
Subtotal, Department of the Interior	587,927,947	674,497,505	621,660,130	616,532,030	-52,837,375	7.83	+28,604,083	4.86	-57,965,475	8.59	-5,128,100	.82
Virgin Islands Corporation	2,276,000	474,000	474,000	474,000			-1,802,000	79.17				
Grand total, ch. VII, Department of the Interior	590,203,947	674,971,505	622,134,130	617,006,030	-52,837,375	7.82	+26,802,083	4.54	-57,965,475	8.58	-5,128,100	.82
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS												
Total	\$65,251,700	\$44,750,000	\$38,250,000	\$37,830,000	-\$6,500,000	14.52	-\$27,421,700	42.0	-\$6,920,000	15.46	-\$420,000	1.09

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion at this point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With respect to the Columbia Basin appropriation, the House committee allowed the full amount requested by the Budget Bureau. The Senate committee cut \$3,700,000, as I recall, or \$4,000,000 from the amount. I was wondering whether, for the purpose of the record, the Senator could give us a brief explanation of the reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason the Senate committees reduced that amount under the Budget Bureau's estimate, and under the amount appropriated by the House, was that we were trying to recover as much money as we could in different places in the bill, to equal the cut that would be made if the Taber-Thomas amendment were adopted. In doing that, we found that, so far as the Columbia Basin was concerned, as in other instances, there was a carry-over of an unexpended balance, which, in the estimate of the engineers of whom we inquired, made it safe to make a reduction at this time. In other words, we wanted to be sure there was sufficient money in the bill to meet all contractual payments for construction projects which were going on during the year, but, where there was more than that, we preferred to let it go over to another year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In regard to this particular instance—

Mr. HAYDEN. We are quite confident that this would in no manner interfere with the orderly progress of construction on the project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Adequate planning for next year will be taken care of, because of the overlays and the amount that was given. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question: In his judgment, and in the judgment of the committee, are there sufficient funds to make it unnecessary to curtail any of the developments of the REA programs which have been brought before the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The REA money, I may say to the Senator, is carried in the agricultural chapter of this bill, and I am sure the amount allowed is ample for that purpose. The only purpose of this section of the bill, chapter VII, with respect to REA, is to provide for cases in which some service is rendered by the Southwestern Power Administration in the Senator's area.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. HAYDEN. The way I understand the situation, so far as southeastern Kansas is concerned, and so far as southwestern Missouri and Arkansas are concerned, is that the Oklahoma contracts as they have been developed, are to serve as a model or basis for similar contracts elsewhere within the area, and, where suitable integrating or wheeling arrangements can be made with private com-

panies in the Kansas or Missouri area, or elsewhere, it then will not be necessary for the Southwestern Power Administration to construct transmission lines to serve preferred customers; just as it happened in Oklahoma. If, however, suitable arrangements cannot be made, there is then authority to see that the preferred customers of the Government are served, customers such as the municipalities and REA.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment in chapter VII. The clerk will state the amendment.

The first amendment, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of the Interior—Title I—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses," was on page 230, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "\$2,315,000" and insert "\$2,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 230, after line 12, to insert:

STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of July 25, 1947 (43 U. S. C. 364), including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Enforcement of the Connally Hot Oil Act," on page 231, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, southeastern power marketing area," on page 232, line 7, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 232, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$10,350,000" and insert "\$8,620,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$1,730,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 233, line 7, after the word "area", to strike out "\$760,000" and insert "\$660,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for and on behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, we desire to ask the chairman of the committee to eliminate that amendment and to let the figure stand as passed by the House, at \$760,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may say to the Senator that the sole and only reason the committee had for making that reduction was the assumption that, having reduced the amount of appropriation and authorization by some \$6,000,000—the appropriation part of it by a little more than \$1,000,000—we thought that perhaps there would not be as much operation and maintenance to be undertaken, and so we made this cut with the idea of

taking it to conference and then determining what it actually should be. In other words, we had no testimony of any kind from anyone upon which to base the cut or to justify the cut. We simply acted on general principles.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that his assumption that the costs of operation with reference to construction have decreased is accurate and well founded. However, as he is probably as well aware as is any other Member of this body, upon the completion of the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration, the utility companies, and the REA, we have now advanced many years in the scope of area served and the extent of operation carried on, and where we will have some saving with reference to the operation and maintenance of construction projects which will not be built there will be a corresponding increase in the operation and maintenance with reference to the over-all picture of the operation.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska is a member of the subcommittee, and my understanding is that the appropriation does carry a percentage increase over the figure for last year. The figure last year was \$525,000. I may be in error, but my understanding is that we increased the figure to \$660,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount carried last year was \$525,000. The budget estimate this year was \$785,000, of which the House allowed \$760,000, and we took off another \$100,000. We took it off by guess, without any particular reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the budget estimate was increased to take care of the very situation which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned, and that when the facilities were reduced about \$1,000,000 out of \$6,000,000 the administration cost was reduced in that amount?

Getting back to my original question, is it not a fact that the increase this year is \$660,000 to continue the improvements which the distinguished Senator is talking about?

Mr. HAYDEN. The justification reads as follows:

It is anticipated that approximately 340 miles of additional transmission lines and related facilities will be completed and ready for operation and maintenance in the fiscal year 1951. These additional facilities, together with the 500 miles of transmission lines already being operated and maintained, will entail an estimated cost of \$575,000 in the fiscal year 1951 as compared with \$375,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The costs for fiscal year 1950 did not represent a full year's operation and maintenance cost, as the program was initiated in that year, and the necessary staff to operate and maintain the 500 miles of transmission lines was not required until the latter part of that fiscal year.

Mr. WHERRY. This justification was made prior to the time the contract was negotiated which permitted a cut in the appropriations for construction.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. There is no connection, if the Senator will bear with me,

between the reduction in the amount of money and the appropriation of this amount of money for operation and maintenance except that in the future, according to the testimony, there will be more lines brought into operation this year than were brought in last year.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I did not state it correctly, but there is the connection that, if lines are not brought in, the increase allowed will take care of the costs this year.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we appropriate money this year to construct a line, until the line is built we do not operate and maintain it.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bonneville Power Administration—Construction," on page 234, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$41,500,000" and insert "\$39,500,000", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$21,750,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to. The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 234, line 22, after the word "energy", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,500,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to discuss this amendment very briefly. I am not objecting to the reduction in construction, but there is a very serious matter involved in the operation-and-maintenance figure, and I wish to point it out in the hope that when the bill goes to conference the conferees will be able to provide a better figure than that which is suggested by the committee.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system in fiscal 1951. The House approved \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$250,000. The Senate committee cut this an additional \$500,000, leaving the Administrator only \$4,500,000 to carry out all of the vital functions required to operate and maintain a transmission system relied upon by almost every community in the entire Pacific Northwest.

I urge the Senate to reject the committee amendment. By so doing we will insure that the \$5,000,000 allowed by the House is available to BPA in the coming year.

The potential adverse effect of the \$500,000 Senate committee cut is out of all proportion to the dollars involved. Let me give the Senate just one example of how serious could be our failure to provide adequate operation and maintenance funds.

Everyone here by this time has become aware of the importance of aluminum production both to a peacetime and to a preparedness economy.

The most essential ingredient in the manufacture of aluminum is large quantities of low-cost electric power available 24 hours a day without interruption. I repeat, without interruption.

Aluminum metal is made in factories called potlines.

The term is descriptive. Each potline is a building with 128 large cauldrons placed in a row.

Heavy electric fixtures are affixed to each pot so that strong, continuous electric current can be poured through it.

The pots are filled with a sugarlike crystal known as aluminum oxide. The current is turned on and other mineral is added.

It is a continuous process. I repeat, it is continuous.

As the metal is drained off the pots new raw material is added.

If the current should fail to supply one of these potlines for as much as three consecutive hours, it would take 2 weeks to get back into production again. The metal and other mineral would freeze in the pots. The electrodes might be damaged. The frozen minerals would be painstakingly chipped out. The 128 pots would be slowly brought back into production, one at a time.

The average aluminum potline produces about 100,000 pounds per day. Thus a 2-weeks' delay, due to a single 3-hour electric-power failure, would mean a production loss of 1,400,000 pounds of aluminum.

The Bonneville Power Administration serves electricity to 19 aluminum potlines in the Pacific Northwest. This represents half the aluminum production of the entire country.

The power system of the Bonneville Administration has been consistently overloaded since the last war. There is so little reserve capacity left in it, due to growth of power use, that any little disturbance can cause a power failure throughout the entire region.

The Bonneville transmission system is like a rubber band that has been stretched around a parcel too big for it. There is no spare stretch left. If any little thing goes wrong, the whole assembly flies apart.

Constant vigilance is required by the Bonneville substation operators to detect and forecast the possibility of trouble.

Constant alertness is required to cut repair time to a minimum after trouble develops. A little money goes a long way here.

A few hundred thousand dollars can mean maintenance crews stationed every 50 or 100 miles instead of every 200 miles.

And a single hour's travel time can mean the difference between 2-hour power failure for 19 aluminum potlines and a 3½-hour power failure.

A single hour's travel could mean a difference of 26,600,000 pounds of aluminum production for the Nation's needs.

The proposed reduction in the operation and maintenance funds of the Bonneville Administration strikes directly at the reliability of service to plants which supply half the Nation's aluminum.

No utility can guarantee against occasional power failure. But inadequate funds for the operation and maintenance of the system can guarantee that there will be a considerable number of power failures.

Lack of a relatively few thousand dollars can mean too few men, too many

miles apart to adequately service a 3,000-mile transmission system.

Too few men will inevitably mean overtime. Overtime will mean fatigue. Fatigue will mean human error and delay.

We must not speculate on our aluminum supply now. These Northwest aluminum plants must be kept in continuous production at all costs.

This means continuous power supply.

It is hoped that in view of the serious situation confronting us, which may grow even more serious due to events in the past few weeks, the conference committee will give very serious consideration to this matter, because it involves one of the most vital matters which exists today in our country, namely, the production of aluminum. The conferees may wish to reevaluate the operation-and-maintenance figure.

I urge full restoration of this cut in operation-and-maintenance funds for the Bonneville Power Administration.

This agency is paying a profit to the Federal Treasury each year.

From the standpoint of economics, from the standpoint of ordinary good business, and, above all, from the standpoint of national security, these funds should be restored.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that Dr. Raver will make the necessary recommendations to the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. In view of the comments of the Senator from Washington with respect to potlines, it should be noted that the amount originally requested for 1951 for maintenance and operation of transmission lines was \$3,400,000. The amount for the over-all administration is \$4,500,000. I come from the Pacific Northwest, and I am interested in the proper operation of Bonneville. However, like every other activity of Government, it must have money appropriated for its operation, and in view of present conditions I hope the committee's action will be sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that the amount requested was \$3,500,000?

Mr. CORDON. For transmission maintenance and operation it was \$3,400,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understood it was \$5,250,000, and that the Budget Bureau approved that figure.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is in error in his understanding of the make-up of the appropriation item. Three million, four hundred thousand dollars was estimated for the operation and maintenance of the transmission system, \$600,000 for power marketing, and \$1,165,000 for general administrative activities. The point I make is that so far as the transmission system is concerned it is more than \$1,000,000 within the figure the committee reached. I join with the Senator from Washington in his suggestion that a careful check be made when the matter reaches conference. I am satisfied that the system can be operated within the figure which the committee has recommended.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, representing in part the State of Montana I am naturally interested in the Bonneville power program. I wish to record myself as being in accord with the distinguished Senator from Washington in this matter.

There seems little point in appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars over a period of years for the construction of vital electric power facilities and then permitting these facilities slowly to deteriorate for lack of adequate maintenance.

Yet the proposed reduction in the operation and maintenance funds of the Bonneville Power Administration will bring about this circumstance.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Montana that the Government has no intention of allowing that to happen. It does not intend that the plants should deteriorate. It has conducted a good job in the past, and it will conduct a good job in the future. The subcommittee in this case is one of the best subcommittees in the Senate. They went into the matter very thoroughly. They heard much testimony. They have pursued the matter with the greatest of care and deliberation. They will see to it that what the Senator fears will not happen.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure of the intention of the committee.

During the past several years I have noticed a recurring pattern in the debates and action on this item.

The Bonneville and Department of Interior officials, in their contacts with Members of the Senate each year, have been uniformly reasonable and complaisant on most appropriation adjustments proposed by this body.

But for the past 3 or 4 years, they have told us a consistent story on operations and maintenance money.

In brief, they have pointed out that, while we have been adding to the size and value of their plant each year, we have not been making commensurate increases in allowances for maintenance and operation of that plant.

Furthermore, I am told, the Bonneville operations records reflect this situation. Each year, there is a little more news in the Pacific Northwest newspapers about severe power failures than in the previous year.

The amount of funds involved in this item is not large. The committee has cut the House figure by \$500,000. Without this \$500,000 much maintenance work on the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system will be left undone.

Now perhaps this would not matter if such work were delayed for a year; but I am reliably informed that much of this work has already been delayed for several years and that, due to rising costs and inadequate funds in past years, the backlog of incomplete maintenance work is slowly piling up and bringing nearer and nearer the evil day when failures in equipment will bring tremendous and serious losses.

This House should reflect carefully on the consequences of power failure in the Pacific Northwest. Half the Nation's aluminum production is in that region and is served directly by the lines

for which this budget item is designed to keep operating.

Three-fourths of the weight of every military plane is aluminum and our national aluminum capacity right now is insufficient for civilian needs—let alone military requirements.

This half million dollars will buy a great deal.

Failure to spend it will inevitably cost us a great deal.

I urge that the House figure be restored.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wish to say that not only is the subcommittee one of the best subcommittees of the Senate, but it is a sympathetic subcommittee. This subcommittee is philosophically favorable to the project.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both the Senator from Montana and I appreciate the fine work which the subcommittee has done. Our only suggestion was that the importance of keeping the aluminum potlines in operation may give rise to the advisability of perhaps reviewing the matter in conference.

Mr. MURRAY. I sincerely feel that the members of the subcommittee have done a splendid job. I know it is not their intention to permit any deterioration of these great works on the Columbia River. At the same time through accident or inadvertence appropriations may not be forthcoming to carry out the programs as they should be carried out. I do not think it is necessary to dwell on the matter any further. I merely wish to record myself as agreeing with the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 234, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of lands and resources," on page 235, line 22, after the word "Management", to strike out "\$6,756,800" and insert "\$7,127,810."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last year there was appropriated \$6,215,000. The House bill increased this sum by nearly a half million dollars more, to a total of \$6,757,000. The Senate committee now proposes to raise this sum by \$371,000 more, to a total of \$7,128,000. I am rounding off the figures to the last thousand. This would represent an increase over 1950 of \$913,000.

Mr. President, the House figures are already \$541,000 above the 1950 expenditure. In view of the stringent economic conditions of our country, and in view of the fact that the increases provided by the committee are for somewhat doubtful purposes, as I shall show in a minute, I hope very much the committee amendment will be rejected, or, better still, that the chairman of the committee, out of the kindness of his heart, will withdraw the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that in this increase of \$371,000 above the House figure, \$100,000 is for range reseeding. It seems to me the Grazing Administration would do much better to prevent overgrazing from occurring than to permit it to occur in the lands it leases, and then spend tax money to reseed the land which has been overgrazed.

There is a second item of \$75,000 for weed control in the California and Oregon forests. I do not know what particular weeds are flourishing there, but apparently they are seeking an appropriation to put down Scotch broom or similar weeds. At any rate if this program is necessary, expenditures for it should be taken from the increase already granted by the House.

There is an increase in the item for general administration, although the House had already allowed \$903,000, making the total virtually \$1,000,000 for administration, which seems to me to be a very high figure.

Finally the committee provided an increase for what are called "cadastral surveys" of \$100,000. I was somewhat puzzled by this elaborate phrase "cadastral survey," and I looked it up in the dictionary and found that it means "an official register of the quantity, value, and ownership of real estate, used in apportioning taxes." In view of the fact that the House had already allowed \$743,000, and this is another \$100,000, this seems to me a rather expensive "cadaster."

I take it that another term for the "cadastral survey" is the "Domesday Book" which William the Conqueror imposed on England. Let us beware of making this appropriation bill another Domesday Book for the American taxpayer and for the resources and manpower of the country at a time when we need them for defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Bureau of Land Management produces revenue for the Government. The amount of increase allowed by the subcommittee was not so much as I personally would have liked to see allowed. When we have an agency which handles income-producing property of the United States, which, if it has proper supervision, can bring greater revenue into the Treasury than the cost of the service, it is highly desirable to make adequate appropriations for it, just as it is to employ additional internal-revenue collectors when they can bring in more money than their salaries cost.

Mr. President, that is the situation with respect to this Bureau. I believe that if the Senator were as familiar with the facts as the subcommittee is, he would heartily agree with us that when it comes to supervising properly leases for oil and gas on the public domain, and for the handling of the grazing land to get a better income, and so on, that, from the standpoint of business enterprise the Bureau of Land Management has not been adequately supplied in the past.

For that reason, the Bureau of the Budget, realizing that this is a revenue-producing agency, increased the amount

recommended to Congress over the appropriation of last year to \$8,650,000. The committee did not allow that much, although I would have liked to see it allowed. I believe it would be a good investment for the Government of the United States to appropriate the full budget estimate. We would make money by doing that. But we compromised in the committee, and the figure in the bill is the amount the committee stands on. I hope the recommendation made by the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have worked on this subcommittee for some 3 years, and I believe that the recommendation of the subcommittee in the matter of the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management is founded in sound logic, based upon testimony which wholly warrants these several increases.

In the instance of the Grazing Administration, the Government is faced with a condition and not a theory in the vast Columbia Plateau grazing areas. These areas were overgrazed many, many years ago, some of them to the point where there was hardly any grass growing year by year.

The reseeding will give an opportunity to bring into forage production vast areas where there is no value at the present time. In addition to that, the necessities in the grazing areas are well known to the people of the West, not, of course, so well known to those who have not lived there.

We in the West realize that there are uncounted thousands of acres of privately owned land which today have value because they can be used in connection with supplemental land that is now administered under the Taylor Grazing Act. Without that supplemental range those privately owned lands would be substantially worthless, in many instances.

With respect to the item of \$75,000 for forest management, the Senator from Oregon has a particular and personal interest in that item in the bill, due to the fact that it represents a necessity in western Oregon, where the re-vested railroad grant lands are situated. The lands represent every other section, or every odd section, for some 200 miles north and south in western Oregon, and in an area that will run from 20 to 40 miles east and west.

The intermingled lands are privately owned. A noxious weed poisonous to livestock is now growing in that area. The State and local governments, counties and the like, have set up weed-control districts. They are fighting to save the range in that area from this noxious and poisonous weed. What they do on their lands will be of no value if they do not have cooperative effort from the United States. Hence the appropriation of \$75,000.

In the cadastral survey item, the committee was particularly interested in the necessity for early survey of the public domain in certain parts of Alaska. If I remember correctly, of the vast area of Alaska something like 3 percent has been surveyed. The greater portion of even those parts of Alaska which now are being settled is unsurveyed. There is

little hope that there can be development in Alaska, as a Territory or as a State, until there can be a survey of the lands so that they may be alienated if, as, and when that is proper to the development of the Territory.

As to the general administration item, the subcommittee over a period of years past, in cooperation, I may say, with the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has urged the Interior Department to get its house in order with reference to its records in the public lands field. The reorganization of the Interior Department in the past 3 or 4 years has resulted in a great lessening in the number of applications for leases on the public lands. Due to this reorganization, at the present time we are hoping that the Bureau of Land Management may go forward with its perpetuation of land title records, something vitally important, as of course every lawyer immediately understands.

The base of title to land, of course, rests in the patent from the Government. We found that those records were in a deplorable condition. A very considerable portion of the money proposed to be added for general administration is going into the work of bringing the records up to date in the Land Department, and perpetuating those which are vital to land titles.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to supplement what has been said by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this chapter of the bill and by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Arizona has covered these particular items in some detail. I have sent for the record of the receipts of the Bureau of Land Management, and I think the receipts are of such striking importance that they deserve a mention in the RECORD.

As the Senator from Arizona has said, the Bureau of Land Management produces revenue for the Federal Government. Several years ago Congress passed the so-called Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of preventing overgrazing and of repairing the damage which had been wrought by overgrazing in the past. So that an appropriation for reseeding these lands is merely a part of the program of overcoming the results of overgrazing in many, many years past.

The total actual receipts of the Bureau of Land Management during the fiscal year 1949 amounted to \$37,149,433.89.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the very able Senator from Wyoming does not mean to contend that it has been the Bureau of Land Management which is producing this \$37,000,000. It has been the public lands that has produced it. The Bureau of Land Management has merely been a real estate agent managing the property and collecting the fees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, the Bureau of Land Management has a great deal to do with the production of the revenue by the management of the leases and of the various holdings upon

the public domain. For example, it would be utterly impossible to procure the revenue derived by the Government from the production of oil and gas and coal upon the public domain if we did not have an efficient Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question is whether we are not paying too much for the whistle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I am sure if the Senator had the opportunity to examine the testimony adduced before this committee he would agree that we are not "paying too much for the whistle."

Mr. President, I was pointing out that the income in 1949 amounted to \$37,149,000. In 1950 it was increased to \$38,850,000. The best estimate submitted to us by the Bureau of Land Management—and these figures have not been questioned anywhere—indicate that in the fiscal year 1951 the revenue will be more than \$44,000,000.

With respect to the appropriation dealing with forest management, that includes expenditures of various kinds to make available for the commercial activities of the country and the sale of public timber the forests which are on the area administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The O. and C. timber sales in 1949 amounted to \$3,532,000. It is estimated that in 1951 they will amount to approximately \$4,000,000, or an increase of almost half a million dollars over 1949.

It seems to me that an appropriation of \$75,000 for the management of these re-vested timberlands which are likely to produce a revenue of \$4,000,000, or in excess of that, during the year in which the expenditure is to be made, is not at all out of line.

Other timber sales have increased from \$331,000 in 1949 to almost \$500,000 in 1950, and it is estimated that next year we shall have an increase of \$600,000.

I assure the Senator from Illinois that if he had searched for a place in which his argument for a reduction was less likely to apply than in any other place in the bill, he has found it when he has tackled the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can appreciate the Senator's argument but feel that the increase of \$541,000 over last year already allowed by the House should be sufficient. I therefore hope the committee increase will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 235, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 236, line 1, after the word "Management", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That of the appropriations herein made in connection with the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, expenditures may be made for weed control on such lands, including those under cooperative weed-control agreements with the State and counties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 236, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$800,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the fiscal year 1949-50 no direct appropriation was made for this purpose, but a contract authorization of \$200,000 was approved. The House bill provided for an appropriation for the coming year of \$600,000, of which \$200,000 was for the liquidation of the prior contract authority, leaving \$400,000 in new money. The House appropriation therefore doubled the volume of last year's operation. The Senate ups this figure by \$200,000, thus nearly trebling last year's figures.

In view of the fact that the House figure already doubled last year's figure, I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the access roads enable the Government to secure a higher price for its stumpage. If we do not build access roads into the forests, then the large lumber companies that can afford to build roads make a low bid for the timber in the area, and that figure is all the Government gets from the stumpage. Whereas with construction of access roads, the increased price for the timber as a result of competition between the different buyers, enables the Government to make money out of the transaction. If there is in this bill a money-making provision, designed to put more money into the Treasury, it is in this item. I should like to remind the Senator from Illinois that there are two ways of balancing the budget. One is to cut expenditures and the other is to bring more money into the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that there seems to be no way of solving this question; there are not two ways, there seems to be no way of doing it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with respect to this particular item I should like to say to the Senate that here and there over the United States the Government is in business, as distinguished from its primary duty and obligation of governing. This is a case where the Government stands in the shoes of private ownership. It is managing, operating, and selling timber on a vast area of approximately 2,400,000 acres. This is a large area of timber land, much of it still untouched, so far as cutting is concerned. It is in a very mountainous area, which is inaccessible except as roads are built, and they are very expensive to build because of the mountainous terrain. Unless access roads can be built much of the timber will not be sold. We will not get money for it, but we will lose it, because it will go the way of all over-mature timber, through rot, insect pest, windfalls, and the like. The building of access roads into these areas is a sound business approach to the management problem. The private owners who have vast holdings build access roads; they build many more miles of such roads per section than the Government has ever dreamed of building. The private owners do so because it is sound business and a good investment.

The Government seeks each year to add a few miles to its access roads program. It loses no money by doing so, for it is repaid by means of the increased stumpage value of the timber which is brought out, which, by the way, Mr. President, returns an annual profit to the United States Treasury. Furthermore, the access roads permit of management looking toward the regrowth of the forests, so that timber can be harvested again, and so that finally a complete reproduction stand of timber will be developed, and will be there for our children and their children. So it is a sound investment and is good business.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that the building of the access roads enables the smaller, independent producers of timber to bid on the Government stumpage; and, therefore such roads are an aid to small business?

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question at all about that. Although there are not many what we would call big-business lumber enterprises in that particular area, there are many which are very small, many which have no privately owned timber, but which depend for their operations upon Government timber. This type of access road will aid them and will increase the number of bids; and when the number of bids is increased, the price on the bids goes up.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask one other question. I think the Senator is well aware of this matter. Is it not a fact that timber which has passed maturity is not the best timber? In other words, when timber reaches maturity, that is the time to cut it, and if it is not cut then, we run the risk of losing the timber. Is that not true?

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that. Mature timber is not subject to deterioration for a considerable number of years after it reaches maturity, but it is more susceptible than is thrifty, growing stock. Once it starts going downhill, it deteriorates rapidly, and every dead tree is a menace to thousands of live trees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 236, in line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 237, line 4, after the word "title", to strike out the following provisos:

Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 percent referred to in section c title II, of the act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund": *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations shall be available for expenditure in connection with such lands in excess of such reimbursements during the current fiscal year.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management, expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands for payment of current expenses in connection with the management of such lands of a type paid from the separate appropriation heretofore made in connection with such lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 percent referred to in section c, title II, of the act approved August 28, 1937, of the special funds designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund": *Provided further*, That no part of such appropriations for such current expenses shall be available in excess of such reimbursements for the current fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Range improvements," on page 238, line 11, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$350,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payments to States (proceeds of sales)," on page 238, line 19, after the word "lands", to insert "and materials"; and in line 22, after the word "receipts", to insert "(not to exceed \$20,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payment to Oklahoma," on page 239, line 8, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$4,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Leasing of grazing lands," on page 239, line 16, after the word "receipts", to insert "(not to exceed \$6,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Payments to States (grazing fees)," on page 239, line 22, after the word "received", to insert "(not to exceed \$300)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—health, education, and welfare services," on page 240, line 14, after the word "lands", to insert "research among mixed Indians and non-Indian groups including cooperation in medical research of benefit to Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 240, in line 19, after the word "festivals", to strike out "\$37,929,000" and insert "\$40,252,328."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can appreciate the desire of both the House committee and the Senate committee to improve the welfare of the Indians. I think we all owe a debt to the Indians, and I commend the House committee and the Senate committee for their desire to help them.

However, I should like to point out that in the current fiscal year the appropriation for the health and welfare of the Indians is \$32,535,000.

The amount carried in the House version of the bill, therefore, is an increase of approximately \$5,400,000 over the appropriation for the present fiscal year.

The proposal of the Senate committee is to make a further increase of approximately \$2,325,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we are making proper progress in our care of the Indians.

In view of the present international situation, despite my natural sympathies for this program, I believe we should slow down the rate of increase in the provision of such funds. Probably it hurts me more to propose this amendment than it hurts anyone else in the Senate. It pains me exceedingly. However, I submit that an increase of \$5,400,000 over last year's appropriation is sufficient.

Therefore, Mr. President, much as it distresses me to make this request, nevertheless in the interest of economy and of conserving our resources for the difficult international situation, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will be filled with compassion and will withdraw the committee amendment, and will accept the munificent amount proposed by the House, namely, \$37,929,000.

I await the generosity of the chairman of the subcommittee in this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning.

In the first place, we were compelled to restore the amount for the California Indians, which everyone agrees should be done. We restored funds for California Indians on the same basis as funds were allowed for Indians in other States. The House had deleted \$1,286,883 for California Indians.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the item for the California Indians over \$1,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator then compromise on a figure to be made up of the amount of the appropriation as voted by the House of Representatives plus the amount required to care for the California Indians? I should be very happy to agree to that, even though I should think that the five million four hundred thousand already granted by the House should be enough to cover this situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was another item which was not properly accounted for by the House of Representatives, in the judgment of our committee.

The Senator, as an educator, will agree with me, I am sure, that the best way to teach the Indian children the English language and to become participating American citizens is to enable them to associate with other children on the playgrounds of public schools. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree as to that, namely, that if an Indian child can be sent to a public school, where he can play on the playground with white children, he will learn more than he will learn in any other way the lessons which will teach him to become an American. That has been demonstrated over and over again by the failure of day schools on the Indian reservations and the failure of boarding schools to bring the Indian children into accord with American ideas so that they can become a part of our civilization.

In order to meet the requirements of the States with respect to providing for the need in the case of Indian children

attending public schools, it is necessary to increase this appropriation above the amount voted by the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives did not allow sufficient to meet the pending contracts with the States for payments for Indian children in the public schools. That item accounts for \$326,000 of this increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then would the Senator settle for the increased cost for the California Indians plus the increased cost of taking care of the boarding-school Indians? I still think that a \$5,400,000 increase should be enough, but I shall not be unreasonable.

Mr. HAYDEN. When I state the third reason for making the increase, I think the Senator will agree that the increase should be made. The committee included \$400,000 for public-assistance payments to other than Navajo and Hopi Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, which is the same as the amount appropriated for 1950 for this purpose. In the absence of this item in this bill, there is no other provision for these Indians who are in need of public assistance.

Furthermore, the Congress passed an act increasing the amounts of money to be made available to Navajo and Hopi Indians for their education, their welfare, and rehabilitation generally.

In this appropriation bill, however, the Senate committee has not voted to allow the full amount of money requested for 1951 to start carrying out the Navajo-Hopi authorization of last year; but the committee did increase the amount above that allowed by the House of Representatives in order to meet that new authorization passed by Congress last year.

Those are the three reasons why the increase should be made. All those reasons are sound and proper, and they should meet with the approval of the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only is the policy sound, and not only is the item sound, but the committee was most conservative in approving the item as it appears in the bill as reported by the committee.

I wish the Senator from Illinois would understand what is behind this particular item. I am sure he would if he would only investigate the situation and would study the evidence adduced before the committee.

If there is one item that is worthy of consideration in connection with this particular bill, it is this item. The Indians can not take care of themselves in the way that the Senator from Illinois can take care of himself.

Of course, the Indian is called upon to go to work, and he is drafted, and of course he can raise the flag on Iwo Jima; but then we complain because he is helped by a small amount of money.

I think that if the Senator from Illinois would investigate the situation which exists among the Indians he would be as enthusiastically in favor of the pending amendment as is any member of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 240, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Resources management," on page 241, line 6, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$10,542,000" and insert "\$10,814,576."

The amendment was agreed to.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.'S RELATIONS WITH SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I am rather reluctant to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate when the general appropriation bill for 1951 is under consideration, but I have a few words I should like to have the Members of this distinguished body hear.

As the Senate well knows, Mr. President, I have always been opposed to outright monopoly which tends to stifle competition among small enterprises. As a small businessman myself, I am well aware of how much these modest-sized organizations have contributed to the growth and development of our great free enterprise system. The continued existence of American business is the economic lifeblood of the United States. Surely we all recognize that fact, and, as part of our responsibilities here, the Congress has from time to time taken steps to assist small business through the extension of loans and other services.

The terms "small business" and "large business" are somewhat relative. Arbitrarily, we may say a business is small if its assets do not exceed, say, \$25,000. It is a large business, perhaps, if its holdings total a million dollars. No doubt some would use other figures in making this comparison.

In my State of Delaware, we have businesses of all sizes—hundreds of them—stretching from one end of the State to the other. In the city of Wilmington, which some choose to call the chemical capital of the world, there are located the main offices of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. This organization, which started many years ago from a very modest and humble beginning on the banks of the Brandywine River, has grown to be one of the largest chemical companies in the Nation. Its assistance, incidentally, to the United States Government, particularly in times of emergency, has been especially notable. This was clearly shown in the field of atomic energy. The du Pont Co. played a tremendous part in the successful development of the atomic bomb. Since then, I believe, it has withdrawn from endeavors along that line because of the fact that its work is primarily in the field of chemistry.

In the present emergency, I am sure the company's facilities and its personnel stand ready at any time for a call by the Government.

However, Mr. President, I am not making these brief remarks to cite the du Pont Co.'s war record or to heap praise on its many contributions to better living. What I do want the Senate to know about is an incident concerning the operations of the du Pont Co. and its relation to small-business organizations

which came to my attention within the past week.

As everyone knows, cellophane, developed and manufactured by du Pont, is one of the greatest single contributions for the preservation and sanitary safekeeping of foods and dozens of other commodities that has ever been developed. Cellophane is a byword among American housewives, many of whom would not think of purchasing food products, particularly, which are without its protection. The development of cellophane was hailed as an accomplishment of tremendous proportions when it was first successfully produced. Manufacturers throughout the country who make and market scores of products leaped at the opportunity to enhance the appearance and to insure the protection of their goods by packaging them in cellophane. As a result, the sales of cellophane increased, and its demand became more and more widespread.

A few years ago, the du Pont Co., which had foreseen this increased demand, proposed to increase its cellophane producing capacity in order to take care of the expanding market. It went ahead with preliminary plans, estimates, and the investigation of plant sites. All this was well under way when the Department of Justice, in December 1947, brought suit against the company, charging that its position in the cellophane business constituted a monopoly. As a result, the company considered it unwise to proceed with its expansion program.

I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I am taking no position with respect to either the charges of the Department of Justice or the countercharges of the du Pont Co. in this case. I feel that since this matter is now before the courts, it would be improper for me to take a stand, even if I were inclined to do so.

In any event, the situation in which the du Pont Co. found itself with respect to the production of cellophane, as a result of this suit, was quickly reflected throughout the country as the demand for cellophane continued and the supply became short.

I now cite the incident to which I referred in my remarks a few moments ago.

There is a business in Gloucester, Mass., known as the Davis Fisheries. This company, I understand, puts out fish products and proposes to wrap them in cellophane. In order to obtain the various cellophane sheets that it required, the company endeavored to purchase for its needs through the du Pont Co. I learned through the office of the distinguished majority leader of the United States House of Representatives that a company representative was desirous of contacting a person of authority in the du Pont Co. with whom to discuss the buying of cellophane. I was pleased to suggest to the majority leader, for the information of his constituent, that I would contact the du Pont Co. and ask that one of its salesmen call on the Gloucester businessman to discuss the matter. When I did, however, the du Pont Co. informed me that though it would be glad to send a repre-

sentative to talk over the Davis Fisheries' needs, I was advised that the current situation with respect to the availability of cellophane was not hopeful, and when I asked why, the company explained the situation, which I have just recited.

Mr. President, as I have said, I deplore the existence of monopolies of any kind when their operation stifles competitive enterprise. But I ask the Senate if it is fair to penalize the operations of this New England company and scores of others by making it so difficult for them to buy a product which is almost essential for the profitable operation of their business.

It may appear that the Government did not force the du Pont Co. to suspend its plans for enlarging cellophane facilities, but certainly the threat of the Justice Department's lawsuit has amounted to virtually the same thing.

Cellophane is now in short supply. Demands cannot be met, and prospective buyers of this product are forced to make out as best they can without it.

I might say further that the du Pont Co. has endeavored equitably to allocate the supply of cellophane which is currently being produced. In addition, the company has actively sought to interest others in the manufacture of cellophane in order that additional supplies will be available to the trade as soon as possible. However, it required more than a year and a half to find a company willing and able to invest the large amount of capital—approximately \$20,000,000—which was necessary to enter the field on an economically efficient basis. At the present time, construction is under way on a new cellophane plant, designed and being built by du Pont for Olin Industries, Inc., in North Carolina. It is to have an initial capacity of approximately 33,000,000 pounds annually. All du Pont cellophane patents and know-how are being made available to this company. It is hoped that this plant will be in production by the middle of next year. I am sure Senators will agree with me that these are rather extreme steps for the company to take in increasing the available supply of cellophane.

It therefore seems to me, Mr. President, that at a time when our capitalistic system and the democratic way of life is being so ruthlessly challenged, we should encourage rather than restrict the continued activities of American business, both small and large.

A company is not good or bad merely because of its size. Its right to exist, and to manufacture and sell its products can most properly be determined by the American people themselves. The developments in the field of chemistry by the du Pont Co. and others have resulted in the creation of goods which have found world-wide acceptance. Cellophane is just one. In addition, there are nylon, orlon, and countless others. In my opinion, if the du Pont Co., or any other company, manufactures a product which is needed and accepted so universally as is cellophane, I feel it should be allowed to do so without being charged with monopolistic practices. American consumers and American business want

chemical products and they want them now.

I should like to say that the cost of cellophane has been reduced in price several times since its first appearance on the market. It is my opinion that this does not seem to substantiate the charges of fixing prices at higher and higher levels which is usually attributed to monopolies.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, why this company, or any other, should not be allowed to fulfill the desires of its potential customers?

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 241, line 13, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$22,422,000" and insert "\$23,635,151"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following provisos:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 242, line 14, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,644,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 242, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two hundred and twenty-seven" and insert "two hundred and fifty."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a further commitment for additional Government automobiles. Two hundred and twenty are for replacements, and thirty are a net increase in the total number. My general observation is that if there is any product of which the Government has an excess supply, it is automobiles. I have noticed that wherever there is a Government bureau there is a large number of automobiles. I do not always object to replacing automobiles that are truly worn out; I am even willing to add seven to the total, so that the hard-worked Indian agents as they go about their ministering tasks may have additional transportation. But why they should have 30 more automobiles I do not know. I shall probably be informed that this is the most meritorious item in the bill, and that to take away these automobiles will be striking a blow

at the heart of "lo, the poor Indian"; but, personally, I hope we can hold to the House figure of 227.

Mr. HAYDEN. The budget estimate was not 227 but was 327. The Bureau of the Budget, after canvassing all of the recommendations made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to its needs throughout the United States, recommended 327 automobiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Arizona that we have, naturally, a high opinion of the Bureau of the Budget, but members of that Bureau are human beings, like the rest of us; they breathe and move, eat, and drink. They are not superhuman. They are also Government employees. If there is one thing that makes a Government employee slightly lose his balance, it is the prospect of riding around in a big automobile. They seem to have an instinctive bias in favor of having more and bigger automobiles and more costly automobiles. Therefore the committee has done well to cut the number down to 250, but we should not make our standard the ideas of the Bureau of the Budget. I am willing to provide 7 automobiles, but I do not want to provide 30.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 110 Indian jurisdictions scattered throughout the United States. They cover a vast area. We must realize that many of the automobiles which are now in operation have been in operation a very long time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to provide for replacements in this instance. That is not the issue between us. The question is the rate of growth of the governmental automobile family. I think we should place a certain restriction on the degree to which the family should be allowed to extend. Incidentally, I think it would be better if we had less expensive operation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is a strict limit on the cost of automobiles. They are all of medium price. The only automobiles costing any amount above the medium price are those for Cabinet officers.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Did the committee hear testimony and determine the number, after going into the facts, and did it determine what was the right and proper number the agency should have?

Mr. HAYDEN. We took neither the number recommended by the Bureau of the Budget nor the number recommended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

These automobiles are necessary in the performance of the service, and are primarily for additional personnel provided for in the Navajo-Hopi long-range program of educational and health activities.

This item does not carry any sum for the purchase of vehicles, but stipulates the number that may be purchased from funds elsewhere provided in the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not a member of this subcommittee and I have taken no part in its deliberations, except in a very general way; but I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that he has a very wrong idea about the duties of an Appropriations

Committee, and especially this particular subcommittee. A committee does not go off half-cocked. It takes proof from witnesses who appear before the members of the committee. The members of the committee go into the facts very carefully. They do not merely jump at conclusions. They do not guess, as perhaps the Senator from Illinois is guessing when he talks of what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. They hear proof. That has been done for 20 or 30 years. Upon the proof before them they exercise their best judgment.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will not undertake to compromise with the Senator from Illinois unless the Senator from Illinois brings some facts before him, rather than merely entertaining an idea that we might trim the budget on this small matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the contention of the very able senior Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the Senate should accept without question every item as it is proposed by subcommittees and committees?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no; not at all. However, I do say that the subcommittee ought not to be guided by the Senator from Illinois, who during this day has not suggested a single fact upon which the position that he takes can be sustained. The Senator has not heard the facts. I doubt if the Senator has examined into the question of how many automobiles ought to be given to this activity. In order that I may be certain about it I shall ask the Senator from Illinois if he has examined into this matter and has heard witnesses testify?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not present when witnesses testified.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I do.

Mr. MCKELLAR. What does he know about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there is a general presumption—

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no; we do not go on presumptions. We go on proof.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that what we know as men we cannot pretend to be ignorant of as Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me point out that the House of Representatives has provided for additional doctors, additional nurses, and additional school teachers on the Indian reservations. If the Senator will tell us how the additional doctors, the additional nurses, and the additional school teachers can go about their business with the same old number of decrepit automobiles, I wish he would do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the first place, we are providing 220 cars as replacements. I am willing to provide something toward growth. However, it is a question of whether we should go overboard on this large additional number of vehicles.

Mr. HAYDEN. We did not go overboard on it. We allowed a reasonable number for the increased number of doctors, nurses, and school teachers. Is it consistent to provide new positions and not means of transportation for those thus employed?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. How many automobiles does the Indian Department have now?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have the figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to put the figures in the RECORD. I have them here. I wish to support the position of the Senator from Illinois in opposing the committee amendment with regard to the number of automobiles to be provided for this agency. The Department of the Interior in 1933 operated with 1,481 automobiles. At the present time it has 4,433 automobiles. I do not have a breakdown for this particular agency. However, another increase is proposed. Therefore, I wish to join with the Senator from Illinois in protesting this continuous increase in the number of automobiles which are made available to Government agencies. I see no sense to it whatever.

We have, according to the Bureau of the Budget, 20,119 automobiles in use in the executive branch of the Government, not counting the military authorities. I think that is entirely too many cars. Each year the appropriations call for an increase. I think it is time we put a stop to it. According to the number of automobiles and replacements which have been authorized in recent years it would seem to me that these cars are relatively new and should be in good condition.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, there are only 233,000 Indians. According to the report, at page 405, the Bureau of Indian Affairs already has 1,531 passenger vehicles. Some of them are 7, 8, or 10 years old, and it is claimed that they are no longer economical to operate. Does not the Senator think, however, that 1,531 cars are sufficient for that agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they are not. We must remember that the cars must be distributed among 110 jurisdictions. Then we must remember that we have Indian boarding schools, as the Senator knows, and Indian hospitals. When we take them altogether, the total number is not too high, in my judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there any reason why some of the people in the agencies in Washington should not furnish their own automobiles? Why should we furnish cars for them to drive back and forth between their office and homes?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is an entirely different situation. When an agent is out on the Navajo Indian Reservation, which is larger than the State of West Virginia, he must travel about to see the Indians. An agent may be out in the Sioux country, where we have large reservations. The Senator may make his argument with respect to the city of Washington, and it may be true that certain employees should not be provided with cars. However, that is not true out in the field.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the Department of the Interior has

approximately 3,000 cars more than it had a few years ago, why do they not move some of the cars from Washington into the field?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 242, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tribal funds," on page 244, line 3, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$2,430,965" and insert "\$2,437,965."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 245, line 1, after the word "laws", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.

And in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. On page 245, line 10, I move the following amendment:

After the word "Oregon", strike out the word "and"; after the word "Washington", insert the words "and Wyoming" and a comma. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept my amendment, I shall not discuss it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several years ago a similar provision was inserted in an appropriation bill. It provided for the acquisition of land. I recall that it involved Arizona, New Mexico, and some other States. Does this amendment refer to that particular subject?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will look at page 241, he will find the provision which relates to the acquisition of land outside of reservations in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and other States. This provision relates to the acquisition of land within reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General investigations," on page 246, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$5,150,000" and insert "\$6,500,000", and in line 6, after the word "which", to strike out "\$4,400,000" and insert "\$5,791,000."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that at 5 o'clock, by unanimous consent, the Senate was supposed to proceed to the consideration of the nominations to the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no unanimous-consent agreement. The senior Senator from Illinois announced that he would make a motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desired to find out what the situation was.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening I did advise the Senate that at 5 o'clock today I would move that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of the consideration of the Export-Import Bank nominations.

I dislike very much to disrupt the consideration of the pending bill, which seems to be moving along very well. But these nominations are exceedingly important. The members of the Board of Directors of the Bank are serving without salary, and not much business is being done by the bank or can be done until these nominations are confirmed.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no desire to disrupt the consideration of the Interior Department chapter of the appropriation bill, but I wondered if the Senator from Illinois intended to bring the nominations up after that chapter of the bill had been completed.

Mr. LUCAS. If I could have some assurance that it would not take too long, perhaps that chapter could be completed. I hope we may get through with the nominations in a couple of hours.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desire to ascertain what the situation is. I want the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Arizona distinctly to understand that I do not intend to hold up the pending bill, but I have a few remarks to make about the directors of the bank, against whom no one appeared in the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, United States Army, retired, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

NOMINATIONS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for a term of 5 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? I had an understanding with the minority leader that I would call for a quorum when these nominations were taken up.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator makes the request in behalf of the minority leader, I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will withhold his suggestion until I may ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota withhold the suggestion?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just for a moment. Is it the intention that we proceed with the Interior Department appropriations when we are through with the executive calendar, or does the majority leader intend to move a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in charge of the bill, has stepped out of the Chamber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think we can finish with the Interior Department section of the bill in an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is speculative as to how long it will take to finish this particular phase of the appropriation bill. The nominations before the Senate are important, and I served notice yesterday that we would proceed to consider them today. If the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator

from Oregon, and the Senator from South Carolina do not take too long in the debate, we might get through with the nominations and finish with the Interior Department appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should very much like to proceed until that section of the appropriation bill is complete. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from North Dakota, we could then take up the nominations. I merely wanted to ascertain what we were going to do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure that if we give the chairman of the subcommittee, who has charge of the appropriation bill, a bare chance, and do not bring in something else for discussion, we can get through with the Interior Department portion of the bill in 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think that would be possible, because there are several matters in the bill which will take considerable time.

Mr. LUCAS. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the calling of the roll. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler	Holland	Myers
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	O'Connor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Graham	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am sorry that the question of confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank is brought up at this late hour in the day.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon mentioned yesterday, the Secretary of the Treasury tells us that the Export-Import Bank has more or less discontinued operations because its directors have not been confirmed, and their terms expired on July 1.

I think the Members of the Senate know the nominees to those positions. They come from various States, and all of them have been endorsed by the Banking and Currency Committee.

So I trust that the nominations will be confirmed by the Senate very promptly, so that the directors of the Export-Import Bank can resume their work.

On the other hand, the Senator from Oregon has submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of the Export-Import Bank. I assure him that I shall welcome an investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Export-Import Bank and any of its operations. Similarly, I shall welcome the appearance of the Senator from Oregon before the Banking and Currency Committee.

However, Mr. President, I do not think action on the nominations should be held up any longer, because the Secretary of the Treasury has advised us that no business can now be transacted by the Bank, in view of the failure to confirm the nominations of the directors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is a quorum present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that the record will show that I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct, Mr. President.

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in yielding to me. I wish to stress the fact that unless the nominations of the directors of the Export-Import Bank are confirmed, the operations of that bank are stopped.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I seldom differ with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on matters of principle; but in this instance I differ with him on a question of procedure.

I shall discuss the recommendation I have made as to how this question can be resolved. Depending on how that recommendation is handled, I shall or shall not discuss further phases of these nominations tonight.

Mr. President, I propose to continue my remarks uninterrupted for a time, in the interest of continuity and clarity.

I wish to assure the Senate that I do not enjoy being in the position in which I find myself this afternoon, because I have no desire to do an unkindness or an injury to a single member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. I think there is danger that an injury may be done them even by raising certain questions which it may become necessary to raise here this afternoon. I preferred to raise these questions in executive session of the committee. That is where these questions should be raised. That is where the information which the junior Senator from Oregon seeks to obtain from the Export-Import Bank should be obtained. I want to keep the RECORD perfectly straight as to the procedure which the junior Senator from Oregon has followed on this matter.

Insofar as I have any personal acquaintance with any of the members of the Export-Import Bank, I like them

personally. I may have some fundamental differences with them in regard to certain of their loaning policies and practices, if I am correctly informed as to what those policies and practices are. I have certain serious differences with them in regard to some procedure which I am advised they follow in reaching their decisions as to what loans should be made. But, so that the RECORD will be perfectly clear, let me enumerate now the steps which have brought us to the point at which the Senator from Oregon presently finds himself on the floor of the Senate.

These nominations were sent to the Senate on Friday, June 16, 1950. They were then referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee held hearings on small business, previously scheduled, on June 22, 23, 27, and 28.

A committee hearing, scheduled to consider the Export-Import Bank nominations on Monday, June 26, was canceled because of a Senate Republican conference held on that day—at least, I am advised by a staff member of the committee that that was the reason for the cancellation of the hearing. I think it is too bad that the hearing was canceled; it is too bad that the hearing at least was not postponed.

On June 27 the members of the committee were polled regarding the nominations, and thereafter the nominations were favorably reported to the Senate, the same day, by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. However, no formal committee meeting was held on the nominations.

Since the nominations were not formally considered by the committee, there are no committee minutes covering any committee action on the nominations.

The RECORD shows that on June 27 the junior Senator from Oregon offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the loan policy pursued by the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the loans made by such bank, with special emphasis on the loan policy pursued by such bank with respect to, and the loans made by such bank to, the countries of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico, and private borrowers in such countries.

Sec. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1951.

On June 27, when I offered that resolution, I commented at some little length as to the reasons why the junior Senator from Oregon felt that such a resolution should be adopted. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on that date the junior Senator from Oregon suggested that these nominations not be pressed for confirmation until there could be a meeting of the committee and the Senator from Oregon could be heard in executive session. I think that was a fair request. It was a request so fair that its granting should have been automatic. That is the first major point I want to state, Mr. President, because when any Member of this body, on a matter as im-

portant as this, respectfully requests, as I did on the floor of the Senate, on June 27, that he be heard in executive session by a committee, in order to discuss certain phases of the policy of the Export-Import Bank which he believes have a direct bearing on the nominations themselves, the request of the junior Senator from Oregon should have been automatically granted by the committee.

I want to be fair to the committee. It is true that at that time the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, found it necessary—and I think for perfectly good cause and justification—to absent himself from Washington in order to go to South Carolina, I assume he left Washington in connection with the campaign which was then being waged in South Carolina. I have no objections to that. But, Mr. President, I think there were two alternatives available to the committee. It could have proceeded in the absence of the chairman, which I think the committee should have done in the interests of having hearings in executive session immediately. I have always had a feeling, and I still have that feeling, to a degree, that a great many of the problems which concern the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the policies of the Export-Import Bank would probably be clarified in an executive session with the committee and the chairman of the bank, and that as a result of such executive session perhaps some determination could be reached as to whether certain policies of the bank, which I think cannot be justified, would be discontinued in the future. But the committee, in spite of my resolution, in spite of the statement I made on the floor of the Senate, did not see fit to proceed with any committee hearing during the period of time when the chairman of the committee was absent from Washington.

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

Mr. MORSE. I will finish my statement, first.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely want to correct a misstatement of the facts.

Mr. MORSE. I yield. If I have made a misstatement, I desire to be corrected.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was in Washington on June 16th, the day the nominations were sent to the Senate. I did not leave until June 27th.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has just returned to the floor of the Senate and did not hear the previous remarks of the Senator from Oregon. Had he heard them, he would know that what the Senator from Oregon said was that on June 27th, when the Senator from Oregon offered his resolution and made his speech on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina was here then, but it was necessary for him to absent himself for a few days immediately thereafter. The Senator from Oregon went on to explain that he thought the absence was entirely justified. He means no criticism of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield, I greatly appreciate what he has said about me, but I was called from the Senate Chamber by a newspaper correspondent, who

wanted to ask me about something. I went out to discuss the matter with him. The only thing I wished to say was that it was on the 16th of June that these nominations were sent to the Senate. I called hearings. Nobody opposed the nominations. The nominees were endorsed by all the Senators from the States from which the nominees came. There were none from South Carolina. Among the Senators from those States was the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is in the Senate Chamber at this time. I wrote him a letter. He knows that. No one objected to the nominations. We held the hearings. No one came. No one appeared for 1 day. So I then asked the committee either to approve or disapprove the nominations. There was not a dissenting vote by any member of the committee. I merely want to keep my record straight.

Mr. MORSE. I want to do everything I can to see that the Senator's record is straight. Nothing has been said by the junior Senator from Oregon which in any way contains any error in regard to the record of the Senator from South Carolina.

I simply repeat, Mr. President, that there were two alternatives which faced the committee, neither one of which the committee followed. It should have followed one of the alternatives which would have given me a hearing on these nominations after I raised a question about them. I think that after the introduction of the resolution on June 27 by the Senator from Oregon and the statement he made on the floor of the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee then and there should have proceeded or made arrangements to proceed in executive session to hear the junior Senator from Oregon before any vote on the confirmation of the nominations was asked for on the floor of the Senate. Not having done that, I say—and I mean no criticism of the Senator from South Carolina; I merely express a difference of opinion with him as to the procedure which should have been followed—that upon his return from South Carolina the committee then should have proceeded in executive session to hear the Senator from Oregon on these nominations before they were submitted to the Senate for a vote.

That is the position of the Senator from Oregon on this question. My good friend from South Carolina has advised us this afternoon that he can assure the Senator from Oregon that he will be heard in executive session of the committee. However, he insists that because Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, is urging that these nominations be confirmed now, for the reason that the Export-Import Bank cannot carry on its business until they are confirmed, and because they have been hanging fire since July 1, we should vote tonight on these nominations. He proposes that after confirmation the Senator from Oregon be given a hearing in executive session on the problems and points he wishes to raise. I cannot accept that offer, for the simple reason that I do not believe in locking the barn after the horse has been stolen. If the Senator from Oregon is to receive a hearing on

this question, I think it should be a genuine hearing on the merits of the matter, in advance of confirmation of the nominations, because—

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

Mr. MORSE. In a moment.

Because, Mr. President, if certain allegations which have been presented to the Senator from Oregon can be developed in committee by way of cross-examination of the Export-Import Bank nominees themselves, I want to say that we would have to have some assurance from those nominees that certain policies will not be followed in the future, before the junior Senator from Oregon could vote for their confirmation and before any other Member of the Senate should vote for their confirmation.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I did not insist that we vote tonight. The Senator knows that I believe in unlimited debate. I want to assure the Senator from Oregon of the fact that there was no request on my part to vote tonight. I have always been opposed to cloture. Some Senators have been in favor of it. I want the Senator from Oregon to know that I shall remain as long as he wants to stay here, but I would never vote to cut off debate.

I have deep affection for my very distinguished friend from Oregon, because we have served together on many committees and we have been together on investigations. Fortunately or unfortunately—fortunately, I think; the Senator from Oregon may think it was unfortunately—the committee reported these nominations to the Senate before the resolution was submitted by the Senator from Oregon and they were reported unanimously, after I had talked to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators who represent the States from which the nominees come. We reported the nominations in all honesty and in the best interest, as we thought, of the Government.

The Senator from Oregon has stated that I said Secretary Snyder said certain things. The Secretary never talked to me about these nominees until a few days ago, when he said the Export-Import Bank's business was being held up.

I hope these nominations will be confirmed. If the Senator from Oregon wants any kind of a session held by the committee, I can assure him he shall have it. But I do not want to get my name tied up with limiting debate on the confirmation of anyone's nomination tonight.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand, as clearly as I can understand anything, that the Senator from South Carolina is opposed to limitation of debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have never been for it.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator missed my point. What I have tried to point out thus far in my remarks is that the hearings should have been held in advance of an insistence on voting on

confirmation. The record is perfectly clear that I asked for such a hearing.

It is true, as the Senator has pointed out, that my resolution was submitted after the nominations were reported to the Senate, but it was only a few minutes after. As I explained to the Senator from South Carolina and certain other members of the committee, I did not receive until that day certain serious allegations in regard to policies of the Export-Import Bank and methods of conducting the affairs of that bank, which caused me to ask for a hearing.

So I simply repeat the statement already made, and move to the next point. Under the circumstances of the case, Mr. President, there is no parliamentary procedure in the Senate that would estop the committee from then and there saying to the junior Senator from Oregon, "The committee will hear you in executive session in advance of asking for a vote on the confirmation of the nominations." The reporting of the nominations to the Senate in no way established any parliamentary right or created any parliamentary barrier which prevented the committee from hearing me within the next few days thereafter, in executive session, in regard to these nominations. That is the procedural point I made. I simply say that, in my opinion, the committee, unconsciously, unintentionally, and inadvertently, is guilty of an act of discourtesy to the Senator from Oregon, because under the circumstances I think any Senator, as a matter of parliamentary or senatorial courtesy, should have been heard in accordance with such a reasonable request as I made.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say as chairman of the committee, and I think I speak for all the members of it, that if we were in any way discourteous to the Senator from Oregon, we apologize. We certainly did not mean to be discourteous to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is why I said that I know such a course of action would not have been followed intentionally by the committee. I may be completely in error and unjustified in feeling, as I do, Mr. President, that I was done an injustice, so far as ordinary procedural rights, which ought to be granted any Member of the Senate, are concerned. But I think the committee made a mistake in not taking up this matter in executive session in advance of the motion which is now before the Senate to proceed tonight to confirm the nominations. It is a matter that could have been discussed and cleared up within a few hours.

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that the last thing the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency would do would be to show any discourtesy to Senators. We always welcome Senators to appear before the committee. I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon who knows my feelings and affection for him,

that we would never be discourteous to him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Mr. President, the second point I wish to make is that even though the motion places me in such a position that I must make a decision either to proceed with the discussion on the floor of the Senate of certain matters which I would prefer to discuss in executive session of the committee—

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator that if he desires to discuss the matters on the floor of the Senate I shall listen to him as long as he desires to discuss them, and I further assure him that, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I shall invite the directors of the bank, should their nominations be confirmed, to an executive meeting of the committee where the Senator from Oregon may discuss these matters, and I shall be there with him on any date he may suggest for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the position of the Senator from South Carolina, and I appreciate it, although I disagree with the wisdom of the procedure he outlines. I think this discussion should be held in advance of confirmation, in order to determine whether the information brought out in such a committee hearing with the members of the bank may not have a very definite relationship to the question of whether or not the nominations should be confirmed.

To finish what I was in the process of saying as to my second major point, the motion for confirmation tonight places the Senator from Oregon in the position where he must make a choice of whether he should discuss at this time on the floor of the Senate certain matters affecting the policies of the Export-Import Bank, and certain loans which have been granted and certain loans which have been denied by the Export-Import Bank, or to withhold that information and discussion at this time, awaiting an executive hearing before the committee, which could be described as a hearing after the fact. At least that kind of discussion might cause some change in the policies of the Export-Import Bank after the nominations of these men have been confirmed.

What the Senator from Oregon intends to do, Mr. President, is to raise certain questions tonight and refrain from a public discussion at this time of certain information which he will raise in the committee.

First, the Senator from Oregon will make a motion that these nominations be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency pending a hearing called by the Senator from South Carolina. The Senator from Oregon will keep himself available to attend the hearing whenever the Senator from South Carolina calls it. In my judgment, and in fairness to everyone concerned, I consider it to be in the public interest that the motion I make be adopted by the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that these nomina-

tions be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency pending a hearing, to be called by the committee for the purpose of hearing the Senator from Oregon and anyone else who may wish to appear on these nominations. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. I disagree with my good friend from Oregon, because on June 16 we had a hearing, and no one appeared in opposition to the nominees. I took the trouble to write to every Senator from the States from which the nominees came. I do not think it is fair to the nominees to have their names recommitted. I merely wish to make that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon submitting a motion to recommit the nominations en bloc? There is only one name before the Senate at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I want to send them all back, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to a motion to recommit the nominations en bloc?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on recommitting the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. The parliamentary question which the Senator from Oregon wished to ask is whether the nominations can be recommitted en bloc without a unanimous-consent agreement, or must he move separately that each nomination be recommitted as the name is called on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon would have the right to move to recommit the first one, because that is the one which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the objection—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would require unanimous consent to recommit them en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the objection to the recommitment of the first nomination until such time as we can have a hearing of the kind which the Senator from Oregon has discussed, I shall make the same motion in respect to each one of the nominations as they are brought up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection if the Senator from Oregon wishes to ask unanimous consent to recommit them all. I think that would be fair. If one is to be recommitted, all should be. I do not object to his asking unanimous consent to recommit them en bloc, al-

though I shall object to recommitting any of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hill	Millikin
Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Chapman	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoepfel
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Lucas	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Young
Hickenlooper	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the nominations to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Will a "yea" vote be a vote in favor of the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote of "yea" will be a vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Ken-

tucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on public business, and if present would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—8

Donnell	Graham	Morse
Dworshak	Langer	Wiley
Ecton	McCarthy	

NAYS—50

Alken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Pepper
Brewster	Ives	Robertson
Bricker	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kem	Schoepfel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
Hayden	McFarland	Watkins
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Martin	Williams
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—38

Benton	Green	Murray
Bridges	Gurney	Myers
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Knowland	Taylor
Downey	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Withers
Gillette	Malone	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how long he thinks he will take?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for the purpose of permitting such a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to answer that question. It will take me a minimum of 5 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The answer is 5 hours.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I heard both the Senator from Oregon and the Presiding Officer. [Laughter.]

I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon another question. It is my understanding that he is desirous of appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee in executive session to discuss these nominations with the various members of the committee. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. That has been my position since June 27, and was so announced from the floor of the Senate on June 27.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask a further question of the Senator. If he should be given a hearing before the committee, will it take him 5 hours on each one of the nominations after he gets the hearing?

Mr. MORSE. I should be willing to submit to the committee at a round-table conference certain exhibits which the members of the committee could scan with me. That would take less than 5 hours.

Of course I shall have to read those exhibits if I proceed with this matter tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply desire to save time, if it is possible to do so. I am willing to help the Senator from Oregon, and I have conferred with the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. He is willing to listen to the Senator from Oregon tomorrow afternoon in executive session of the committee, provided some time can be saved. But if the chairman calls the members of the committee together tomorrow afternoon, and the Senator from Oregon proposes to take 5 hours upon each one of the nominations, there is not much point in having the executive session of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. My 5-hour discussion on the floor of the Senate will be in regard to all of them at the same time. I may have seemed facetious in my statement to the Senator from Illinois when I said it would take me 5 hours to discuss this matter in a Senate speech, but let me say most seriously to him that I appreciate the courtesy of his attempt to reach an understanding on this matter. I think it only fair to say to the Senate that before or while the roll call was in process, on my motion, I had a discussion with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from South Carolina, and it is my understanding—and if I am mistaken, they can correct me—that they are agreeable to a suggestion we made jointly in that conversation. As I recall the suggestion it was that the Senator from South Carolina call his committee together tomorrow for the purpose of discussing this matter with the Senator from Oregon, and that these nominations remain on the calendar and not be recommitted.

I mean it most sincerely when I say there are two things the Senate ought to do in this matter: In the first place, the record is perfectly clear that the junior Senator from Oregon asked for a conference with the committee on June 27. I think any Senator who asks for

that kind of conference, as a matter of parliamentary courtesy, should have it extended to him. In the second place, I desire to discuss certain phases of this matter in executive session because, in fairness to all concerned, that is where any problems connected with this matter which can be cleared up ought to be cleared up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would it be in order for the Senator from New Mexico to make a unanimous-consent request at this particular time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A unanimous-consent request is in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to present a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that my rights are in no way jeopardized thereby.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Inasmuch as the committee has reported the nominations to the Senate, and since it is the desire of the Senator from Oregon to discuss them for 5 hours, I ask unanimous consent that at 18 minutes to 12 o'clock tonight the Senate vote on the nominations, and that the Senator be allowed his 5 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to say that I am one who has been very diligent in attempting to clear these nominations through the Senate. I was under the impression that the reason they were held on the calendar was that a certain resolution had not received attention by the committee. I want the RECORD to show that it is perfectly agreeable to the junior Senator from Nebraska that the suggestion made by the majority leader prior to the pending unanimous-consent request is agreeable to the junior Senator from Nebraska, namely, that the junior Senator from Oregon be permitted in executive session of the committee to question the nominees or to question any other witness he cares to question. I think that is only a reasonable request.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. If that cannot be done, then I should certainly be glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a certain time on the nominations. But I want the RECORD to show that, as far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly agreeable to complying with the suggestion made by the majority leader and the junior Senator from Oregon, that the latter have an opportunity to interrogate the nominees in executive session and that thereafter the committee report to the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to ask the Senator this question: In the event the meeting of the committee is held tomorrow afternoon, could the Senate again take up the nominations at 5 o'clock, and vote at 7?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before answering the Senator from Illinois, may I first address a comment to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I desire to do that so there may be removed any doubt in his mind as to where the Senator from Oregon stands on his unanimous-consent request. The Senator from Oregon will object to that request and he wishes to say to the Senator from New Mexico that he does not appreciate the implications of the discourtesy contained therein.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Now, answering the Senator from Illinois—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Answering the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Oregon wishes to say that he has tried, as the RECORD will show, to be exceedingly fair about a matter which has a great many delicate angles.

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

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon has asked, now for days, to have an opportunity to discuss this matter in executive session. But let him make very clear to the Senate and to the Democratic side of the aisle that if what they want is a full discussion of this question on the floor of the Senate, I shall give it to them for about 5 hours—tonight. But I prefer not to do it. I have tried to be reasonable and fair about this matter; but if Senators do not want to extend me the courtesy I have requested, we will stay here until I finish my discussion tonight.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is now about 12 minutes to 7, and in view of the fact that members of the Banking and Currency Committee have gone home, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate notify the members of the Banking and Currency Committee that we shall meet at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon to hear the Senator from Oregon. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request to make, myself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the Senator from Oregon objected to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now a unanimous-consent request by the

Senator from South Carolina, which is before the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression that the Senator from Oregon and I were just about to have a meeting of the minds with respect to voting at 7 o'clock tomorrow or at any other time the Senator might suggest, in keeping with his position, with respect to the amount of time it will take to debate the matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my judgment that after an executive session of the committee we could vote on these nominations within an hour after they are returned to the floor of the Senate. I do not think 7 o'clock tomorrow night should necessarily be the time at which to vote. I think we can vote on the nominations at 5 o'clock or we can vote at 6 o'clock.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. With that understanding, I am sure the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee will call his committee together tomorrow afternoon in order to hear the distinguished Senator from Oregon with respect to complaints. It does not require any unanimous-consent request. The Senator from South Carolina, I am sure, will advise the Senator from Oregon that the committee will hold a meeting, and we can make disposition of the matter without any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to voting at 6, at 6:30, or at 7 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. With that understanding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we reach the hour of 5 o'clock tomorrow we proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations of the four men referred to to be members of the Export-Import Bank, that at 6 o'clock the Senate vote on the nominations, and that the time be divided equally between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not think I shall object—this is a peculiar situation in the United States Senate. What is there so secret about any information a Senator may have as against nominations which have been favorably reported by the committee that the people of the United States should not know about it? Is it of such a grave nature that it is necessary to hold an executive session? What more is the committee going to find out that the people of this country should not know?

I did not rise in order to jeopardize the rights of the Senator from Oregon in any way, but I feel that if it takes 5 hours, if it is so serious that it takes that

long a time to inform the Senate as to how bad or how good these nominees are, it is about time the Senate and the people of the United States know about it. Why hold a secret session? Why not tell us about it?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The audience in the galleries listens to us. We are in open executive session, and if the information is so grave that it requires 5 hours to tell us about it, it is time we listened for 5 hours. I object.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am certain that the Senator from Oregon would not wish a secret session.

Mr. MORSE. I asked for an executive session of the committee in the first instance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator from Oregon object to having an open session?

Mr. MORSE. I should prefer to meet with the committee in executive session and then let the committee decide after it heard me if it wishes an open hearing.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator says, that the committee can decide afterward.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the objection made by the Senator from New Mexico, I move that these nominations remain on the executive calendar so that the Committee on Banking and Currency may provide me with an opportunity to discuss the policies of the Export-Import Bank with the committee tomorrow afternoon, with the understanding that the Senate will vote on the nominations at any time starting from 6 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press that motion. We can have an understanding that the names will remain on the calendar and that the Senator from Oregon will have his day in court before the Committee on Banking and Currency tomorrow afternoon, say, at 2:30 o'clock, and he can appear before the committee and give the committee the information which he has. I am not aware of how serious the information may be. If it is as serious as the Senator from Oregon says it is, I do not want it to be understood that we are going to hold a hearing in executive session. I make that suggestion only because I do not want the Democratic Party to be put in a false light.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I shall summarize the position I take in the committee meeting tomorrow because I have no intention of putting the Democratic Party in a false light and there is nothing in what I have to say to the committee which will put the Democratic Party in a false light.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can summarize the situation, but it still leaves an inference of embarrassment to the Democratic Party.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is entitled to know the general line of inquiry which the junior Senator from Oregon intends to pursue in committee. I have already covered it in my speech

of June 27 on the floor. It goes to the question of the criteria, the standards, and the policies which the Export-Import Bank applied in granting loans to various nations, including particularly the Argentine loan about which I think the committee ought to ask certain questions before a final vote is taken on these nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think we understand each other as a result of the colloquy which has taken place. I think it is in order to move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock—

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate is now in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I am aware of that. I have not yet moved a recess. I am exploring the situation a little bit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Please let me finish what I was trying to say.

At 2:30 tomorrow afternoon the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet in the hearing room of the Committee on the District of Columbia, adjacent to the Senate Chamber. Following that, at 5 o'clock or 5:30 o'clock, we can proceed with the nominations. The Senator from Oregon thinks it will not take more than an hour.

Before I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senate as a whole be informed as to what new evidence or new information was adduced at the committee meeting tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. That will be a matter for the committee to determine.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We can hold a meeting of the committee in the committee room of the Committee on the District of Columbia at 2:30, with the understanding that any Senator who wants to attend may attend. Does the Senator from Oregon agree to that?

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Oregon yield the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was going to ask regarding the other nominations, but so long as most of the Members have gone, it might be better to go through with the executive calendar tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. We shall go through with the executive calendar tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the majority leader made a statement which I think should be clarified. Is it the intention of the majority leader to take up contested nominations?

Mr. LUCAS. Not the contested nominations. Nominations which are objected to will go over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18 (legislative day of July 1), 1950:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the grade indicated below:

TO BE COMMISSIONED ENSIGN

Edward C. Maran
Julian W. Flint

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL OF THE LINE

Maj. Gen. William Ray Carroll, [REDACTED], Washington National Guard, to date from October 17, 1949.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE

Brig. Gen. William Watson Burgess, Jr., [REDACTED], California National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Carl Otha DeBard, [REDACTED], Indiana National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Frank Eino Heikkila, [REDACTED], New York National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Earle Marian Jones, [REDACTED], California National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Dwight Linn McReynolds, [REDACTED], Tennessee National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

Brig. Gen. John Bassett Moore, [REDACTED], Delaware National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. John Burl Webb, [REDACTED], Arkansas National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS, ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Brig. Gen. Timothy Joseph Regan, Jr., [REDACTED], Massachusetts National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Joseph John Scannell, [REDACTED], Delaware National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Lilburn Halsey Stevens, [REDACTED], Washington National Guard, to date from February 27, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Samuel Thomas Wallace, [REDACTED], Tennessee National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named person for appointment as a chaplain of the Regular Army in the grade of first lieutenant under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Gerard J. Gefell, [REDACTED].

The following-named persons for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel

Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Gilbert A. Frisbie, [REDACTED]
Thomas F. Meagher, Jr., [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 881, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

John D. Bang, [REDACTED]
Alfred Barnes, [REDACTED]
Glen D. Belnap, [REDACTED]
Russell W. Bertholf, Jr., [REDACTED]
Thomas R. Biggs, [REDACTED]
Edward P. Billinghamurst, [REDACTED]
William C. Boehm, [REDACTED]
Edmund G. Boy, [REDACTED]
David H. Brazil, [REDACTED]
Charles T. Burch, [REDACTED]
Bruce Burnett, [REDACTED]
Robert E. Burt, [REDACTED]
Roscoe C. Cartwright, [REDACTED]
Alphus R. Clark, [REDACTED]
Coleman C. Clement, Jr., [REDACTED]
Roland H. Collins, [REDACTED]
Clifton H. Conrad, [REDACTED]
William T. Cooper.
Frederick G. Dempsey, [REDACTED]
James E. Dempsey, [REDACTED]
Thomas R. Dolezal, [REDACTED]
Leo E. Eutsler, [REDACTED]
William G. Foreman, [REDACTED]
Walter C. Franzen, [REDACTED]
Peter P. Genero, [REDACTED]
Shirl L. Gerlach, [REDACTED]
Nicholas N. Gombos, [REDACTED]
Lorayne M. Griffin, [REDACTED]
Owen R. Grogan, Jr., [REDACTED]
Tom S. Groseclose, [REDACTED]
Conrad L. Hall, [REDACTED]
Leonard H. Harris.
Return C. Haynes, [REDACTED]
William H. Henry, Jr., [REDACTED]
Wilbur J. Hewitt, [REDACTED]
Clifton W. Holbrook, [REDACTED]
Needham C. Holden, Jr., [REDACTED]
John H. Hougren, [REDACTED]
Carol N. Johns, [REDACTED]
Carlton S. Johnson, [REDACTED]
Phillip Kaufman, [REDACTED]
Ernest J. Lansing, [REDACTED]
James R. Lay, [REDACTED]
Lloyd L. LeClair, [REDACTED]
Charles C. Leneten, Jr., [REDACTED]
Robert M. Lorenz, [REDACTED]
Roy W. Lundquist, [REDACTED]
Donald L. Lynes, [REDACTED]
John E. Maier, [REDACTED]
Robert J. Maier, [REDACTED]
John G. Mantalas, [REDACTED]
William Maughn, Jr., [REDACTED]
William F. McCormick, Jr., [REDACTED]
Eugene B. McCoy, [REDACTED]
Richard G. McSwain, [REDACTED]
John W. Meek, Jr., [REDACTED]
Frank A. Merigold, [REDACTED]
Francis S. Obradovich, [REDACTED]
Frank S. Plummer, Jr., [REDACTED]
Charles E. Pritchard, [REDACTED]
Jacob A. Randolph, Jr., [REDACTED]
Thompson L. Raney, [REDACTED]
Gerald W. Recktenwald, [REDACTED]
Tom Reid, [REDACTED]
Perry R. Rice.
Edwin T. Rios, [REDACTED]
Howard F. Robinson, [REDACTED]
James E. Rose, [REDACTED]
Harold Rounds.
Harold W. Runft, [REDACTED]
James W. Ryan, [REDACTED]
Eugene G. Sabota, [REDACTED]
Craig C. Scott, [REDACTED]
Dwain L. Scott, [REDACTED]
John A. Seddon, [REDACTED]
Orville D. Severson, [REDACTED]
Robert J. Sharpless, [REDACTED]
Fred C. Sheffey.
Earl S. Sleeper, [REDACTED]

Carl F. Smith, [REDACTED]
Robert W. Smithson, [REDACTED]
Felix S. Smolenski, [REDACTED]
Marvin H. Snow, [REDACTED]
Fred G. Swafford, Jr., [REDACTED]
Raymond V. Taibbi, [REDACTED]
Robert L. Teague.
Francis W. Turnbull, [REDACTED]
Charles M. Tyson, [REDACTED]
Edward S. Waddell, [REDACTED]
Vernon V. Wallis, [REDACTED]
Vernon J. Walters, [REDACTED]
Joseph F. White, [REDACTED]
Charles B. Wild, Jr., [REDACTED]
Vernon C. Williams, [REDACTED]
Calvin O. Wilson, [REDACTED]
Charles Q. Wright, Jr.
David R. Young, [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Edd M. Carter.
Thomas J. Collins, Jr.
Raymond A. Cramer, Jr.
C. W. Dickerson, Jr., [REDACTED]
Stephen V. Hughes, Jr., [REDACTED]
Paul M. Jordan.
Frank S. Klein.
Roy T. Nakashima.
William H. Naylor, Jr.
Henry Sporer, Jr.
John J. Trzcinski.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the gracious benefactor of all mankind, we thank Thee for this day which has come to us as a sacred gift, bringing with it glorious opportunities for service and tasks which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

We pray that Thou wilt mediate unto us, through Thy spirit, that divine wisdom and power which will enable us to see our duties and responsibilities more clearly, understand and interpret them more wisely, and perform them more faithfully and courageously.

We are daily praying that Thy special blessing may rest upon our President, our Speaker, and all the leaders and Members of this legislative body. Grant unto them that spiritual guidance which transcends the fallibility of all human wisdom and that strength which never fails or grows weary in well-doing.

Hasten the time when sentiments and thoughts of good will shall permeate the mind of man and the righteousness of God shall flow everywhere as a mighty stream lifting the nations of the earth into the loftier altitudes of peace.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

ADDITIONAL EMERGENCY MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, during recent days since the Korean crisis arose, Members have frequently asked me about the necessity for additional funds for the Armed Forces. We have all been desirous of being of every possible service in this important matter.

Immediately after hostilities began in Korea, in my capacity as chairman of the Armed Forces Subcommittee on Appropriations and acting on the advice of the subcommittee, I communicated with the President and the Secretary of Defense stating that we were prepared to give immediate consideration to a request for additional funds to meet the emergency. I stated that we would promptly make all needed funds available, making this statement because I knew the attitude of the House. The President advised that the matter would have his attention and that we would be advised of any needed assistance. The Secretary of Defense made similar response.

I have no doubt that the House will approve the actions of the subcommittee.

It is against this background that the House will receive the President's message tomorrow and I have full confidence that all necessary funds will be promptly provided. I shall do all in my power to provide quick action. We have just been waiting to receive the recommendations of the Armed Forces in order that we might take action here.

A UNITED STATES MEDICAL ACADEMY

Mr. HELLER. 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. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to discuss with a friend of mine, Dr. Alexander Kaye, of New York City, a prominent surgeon, the problem of the shortage of doctors which exists in the country as a whole. In the course of our very interesting talk he called to my attention an article which appeared in the May 1950 issue of Medical Economics which proposed a Federal school for physicians; that is, a West Point of medicine, providing full training at no expense to carefully selected medical candidates to produce M. D.'s for Government service. I thought so well of this idea that I have this day introduced a bill to create a medical academy. I wish to call this bill to the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

Its purpose is to bring increased numbers of physicians and dentists into Government service, both in military and civilian capacities, thus gradually eliminating the shortage of doctors which exists in the Federal Government, and perhaps partially remedying the situation in the country.

Mr. Speaker, a United States Medical Academy may be the only way to insure enough doctors for Government service if civilian medicine continues to increase in amount and in its monetary rewards. Under the provisions of this bill, such an academy would insure a constant and regular flow of physicians and dentists into government after the graduation of the institution's first class. Even if it were unable to meet all the Government's needs, the academy's graduates could form the necessary core of a Government medical service.

The proposed legislation contains the following major provisions:

First. It creates the United States Medical Academy along lines similar to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy.

Second. Appointments to this academy would be made from all congressional districts, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, 8 from each State at large, and 132 from the United States at large.

Third. Candidates for admission would be at least 20 years of age but less than 25, graduates of a college or university or the equivalent, citizens of the United States, and of good moral character.

Fourth. The course of study would include the following subjects: anatomy, physiology, chemistry, hygiene, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, pathology, bacteriology, and diagnosis.

Fifth. Graduates from the academy would remain in Government service for 5 years.

Sixth. All employees of the academy would be paid in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 and would be subject to the provisions of the civil-service retirement laws.

Seventh. The academy would have a superintendent appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 10 years, and a Board of Visitors with prescribed pay and minimum duties.

Eighth. Certain other general sections are included to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this bill will receive the approval of the committee to which it will be referred and the subsequent approval of the House of Representatives.

CENSORING OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. CROOK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, living in the greatest country on the face of the earth and knowing in these critical times that on the fringe we are confronted with ruthless groups of Communists with whom we are engaged in battle today, may I say that I am of the opinion we are entirely too free in divulging just what we are doing and propose to do in the arena of military activities in these critical times. Perusing the press and chronicles of the time and listening

very carefully to radio reports, I am stimulated to believe that we are giving the enemies as much information or more than we are giving to our own people. Such practice is most detrimental.

Is it not about time to start censoring some of the information that is going out through the medium of the press and over the radio? It is something for us to think about, I want to assure the membership. North Korea and her supply forces certainly refrain from telling us and the world of their designed plans and movement of reinforcements.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COORDINATION OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

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 have been so much disturbed at what I believe to be a lack of coordination in civilian defense that I am today introducing a bill which would create an agency and a head thereof for Federal National Civilian Defense which would report directly to the President. There seems to be no head today. It is under the War Resources Board but there is no central office for leadership and guidance for control, although I do not like the word "control."

There should be a guiding and leading center created very much as the Red Cross operates. I have heard it stated that more has not been done about civilian control because of the war hysteria that might arise. The Red Cross takes care of disasters and is all geared and ready to go when we have a hurricane or great fire or other disaster. We ought to do the same thing for civilian defense today. It should be a continuing agency just as is American Red Cross. This should be done and done at once. There is no time to lose. Soviet Russia has civilian control. England and Norway and other countries all have national civilian guidance and leadership of control.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

THE MERIT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1027) for the relief of the Merit Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Merit Co., of Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$47,427 less appropriate tax adjustments to the extent that the taxpayer has benefited from this loss in computing his Federal excess-profits tax and income tax liability for any year, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United

States for additional compensation for work performed and materials furnished by it under purchase orders Nos. 5C-8010 and 5C-14717 (contract NCo-8173/8175), which were placed with it by the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$47,427" and insert "\$31,612.39."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WONG SUEY WING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 382) for the relief of Wong Suey Wing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wong Suey Wing, the minor child of Wong Sing, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be eligible for admission into the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

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

MICHELE BARTOLOMEO MARCHISIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 841) for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio, of Trinchera, Colo., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 2, 1948, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

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

VARTAN CHAMSARIAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 976) for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant

of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Vartan Chamsarian, of Troy, N. Y. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Vartan Chamsarian shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Vartan Chamsarian shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

Sec. 3. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Turkey.

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

JULIANA MENDIOLA ALASTRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastrá.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Juliana Mendiola Alastrá, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 7, 1949, the date on which she was admitted as a visitor, upon payment of head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

PHIL MEYERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1779) for the relief of Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers, of Denver, Colo., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Lithuania.

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

FRANCISCO GONZALEZ PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2077) for the relief of Francisco Gonzalez Perez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), or the provisions of the act of March 4, 1929, relating to entry after deportation (8 U. S. C. 180), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Francisco

Gonzalez Perez of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has notice at the time of enactment of this act, the said Francisco Gonzalez Perez may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is not found to be otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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

GEORGE A. VOREGARETHSOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2277) for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos), of Larsia Thiselia, Greece, the adopted son of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Voregarethsos, of Minot, N. Dak., shall be considered to be the alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Voregarethsos, of Minot, N. Dak., citizens of the United States.

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

MARIA CICERELLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2296) for the relief of Maria Cicerelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Cicerelli shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her father, Sam Cicerelli, a citizen of the United States.

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

KIMIE YAMADA INA AND RITSUKO INA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2676) for the relief of Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kimie Yamada Ina, the Japanese fiancée of Hugh L. Burleson, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina, and that Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina, may be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Kimie Yamada Ina is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Hugh L. Burleson, and that she and her daughter are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Kimie Yamada Ina, she and her daughter shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Kimie Yamada Ina, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said

Kimie Yamada Ina and her daughter, Ritsuko Ina, as of the date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and head taxes.

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

JAMES ERMINI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6223) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of James Ermini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of James Ermini, who entered the United States at New York, July 18, 1949, and that he shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence only as of that date and nullifying and canceling all other departures and entries which he might have made thereafter.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Ermini" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "as of July 18, 1949, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMOS CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6386) to legalize the entry of Amos Chen, a native of China.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Amos Chen, a native of China, shall be considered to be a permanent resident of the United States from the date of his entry on April 5, 1945.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the Chinese quota in the current quota year or the first year in which the quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the twenty-seventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (o)), and notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943 (8 U. S. C. 212a), the provisions of sections 6 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 206, 209), shall be held to be applicable in the case of Amos Chen, a native of Jamaica, British West Indies, and the husband of a United States citizen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Amos Chen, a native of Jamaica, British West Indies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENA JANGE CHINN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6746) for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Helena Jange Chinn (nee Helena Toy Jange), the wife of Harold Chinn, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Helena Jange Chinn under this act upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after "citizens", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

REGOLO GAGLIACCO AND HIS WIFE,
GINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8093) for the relief of Regolo Gagliacco and his wife, Gina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Regolo Gagliacco and his wife, Gina, Italian nationals residing in Canada, shall, upon application at a port of entry into the United States, be admitted for permanent residence as returning immigrants without immigration visas, provided they meet all the other requirements of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204), shall be applicable to Regolo Gagliacco and his wife, Gina Gagliacco, Italian nationals residing in Canada and lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in 1946."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ERIKA KUHN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8740) for the relief of Erika Kuhn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Erika Kuhn, the fiancée of Matthew J. Ontko, a United States citizen and veteran of World War II, may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for the period of 3 months if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Erika Kuhn is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Matthew J. Ontko. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Erika Kuhn, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Erika Kuhn, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Erika Kuhn as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

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.

LEILA M. DODD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8780) for the relief of Leila M. Dodd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held applicable to Leila M. Dodd, who was born in French Indochina in 1898, adopted in infancy by an American missionary and his wife, and brought to the United States.

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.

MARY RYNIK BARAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8918) for the relief of Mary Rynik Baran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Rynik Baran, a nation and citizen of Czechoslovakia, shall be considered to be the natural-born daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George Baran, United States citizens.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 5, after the words "natural-born", strike out the word "daughter" and insert in lieu thereof the words "alien child."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ARCHIBALD WALTER CAMPBELL
SEYMOUR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8973) for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour shall be held to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States upon payment of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for India.

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.

PATENT IN FEE FOR FRANCIS LEE
EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6958) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Francis Lee Edwards a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The south half of the south half of section 22, the south half of the south half of section 23, the north half of section 26 and the north half of section 27, township 6 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 960 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 90 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 90 days; and (2) prior to the expiration of such 90 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 90 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated, shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PATENT IN FEE FOR EDGAR S. BIGMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7017) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior

to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Edgar S. Bigman a patent in fee to the following-described lands, known as allotment No. 3064 on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont: The south half of the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter of section 17, the southeast quarter of section 18, and section 20, township 3 south, range 34 east, containing 1,040 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof unless (1) at least 90 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 90 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 90 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 90 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

XXXXXXXXXX Kuzser, Czeslawa (alias Cywie or Czeslawa Miller, alias Sylla Kuzser).

XXXXXXXXXX Kuzser, Szymon (alias Symcha or Simka or Sam Kuzser).

XXXXXXXXXX Paulson, Grace.

XXXXXXXXXX Weinberger, Irena Szenker.

XXXXXXXXXX Martinez, Fernando Antonio.

XXXXXXXXXX Martinez, Roberto, or Roberto Martinez-Sanchez.

XXXXXXXXXX Martinez, Maria Eugenia Del Socorro.

XXXXXXXXXX Martinez, Mario Sergio.

XXXXXXXXXX Rempaldi, Riccardo (alias Riccardi Rampaldi).

XXXXXXXXXX Scheinberg, Noach.

XXXXXXXXXX Scheinberg, Pola.

XXXXXXXXXX Soto, Jesus.

XXXXXXXXXX Sperapani, Giannina Cafferecci.

XXXXXXXXXX Sperapani, Roger Joseph, or

Ruggero Temperini.

XXXXX Torres, Hermelinda, or Maria

Hermelinda Torres.

XXXXXXXXXX Torres, Anastacio, or Anastacio

Torres-Villa.

XXXXXXXXXX Wecker, Karl Ludwig Paul.

XXXXXXXXXX Wein, Martin, or Moshe Weinschenker.

XXXXXXXXXX Wong, Ella Guadalupe (nee Elia Guadalupe Fuu Perez).

XXXXXXXXXX Minner, Robert Franz Cornelius.

XXXXXXXXXX York, Norma Louise, or Norma

Louise Smith or Sunny York or Sunny Smith

or Norma Howell or Sunny Howell.

XXXXX Grey, Alice Mary (see Samson).

XXXXXXXXXX Grey, Henry James.

XXXXXXXXXX Medina-Zamudio, Isidro Medina.

XXXXXXXXXX Medina, Emilia Garcia, or

Amelia Garcia Medina or Amelia Garcia

Medina-Zamudio or Amelia Medina or

Amelia Garcia or Emilia Garcia or Emilia

Medina.

XXXXXXXXXX Avalos, Elias.

XXXXXXXXXX Avalos, Francisco, or Francisco

Avalos Rios or Francisco Rios Avalos.

XXXXXXXXXX Avalos, Jose.

XXXXXXXXXX Britton, Wilfred.

XXXXXXXXXX Deste, Mario.

XXXXXXXXXX De Valdespino, Aurelia Villarreal, or Aurelia Villarreal De Devalos or Aurelia Villarreal-Gomez or Maria Villarreal.

XXXXXXXXXX Fischer, Felice Breier, or Felice

Breyer Fischer.

XXXXXXXXXX Ghilarducci, Francesco (Frank)

(alias Joe Martini).

XXXXXXXXXX Glunz, Richard Johann.

XXXXXXXXXX Maroudis, John Leonidas.

XXXXXXXXXX Tarazon, Dionicio, or Francisco

Valencia or Jose Sanchez.

XXXXXXXXXX Barry, Olive Inez (nee Williams).

XXXXXXXXXX Barry, Leopold Orlando.

XXXXXXXXXX Callwood, Gladys.

XXXXXXXXXX Callwood, Ina.

XXXXXXXXXX Callwood, Princess Andora (nee

Fahle).

XXXXXXXXXX Stavrides, Theoharis Stavros.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 95) relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

XXXXXXXXXX Abbas, Shaki or Shake alias Shake Shassen.

XXXXXXXXXX Ackland, Robert McLuckie.

XXXXXXXXXX Acosta, Rudolfo Ruiz.

XXXXXXXXXX Adler, Barbara.

XXXXX Alfonso, Antonio Joaquim.

XXXXXXXXXX Aftosmes, Demetrios or James

Aftosmes.

XXXXXXXXXX Agullera, Guillermo.

XXXXXXXXXX Agullera-Flores, Antonia or

Tony Agullera-Flores.

XXXXXXXXXX Aidecon-Lezamez, Juan.

XXXXX Alonso, Orestes or Orestes Esteban Alonso y Arencibia or Rafael Fuentes.

XXXXXXXXXX Arens, Hermanus Josephus

Aloysius Cecilia or Hermanus J. A. C. Arens.

XXXXXXXXXX Alvarez, Lucy Amaya or Maria

De La Luz Alvarez.

XXXXXXXXXX Amador-Flores, Dimas.

XXXXXXXXXX Andreason, Genoveva (nee

Nasura).

XXXXX Andronoff, Stephan.

XXXXXXXXXX Angelcovich, Spas Risto or

Spasa Risto Angelcovich.

XXXXXXXXXX Anglin, Loretta (nee Nairne)

or Loretta Agatha Anglin.

XXXXXXXXXX Apodaca, Inocente.

XXXXXXXXXX Armstrong, Angelina or Ange-

lina Misa.

XXXXXXXXXX Arrien, Ignacio or Ignacio Ula-

cia or Ignacio Ula Arrien.

XXXXXXXXXX Arriola, Pedro or Rosales.

XXXXXXXXXX Arslanian, George or Nazaret

Arslanian.

XXXXXXXXXX Artimovski, Pavel or Pavel

Artimovsky or Paul Duricka or Pavor Arti-

moszke or Pavel Artimosky.

XXXXXXXXXX Athanasiou, Ioannis Vasilios or

John Athanasiou or Athanasiou.

XXXXXXXXXX Atkinson, Margaret (nee Maggie

Clarke).

XXXXX Attis, Rupert Ernest.

XXXXXXXXXX Aubain, Joseph Jules Firmin.

XXXXXXXXXX Augoustis, John Deamatis.

XXXXX Avedesian, George Krikor.

XXXXX Avedesian, Hyganoosh.

XXXXXXXXXX Bakke, Aina Eugenia or Aaine

Eugenia Broo (maiden name).

XXXXXXXXXX Balbi, Aniello.

XXXXXXXXXX Ballas, John formerly Janos

Balazs.

XXXXXXXXXX Bangos, Jim John or Demetrios

John Bangos.

XXXXXXXXXX Bangos, John Jim.

XXXXXXXXXX Barlow, Leslie Denise.

XXXXXXXXXX Barnes, Percy Stuart Joseph.

XXXXX Bartelt, John Detlef.

XXXXXXXXXX Bassonetti, Achille.

XXXXXXXXXX Batista, Alfredo Jose.

XXXXXXXXXX Bottaro, Carlo or Carlo Delan

Grallo or Carlo Battaro.

XXXXXXXXXX Baltazar-Lozano, Alberto.

XXXXXXXXXX Bauer, Hagen Herbert.

XXXXX Becker, Monica Inge.

XXXXXXXXXX Bilbao, Justo Echevarria or

Justo Bilbao.

XXXXXXXXXX Berghe, Joseph Alfert Van Den

or Joseph Alfred Van Den Berghe.

XXXXXXXXXX Berr, Lena (nee Tzadikoff).

XXXXXXXXXX Betcher, Edward or Eduards

Betchers.

XXXXXXXXXX Bisceglie, Michele.

XXXXXXXXXX Bishop, Joyce Evelyn.

XXXXXXXXXX Blackette, Beresford Hugh.

XXXXXXXXXX Blanshard, Florence.

XXXXXXXXXX Bley, Anna Friederike (nee

Hochbach).

XXXXXXXXXX Bleziotes, Haralambos or Harry

Bleziotes.

XXXXXXXXXX Bocca, Stefano or Stephen.

XXXXXXXXXX Boeckmann, Emmy or Bock-

mann or Bockman (nee Doerner).

XXXXXXXXXX Boen, Joen Fong or Boen Joen

Fong or Stephen Boon.

XXXXXXXXXX Bonivy, Doris Bowles (nee Pin-

der).

XXXXXXXXXX Borges, Eduardo Ferreira.

XXXXXXXXXX Borgias, Constantinos Nicholas.

XXXXXXXXXX Brennan, Joseph Francis.

XXXXXXXXXX Brizich, Pete or Pedro or Petar

Brizic.

XXXXXXXXXX Brodowicz, Adela or Adela Boro-

sleqicz or Adell Boreseviecalte.

XXXXXXXXXX Brooke, Cheryl Louise.

XXXXXXXXXX Brooker, Barry Charles.

XXXXXXXXXX Brown, Louis Withington.

XXXXX Brown, Shizu Ozasa.

XXXXXXXXXX Brull, Maria Victoria Puig.

XXXXXXXXXX Brull, Mercedes Puig.

XXXXXXXXXX Brull, Pedro Eduardo Puig.

XXXXXXXXXX Brunner, Julius.

XXXXXXXXXX Buchanan, Peter Francis.

- Bustamante, Lauro or Lauro Bustamantes or Laurito Bustamante.
 Cabano, Alfonso Davide.
 Cafiero, Federico or Frederico or Ferderick Cafiero.
 Caretti, Giovanni Angelo or John Caretti.
 Cassella, Marjorie formerly McDonald (nee Eldred).
 Cathelin, Rose or Rose Varga or Sandorne Istvan.
 Centore, Gaetano.
 Chakalis, Spiros or Sam Chakalis.
 Chalom, Haim or Haim Cholom.
 Chan, Chin Yi.
 Charles, Hilda.
 Chavez, Isabel Tapia.
 Chen Helen Kuang-Ih or Kuang-Ih Chen.
 Chen, Eugene Yu Ming or Yu-Ming Chen.
 Cherubino, Giuseppe or Joseph Carabino or Joseph Calluchio.
 Childress, Betty Christine or Betty Christine Bradley.
 Chu, Phyllis Lai or Lai Fui Jen.
 Clarke, Alva John.
 Clarke, Geraldine Rae.
 Clarke, Jazell.
 Clarke, John Alva.
 Clarke, Marguerite or Margaret Clarke.
 Clarke, Margaret Helen (nee Macleod).
 Clarke, Sybil Rae.
 Codreanu, Gregoire Georges or George Codreanu.
 Colasante, Josephine (Giuseppina) formerly Moggio.
 Conside, John William.
 Coombs, Catherine Maude or Catherine Maude Brown.
 Cornelos, Stefanos Michael or Steve M. Cornellos or Stefanos Michael Cornellos or Stefanos Kornelos.
 Cornier, Candida Rosa nee Leger) alias Anglianda.
 Cosgrove, Ernest Howard.
 Coughlin, Joseph Michael.
 Coultas, Bramwell Gerald.
 Courtney, Marilyn Patricia.
 Crough, Yvonne Lapierre.
 Cummins, Sylvia Millicent (nee Ruwald).
 D'Addario, Eva Johanna or Eva Johanna Deyhle or Deyle.
 Dale, Percy Oliver.
 Dale, Annie Elizabeth.
 Dalsass, Angelo Pietro or Joe Dalsass or Joe Dansass or Joseph Dansass.
 Davidson, Margaret Campbell.
 Davidson, Alice Campbell.
 Davis, Helen Augustine or Helen Augustine Romney.
 De Alcuz, Luis Gregorio.
 De Browne, Maria De La Paz Romero Hernandez or Maria S. Browne.
 Da Cunha, Diogo.
 De Cantu, Francisca Castaneda or Francisco Castaneda Vda De Flores.
 De Esquivel, Teresa Sanchez Vda. or Teresa Sanchez De Esquivel or Teresa Sanchez or Maria Teresa Esquivel.
 De Jesus, Pastor.
 De Montoya, Maria De Los Angeles-Delgado or Angela Delgado or Jeannie Barragan.
 De Martinez, Emma Scarbrough or De Martinez, Herminia Samano or Herminia Samano de Loza or Herminia Loza and Erminia Samano or Erminia Samano De Martinez.
 De Martinez, Maria Brisenor or Maria B. Martinez.
 De Sanchez, Constanca Gonzalez.
 De Siebert, Emily or Emily De Bois or Aranka Emily De Bois.
 Demiris, Vasilios Georgiou or William John Demeris.
 Desantis, Gaetano.
 Deyl, Cornelius Mariuns or Charlie Deyl.
 Diaz, Rafael or Rafael Dias.
 Diegele, Babette (nee Paul).
 Dietrich, Stefan or Dietich.
 Digenis, Ioannis Spyros or John Spyros Digenis.
 Dinwiddie, Gilbert Meade.
 Domingo, Herbert Oscar.
 Dominguez, Domingo Yanez y or Domingo Yanes.
 Doss, Kathryn (nee Burtchael).
 Borsch, Constanca Lumpun (nee Catubig).
 Dorsch, John Armand.
 Dos Santos Da Silva, Joao or John Silva Santos.
 Drexler, Jean Fay (nee Jean Fay Goldfarb).
 Doval, Antonio Jose.
 Edwards, Pradisth Cheosakul.
 Edwards, Samuel Octavius.
 Elden, Amy Delores (nee Watt), formerly Barry.
 Elsler, Mikulas.
 Elsler, Ester (nee Kalis).
 Ekeseth, Trygbe Lorentz or Theodore or Teddy Lorentz Ekeseth.
 Elizondo-Sanchez, Mauricia or Maria Mauricia Elizondo.
 Elizondo-Sanchez, Alicia or Anita Alicia Elizondo.
 Elton, Henry John.
 Elton, Claire Harriet.
 Emmers, John.
 Emmers, Erna or Janis May Emmers or Hermesen or Erna Bardul or Marija Matilde Erna Emmer or Hermesen.
 Espanza-Orosco, Guadalupe.
 Espinosa-Arroyo, Jose or Jose Espinosa.
 Evans, Kenneth Joseph.
 Ezra, Regina (nee Schayek).
 Ezra Rosemary Ann.
 Ezra, Diana Louise.
 Falck Maximilian or Alfred Falk.
 Faero, Anna Maria.
 Fattorusso, Gennaro Antonio.
 Faudoa, Marcelina or Marcelina Faudoa De Jaralera.
 Feher, Lester or Ladislaus or Laudislaus or Laszlo Feher or Feher Laszlo.
 Ferguson, John Munro.
 Fernandez, Francisco Ramos y or Francisco Ramos or Frank Ramos.
 Ferola, Gabriel Emanuel.
 Ferreiro, Rosenda or Rosenda Sanchez Perez.
 Ferro, Antonio or Anthony Venturi.
 Filippi, Angelina or Angelina Lemmi.
 Fisko, Stefanie, or Stephanie Bazert Patch or Stella Stephanie Patch or Stella Patch or Stephanie Stella Bazert or Bieser or Stefania Danis or Dennis (nee Bieser) or Stefania PYC or Petch.
 Flynn, Lillian (nee Hoffenreich) formerly Neubauer and Fritz.
 Foo, Chu Chung or Chung Fu Chee or Chung Fee Chee.
 Ford, John Goodfellow or Jack Ford.
 Forder, William John.
 Forder, Elizabeth (nee Lloyd).
 Forneas, Palmira Alvarez or Palmira Alvarez Vidal (maiden name).
 Freiberg, Anna Marie (nee Anna Marie Hansen).
 Frenkel, Irma or Irma Mary Frenkel.
 Frett, Iris Emelita (nee Creque).
 Freudenthal, Agustina Velary or Agustina Gomez.
 Friers, Ernest Alfred.
 Friedemann, Ingrid Elizabeth or Sheldon.
 Garza-Hernandez, Antonio.
 Gaskell, Wilhelmina Trinidad or Mina Gaskell.
 Gaskell, Leonardo or Dan Gaskell.
 Gavaletz, Joseph Machael.
 Georgatos, Philimon or George Poulos.
 Giannantoni, Ester or Esterina Maria Giuseppa Giannantoni or Sister Ester Giannantoni.
 Georgiadis, Dimitrios George or James George or Jimmy Georgiadis.
 Geyer, Muriel Kathleen or Muriel Kathleen Hovey (nee Brooks).
 Giannos, George Konstantine.
 Gifford, Peter Ernest.
 Godinez-Angulano, Jesus or Jesus Godinez Angulano or Jose Godinez-Angulano.
 Goldberg, Machael Alexander or Michael Alexander Rinnhofer.
 Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Francisco or Francisco Rodriguez.
 Goodson, James Henry.
 Goodwin, Lida or Lida Nitov (nee Lida Gochman).
 Grant, Anna Catherine (nee Carantonis).
 Graziotto, Pietro.
 Green, Halcha Mary (nee Alcock).
 Green, Harry.
 Grindheim, Oskar Johan Ingvaldson.
 Groleau, Joseph Leo.
 Grossman, Konrad.
 Gruios, Kosta or Kosta Gruioff.
 Guvesch, Michael or Mike Gubesch.
 Guerrero, Manuel or Manuel Guerrero-Rodriguez.
 Guiffre, Andrea or Clavaro Sicilian.
 Gulab, Jam Dad or Jan Dad Gulab.
 Gutierrez, Ricardo Cruz.
 Gutman, Henry or Indric Gutman.
 Guzman-Marin, Baldomero.
 Halmenlahti, Rauno Uolevi.
 Halsbenning, Anton Gustav.
 Halyrewicz, Pauline or Pauline Burbulak.
 Hansen, Benny Byrstring.
 Harris, Charles John alias John Doran.
 Harrison, Andrew Robinson.
 Hawnslay, Benjamin Eric.
 Heidel, Baerbel Maria.
 Heidel, Christel Elisabeth.
 Henderson, Adam John.
 Henderson, Rose Margaret formerly Blood (nee Ogenski).
 Hennings, Antje.
 Henriksen, Harry Hilbert.
 Hermosillo, Maria Guadalupe Carvajal or Maria Guadalupe Hermosillo.
 Hernandez, Domingo or Domingo Hernandez Saucedo.
 Hernandez-Jimenez, Francisco.
 Hernandez-Jimenez, Crencio.
 Hernandez, Leocadia Meila Vda.
 Hernandez, Ramon.
 Herrera, Andres or Andres Martinez Herrera.
 Heumann, Gad Yosef.
 Hieronymus, Margaret Helen.
 Hinttala, Aimo Johannes.
 Hoffer, Beatrice.
 Hoffmann, Else Anna.
 Hoestlandt, Jacqueline Marthe (Hoag).
 Hovaler, Franz or Frank Hovaler or Frank Hoval.

XXXX Hudepohl, Rose Catherine Louise or Rose Hudepohl or Rose Rodriguez or Rose Ricciardi.
 XXXXXXX Hutton, Leyan Angelica or Leyan Angelica Kuntz or Leyton Angelica Kuntz.
 XXXXXXX Ingrassia, Orlando or Tony.
 XXXXXXX Irsius, Albertus or Albertas Irsius or Albertus Irsius or Albert Hirsch or Albertas Girsch.
 XXXXXXX Jaramillo, Nancy Isabel or Nancy Isabel Benton or Nancy J. Benton.
 XXXXXXX Jarvi, Suoma Aleksandra or Suoma Aleksandra Uotila or Sally Udd.
 XXXXXXX Joeschke, Monica.
 XXXXXXX Johansen, Hans.
 XXXXXXX Jorgenson, Florence Marie (nee Patterson) formerly Bienieck, alias Marie Bienieck.
 XXXXXXX Kalagias, Markos Peter.
 XXXXXXX Kara, John Said or Hanna Said Kara.
 XXXXXXX Karras, Ourania (nee Dede or Dege).
 XXXXXXX Katchadoorian, Zaroche (nee Kolian) formerly Havaginian.
 XXXXXXX Kates, Frederick William (nee Kaatz).
 XXXXXXX Kedziora, Joseph Harold or Joseph Kedziora or Joseph Francis Kedor or Joseph Kedar.
 XXXXXXX Kelly, Sieglinde or Linda Kelly.
 XXXXXXX Kepich, John.
 XXXXXXX Kiel, Rubin or Robert Cohen.
 XXXXXXX Klein, Arthur August or Arthur Klein or Arthur A. Klein.
 XXXXXXX Kloss, Johanna M.
 XXXXXXX Kloss, Karl Reinhold.
 XXXXXXX Knight, Ruby Walls (nee Ruby Weir Walls).
 XXXXXXX Knott, Jean (nee Larose).
 XXXXXXX Koelner, Raphael.
 XXXXXXX Kohl, Gunter Georg or Gunter Kohl or Guenter Kohl.
 XXXXXXX Kolodrubski, Ivan or John Kolodrubski.
 XXXXXXX Konishi, Shigeki.
 XXXXXXX Koo, Jam Cheong.
 XXXXXXX Korsnak, Peter or Joseph Kopchak.
 XXXXXXX Koschak, Jane Camilla or Jane Camilla Berner.
 XXXXXXX Koupal, Peter Michael or Peter Michael Lumsden.
 XXXXXXX Kriwcek, George Viktor.
 XXXXXXX Krumins, Aro.
 XXXXXXX Krumins, Astra.
 XXXXXXX Kundrak, Michael.
 XXXXXXX Kurek, Paul Ignatz or Hans Kroll or Kurney.
 XXXXXXX Kwassman, Rifka (nee Rifka Garten).
 XXXXXXX Lachowicz, Dorthy (nee Kuzma).
 XXXXXXX Ladow, Irene Andreevna (nee Dmitrieva).
 XXXXXXX Lagana, Giovanni or Giovanni Lagano.
 XXXXXXX Lamarca, Gaetano.
 XXXXXXX Lamoretti, Giovanni or John Lamoretti.
 XXXXXXX Lau, Ching Sut.
 XXXXXXX Lau, Lee Sook.
 XXXXXXX Lara-Sotelo, Esquipula.
 XXXXXXX Lara-Amarillas, Maria Elena.
 XXXXXXX Lardaro, Francesco or Frank Lardaro.
 XXXXXXX Latsis, Stamatios John.
 XXXXXXX Latvel, Helen or Helen Latvel (nee Helene Alexandravitch).
 XXXXXXX Lazarus, Isidor or Lee Lane or L. Lerner or L. Hillman.
 XXXXXXX Leduc, Françoise (Frances).
 XXXXXXX Lee, Phyllis Pui Yan.
 XXXXXXX Li, Annie Sheng (Hwai Lu) or Annie Sheng (Hwai Lu).
 XXXXXXX Licari, Maria Angela.
 XXXXXXX Lim, Harry Leonard.
 XXXXXXX Lindquist, Birger Otto or Bob Lindquist.

XXXXXXXX Lipp, Gerhard or Gerhard Keltor or Gary Keltor.
 XXXXXXX Lisker, Sally or Sally Fischler, or Sally Winter or Sara.
 XXXXXXX Liu, Pei-Chang or Florence M. Liu or Buol Ciong Lau.
 XXXXXXX Lombardi, Luigi.
 XXXXXXX Lombardi, Anna.
 XXXXXXX Lopez, Antonio Santamaria or Antonio Santamaria.
 XXXXXXX Lopez, Juan Francisco or Juan Francisco Lopez-Manriquez.
 XXXXXXX Lorenzo, Dolores Rego.
 XXXXXXX Loriga, Salvatore.
 XXXXXXX Louie, Sing Hon, also David Louie.
 XXXXXXX Louie, Wigney Shee.
 XXXXXXX Lovejoy, Kathleen (nee Toner).
 XXXXXXX Luczak, Michele Cecile.
 XXXXXXX Ludicke, Karl or Karl Luedicke.
 XXXXXXX Luna-Garcia, Cleofas.
 XXXXXXX Lung, Evelyn or Eng Gick Ling.
 XXXXXXX Maennik, Kai.
 XXXXXXX Maennik, Reet.
 XXXXXXX Malmberg, Walter August Paul.
 XXXXXXX Makrides, Efstratios.
 XXXXXXX Malenfant, Gerard, now Gerard Andre Goodbold.
 XXXXXXX Mandujan, Emilia or Emilia Rodriguez.
 XXXXXXX Maralotto, Pietro Giobatta.
 XXXXXXX Markelos, Raftopoulos or Mike Raft.
 XXXXXXX Marrale, Gerlando or John Marrale or John Morrale.
 XXXXXXX Martens, Mildred Ludmilla (Ludmilla Surjenko, maiden name) formerly Mildren Ryan.
 XXXXXXX Mattei, Noel.
 XXXXXXX Mayer-Ziotti, Gabriella Gemma or Gabriella Snowden.
 XXXXXXX Meaurio, Josefina or Josephine Rice, Jr., or Josephine Meaurio or Mrs. Joseph Rice, Jr., or Josephine Coennen.
 XXXXXXX Mendolia, Luigi.
 XXXXXXX Mendrinos, John Ioannis.
 XXXXXXX Menges, Ingrid Hilde.
 XXXXXXX Mering, Esther (nee Stern).
 XXXXXXX Mers, Henriette Marie.
 XXXXXXX Marzano, Tommaso.
 XXXXXXX Mescheriakoff, Mary Vladamir.
 XXXXXXX Mescheriakoff, Militsa.
 XXXXXXX Mescheriakoff, Tomislav Nicholas.
 XXXXXXX Mihaliadis, Christos alias Christ Mihaliadis alias Christ Mihalloupi alias Christos Michalioudis alias Christos Michaliadis alias Christos Michalidis alias Christos Miraliodis.
 XXXXXXX Miofas, Costas.
 XXXXXXX Misfeld, Daniel Friedrich or Friedrich Mihsfeld.
 XXXXXXX Molina, Augustine, Jr., or Augustin Molina.
 XXXXXXX Mongiat, Domenico.
 XXXXXXX Monje, Maria De Jesus.
 XXXXXXX Monroy, Oscar Juarez.
 XXXXXXX Montgomery, Gelerina del Rosario.
 XXXXXXX Moragues, Gabriel Alemany or Gabriel Alemany.
 XXXXXXX Moran, Ernesto Perez.
 XXXXXXX Morlaty, Sharon Vicki Ann or Sharon Vicki Ann Rutherford.
 XXXXXXX Morrison, Lawson Alexander.
 XXXXXXX Moulton, Peter William alias Rowe.
 XXXXXXX Moustakas, Pericles or Peter Moustakas.
 XXXXXXX Mukal, Isao or Sam Mukal.
 XXXXXXX Munoz-Silva, Pedro alias Francisco Flores.
 XXXXXXX Murakami, Fumiye (nee Koyama) or Fumie Koyama or Humie Koyama.
 XXXXXXX Muskopf, John of Johan Muskopf.
 XXXXXXX Muskopf, Magdalena.
 XXXXXXX Muskopf, Rose or Rosalia Muskopf.
 XXXXXXX Myhre, Ragnvald Johannes.

XXXX McCoubrey, Evelyn Beryl nee Allsop.
 XXXXXXX McIlvaine, Sixta Bernil.
 XXXXXXX McWilliam, Doris Bertha or Doris Bertha Nixon.
 XXXXXXX Nagly, Gersohn Joseph.
 XXXXXXX Nahan, Gilberto Micheline Jeannine.
 XXXXXXX Nargiz, Rico George or Krikor Badarjikian and Krikor.
 XXXXXXX Nava-Luna, Andres or Andres Nava.
 XXXXXXX Nelly, Lydia Estrella or Lydia Atienza Estrella.
 XXXXXXX Newman, Signa E. alias Hanna Aaltonen.
 XXXXXXX Nilsen, Nils or Nilsan or Nilson or Nielsen.
 XXXXXXX Nina, Jose Dos Santos.
 XXXXXXX Niva, Eleanor Mary (nee Eleanor Mary Miller).
 XXXXXXX Nocera, Giovanna Maria (nee Farasporo).
 XXXXXXX Nunez, Ramon or Raymond Nunez.
 XXXXXXX Oerlemans, Alesandra Eleanora or Alesandra Eleanora Laniewska (Laniauskaite).
 XXXXXXX Okumura, Shotaro.
 XXXXXXX Oliveira, Gwendolyn.
 XXXXXXX O'Neal, Marie Cleopatra or Marie C. O'Neal or Marie C. O. O'Neal.
 XXXXXXX Ong, Arnold Kwok or Ong Kwok On or Arnold K. Ong.
 XXXXXXX O'Rourke, Sarah or Smyth or Smith or Sarah Burke.
 XXXXXXX Ortega, Miguel or Miguel Porras Ortega.
 XXXXXXX Osoling, Olaf.
 XXXXXXX Osorio, Alfonso Ramos.
 XXXXXXX Palios, Markos.
 XXXXXXX Palios, Lanbros Marcou or Lam-bros Marcou Palliou.
 XXXXXXX Panagis, Eudokia (nee Reizi).
 XXXXXXX Paneth, Eli.
 XXXXXXX Paneth, Hanna.
 XXXXXXX Paoletti, Loredana.
 XXXXXXX Pappadopoulos, Haralambos John or Harry John Pappas.
 XXXXXXX Pappas, Chariclea alias Chariclea L. Papanaoim alias Chariclea Papa (nee Marinos).
 XXXXXXX Pappas, Helene Marcos or Pappalonnis (nee Helen or Eleni Gregorios Komnisi).
 XXXXXXX Paravalos, Antonios or Anthony Valos.
 XXXXXXX Pardo-Loredo, Ramon.
 XXXXXXX Paser, Latip John.
 XXXXXXX Paves, Fanny (nee Davidson).
 XXXXXXX Pefanis, Gerasimos Demetrios.
 XXXXXXX Perez, Isidro Remijio or Isidro Remijio or Isidro Remigio or Isidro Remigio Perez.
 XXXXXXX Remijio, Eulegio or Eulegio Remijio or Eulegio Remijio-Gonzalez.
 XXXXXXX Remijio, Hipolito.
 XXXXXXX Perez, Juan Martinez.
 XXXXXXX Perrone, Angelo.
 XXXXXXX Perz, Anna or Anna Stiene.
 XXXXXXX Petagara, Ernesto Fronteras.
 XXXXXXX Petsas, Nicolaos (or Nicholas) or Nick Petsas.
 XXXXXXX Pickles, Engelia Theresa.
 XXXXXXX Pilot, Pietro or Ermengildo Pilor or Ermengildo Pillot of Peter Pilot or Pete Pilot.
 XXXXXXX Ping, Ho or Benny Hall.
 XXXXXXX Pitirri, Calogera (nee Curto).
 XXXXXXX Pole, Daniel Arnold.
 XXXXXXX Postorino, Giancarlo.
 XXXXXXX Prager, Beatriz Elizabeth Gonzalez or (Betty) Beatriz Llaneza Prager.
 XXXXXXX Presas, Gerardo Bruguera.
 XXXXXXX Promm-Cornelius, Peter or Peter Clark.
 XXXXXXX Pscheck, Elisabeth Maria Von or Elizabeth Maria Von P. Scheck or Elizabeth M. Koepfer.
 XXXXXXX Punt, Gunter.

Pyfrom, Graciela Ysabel or Graciela Isabel de Jesus Reno y Delgado de Pyfrom.

Raag, Merika.

Rabenou, Khalil.

Ramirez-Guaracha, Basilio.

Ramirez-Maldonado, Nicolas.

Ramos, Orlando Maria.

Rankin, Margaret Geddes.

Renfrew, Gladys Lavinia Ann Dorus (nee Brito-Paulickpulle or Sita Renfrew).

Reno, Loretta (nee Hubbert).

Rezou, Harry Demetrios.

Richardson, Idalia or Idalia Parson.

Rieger, Ulf.

Rikuris, Edite.

Rocco, Francesco or Frank Rocco.

Rocha, Jose Castelo.

Rodriguez, Feliciano Fontan or Feliciano Fontan.

Rodriguez-Grenfell, Horacio or Horacio Rodriguez.

Rodriguez-Zavala, Jose.

Roensch, Gustav.

Roensch, Richard Albert.

Roensch, George Alfred.

Roensch, Mary Agnes.

Rojas-Terrazas, Rodolfo or Alberto C. Terrazas.

Rooney, Anna Marie or Rea Rooney (nickname).

Royce, Dorothy Beryl (nee Fleming).

Roy-Munro, Royston or Roy Munro.

Rubio, Luciano or Luciano Rubio Chavez.

Rudyk, John or Jan Rudyk.

Rueda, Petra Aguiar or Petra Aguiar.

Rugnone, Peter or Pietro.

Ruhl, Ida Franziska or Ida Franziska Hermes.

Ruiz, Pascual Vidal.

Rumpell, Ludwina Catherin or Rumpell or Kwasnicki.

Russell, Charlotte (nee Stewart).

Ruta, Nunzio Giovanni Francesco or Nunzio Ruta.

Salgado, Jose Manuel.

Saloumis, Stelios or Steve Saloumis.

Samson, James Patrick or James Patrick Painting.

Sanchez, Manuel Carrasco.

Sander, Johanne Anne.

Sarzan, Ahmet Haldi or Haldi Fevzi Sarhan.

Savala, Nello.

Savka, Juro or George Savka.

Schertler, Perta or Romana Strasser.

Schneck, Yvette.

Schrank, Waltraud.

Schultz, Hugo Emil Karl.

Schulzter, Alfred or Fred Peterson.

Sederlund, Carl Gustav Alfred.

Seiberl, Anna (nee Hinterholz).

Simoutre, Mireille Cecile Jeanne.

Serelis, Theodore Vassiliou.

Serna-Garza, Aurelio or Aurelio Cerna.

Serna-Garza, Carmen or Carmen Cerna.

Serna-Garza, Leopolda.

Serna-Garza, Pedro or Pedro Cerna.

Serna-Garza, Reynaldo.

Sewell, Lillian Maude or Lillian Maude Grossin or McCressin.

Shamanduroff, Visha Rokas (nee Visha Dimitroff Rokoff).

Shiray, Rachib Kalille or Robert Shiray or Joseph Haleb Abraham or Bob Mahool.

Short, Kate (nee Goldenberg).

Shu, John K. or Shu Ser Kong.

Sideris, Basilios.

Simpson, Michael Richard.

Sing, Tse Foo or Francis Tse.

Sittinger, John Evangelist.

Sivaslian, Vertayim.

Small, Oliver or Sydney Bailey.

Smith, Filo Sussie (nee Solomon).

Smith, Olga Fausta Riesco.

Socha, Josephine or Marczak Katazyina.

Sock, Chin or Chin Leong Goot.

Solano, Eva.

Solans, Emilio or Emilio Solans Pastor.

Solarek, Marta (nee Marta Martha) Staniszewska).

Sommer, Joseph George or Joseph Sommers or Joseph Fink.

Sosa, Julio.

Souto, Rosendo Gonzalez.

Spertrino, Joseph or Joe or Giuseppe Anthony Spertrino.

Stalco, Antonio.

Statheros, Stamatios Evangelos or Steve Statheros.

Stavroutias, Basil B. or Bill Starr.

Stefanopoulos, Nicholas George.

Steinhauser, Edith Elizabeth or Sprague.

Stirbl, Ludwig.

Stoddard, Marion Burns or Marion Burns Stoddard Flanagan.

Stoyonoff, Spiro or Spiro Stoyon.

Strej, Iona Clark nee Clark.

Strelnek, Helen (nee Yedwiga Jakstat) or Helen Strelnick or Toschki Hadl.

Stuifbergen, Veronica Emily.

Subhra, Raja Krishan or R. K. Subhra and Jimmy Subhra.

Supicich, Joseph or Josip Kazimir Supicic or Joseph Supicic.

Tamayo-Quintero, Jesus.

Tanca, Gonul.

Tauchnitz, Hans Georg.

Tentes, John, or Ioannis Tendis.

Tercero, Teresa, or Teresa Tercero.

Theofilos, Constantinos P.

Torres, Juan Rios, or John Rios Torres.

Townsend, Emma Mona (nee Emma Mona MacFarland).

Trevino-Morales, Miguel.

Tsang, Shui Wing, or Mickey Tsang.

Turke, Henry Leonard, or Henry Turk or Enrique Lautero Turke Thierback.

Turkovich, Frances Magdalene (nee Curnell), or Josephine Soroka.

Udiman, Viviane Berthe Madeleine.

Urizar, Daniel.

Urmston, Lucy Matilda.

Valente, Pasquale.

Vallone, Pietro.

Van Eepoel, Laura Catherine.

Van Heemstra, Franz Julius Johan.

Van Heemstra, Maria Ingenata (nee Visser).

Varga, Joseph or Josef.

Varvarigos, Nicholas John or Nicholas Ioannou Varvarigos.

Vattuone, Giuseppe Emanuele.

Vega, Maria De Los Angeles Palacin De La.

Verfaillie, Julius.

Verfaillie, Marie Elodia (nee Decock).

Vikingstad, Ole Kornelius or Ole Corneleus Vikingstad or Ole C. Vikingstad or Ole Vikingstad.

Villalpando-Rangel, Jose De Jesus.

Visser, Jeanne Emmen Riedel (nee Emmen Riedel).

Vitali, Julio or Giulio Vitali.

Vourazerios, Ioannis or John Nick Vourazeris.

Wakim, Marie, Maria Wakim, Marie Beatrice Wakim, Mary S. M. Wakim, Mary Wakim, Mary Petros, Maria De Wakim (nee Saleem-Moawad) or Salum-Moawad.

Ward, Anthony David Liewel-lyn.

Wechter, Marcia (or Margaret or Margot).

Wechter, Sophie R.

Weissbach, Anna Marie (nee Winkler).

Weissshuh, Ferdinand F.

Weisz, Marcel.

Whalen, Malka Regina (nee Koliadicky) or Julviansky or Kulviasky or Malka Kolitz or Malka Blau or Blay.

White, Arthur Emanuel or Arthur Raymond Wynter White.

Why, Cher or Caher Why.

Wing, Chew Him or Wong Shew Wing or Him Wing Chew or Him Chew Wing or Jack Wing.

Wirchianski, Anna.

Wisser Josephin or Josephine Kline or Josephine Wolff.

Witting, George Karl or Georg Witting.

Wo, Chung or Chin Wo or Chung Ho or Chang Wo or Chin Woo.

Woegerer, Ferdinand or Maximilian Ferdinand Waldeck.

Wolf, Edith.

Wolf, Brigitta.

Wrin, Lulu Maude (nee Ferguson).

Wylupek, Wojciech.

Rodriguez, y Juan Francisco Resituto or Rodriguez or Jose Santiago.

Yambouranis, Eryfile or Eryfile Constantine Psiropoulos.

Yanakis, Peter John or Panagiotis Ioannis Gianatsis or Peter John Pappas.

Yanakis, Evangelia or Evangelina or Evangelia Gianatsis (nee Papageorganti), or Evangelia Pappas.

Yanatsis, Emanuel Antonio.

Yee, John Hwa or John Yee.

Yilkyla, Ruth Emilia or Rauha Emilia Yilkyla.

Yoda, Kunio.

Yoda, Yukii.

Young, Helen Lewin or Helen Westman.

Young, Maris De La Paz or Maria De La Paz (Pacita) or San Luis Young.

Yu, Wei Fang, or Alice Wei Fang Yu.

Yuen, Andrew Sik Hop.

Yuen, Evenlye Chan Sheung.

Yun, Low or Lou Yun.

Zavala, Andrea Reyes.

Zeitz, Shirley Gloria Vallejo.

Zervas, Athanasios or Athanasios Demetrios Zervas.

Aghnides, Elie Prodromos or Elie P. Aghnides or Elie Aghnides.

Lin, Margaret Hie Ding or Lin Wei Tseng.

Sandler, Adolf.

Lidoskis, Marie Veniselos.

Veniselos, Hariclis, Kyriacos.

Veniselos, Nikatas K.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 25, line 5, strike out the registration number and name:

"Royce, Dorothy Beryl (nee Fleming)."

On page 32, after line 20, insert the following registration numbers and names:

"Bortolotto, Paolo.
Calovich, Mary or Mara Abram alias Mary Car.
Didner, Samuel.

“XXXXXXXXXX Edquid, Arturo M. or Arturo Maatubank Edquid.

“XXXXXXXXXX Livanos, Arletta Stavros nee Zafraakis.

“XXXXXXXXXX Mondillo, Giovanni Battista alias Giuseppe Battista Mondilla or Gio Batta Mondillo.

“XXXXXXXXXX Tonseth, Johanna Katharina Flood.”

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHOKO NISHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6832) for the relief of Choko Nishida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or any of the other provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit the entry into the United States for permanent residence of Choko Nishida, the Japanese fiancée of Clifford M. Sergeant, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Choko Nishida is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Clifford M. Sergeant and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Choko Nishida, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported at any time after entry in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156).

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, add the following:

“In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Choko Nishida, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Choko Nishida as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KIYOKO S. BARR AND HARUE BARR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7370) for the relief of Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 7, after the name “Harue Barr,” strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: “the Japanese wife and child, respectively, of Roger L. Barr, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. YUKIKO YOSHII FRENCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7919) for the relief of Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French, the wife of Raymond David French, a citizen of the United States and a member of the armed services, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 7, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: “not apply to Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French and her son, the wife and child respectively of Raymond David French, a citizen of the United States presently serving with the United States Armed Forces.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French and her son.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERALD GOODWIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8383) for the relief of Mrs. Gerald Goodwin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Gerald Goodwin, the wife of Gerald Goodwin, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

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.

KIMIKO TOMITA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8473) for the relief of Kimiko Tomita.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of

1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Kimiko Tomita, the Japanese fiancée of Toshio Henry Shiozaki, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Kimiko Tomita may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act.

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

KIMIKO YAMAGUCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8558) for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kimiko Yamaguchi, the Japanese fiancée of Angelo A. Amato, a citizen of the United States, and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Kimiko Yamaguchi may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Kimiko Yamaguchi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Angelo A. Amato, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Kimiko Yamaguchi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Kimiko Yamaguchi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Kimiko Yamaguchi as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon payment of the required fees and head taxes.

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.

MRS. YUMIKO KAWAI MISANIN AND HER DAUGHTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8684) for the relief of Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin and her daughter, Maria Mari Misanin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin, a Japanese national, who is the spouse of Michael G. Misanin, a United States citizen and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II and their minor child, Maria Mari Misanin shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed if they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof: “That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration

Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin and her daughter, Maria Mari Misanin, the Japanese wife and child, respectively, of Michael G. Misanin, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. TOKIKO AMANO ROLOSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8742) for the relief of Mrs. Tokiko Amano Roloson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Tokiko Amano Roloson, the wife of Robert J. Roloson, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

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.

YAEKO NAKAJIMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8826) for the relief of Yaeko Nakajima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yaeko Nakajima, the Japanese fiancée of Byron E. Emery, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Yaeko Nakajima shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that the said Yaeko Nakajima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Byron E. Emery and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yaeko Nakajima, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If the above-named parties are married within 3 months after the entry of the said Yaeko Nakajima, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yaeko Nakajima, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

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.

DR. NICOLA DI PALMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7563) for the relief of Dr. Nicola Di Palma.

XCVI—663

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Dr. Nicola Di Palma as of April 2, 1949, the date on which he entered the United States.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italian persons of the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "States", insert "upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HOWARD H. MORAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6697) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Howard H. Moran, Glasgow, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described land situated on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota: Allotment No. 6650, southwest quarter, section 31, township 39 south, range 28 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing 160 acres more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out everything following the comma after the figure "6650" and insert the following: "lots 3 and 4 and the east one-half, southwest quarter."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the first word "south" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section 31, township 39 north."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sixty-five."

Page 1, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Rosebud Sioux Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least sixty days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Rosebud Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of sixty days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such sixty days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Rosebud Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Rosebud Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Rosebud Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of sixty days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and re-

corded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JOSHUA BRITTON

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 487) to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That title in fee is hereby confirmed in Joshua Britton, who made entry under the act of 1847 under warrant numbered 52347 on May 21, 1849, at Shawneetown, Ill., district land office, his heirs and assigns, to all rights to and interest in the following-described lands in Jefferson County, Ill.:

West one-half of the southwest quarter of section 24, township 1 south, range 3 east, third principal meridian, Illinois.

The joint resolution 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "A Fraud and a Hoax."

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain items pertaining to Walter Winchell and his accusations against a certain Mr. Sidor.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune.

Mr. WHITAKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial on independence from a Bowling Green, Ky., paper.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. Lecompte asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a series of paragraphs from the Centerville (Iowa) Iowegian.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include four newspaper articles.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lefevre asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Evening Star.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Altoona Tribune of Saturday, July 8.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Allen, of the Boston Globe, on Sunday.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1949

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 696) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3809) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and all points of order against the said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 209]

Abbutt	Furcolo	McConnell
Allen, La.	Gathings	McMillen, III.
Andrews	Gillette	Marcantonio
Bailey	Gilmer	Mitchell
Barrett, Wyo.	Gordon	Monroney
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Morgan
Beggs, La.	Gregory	Morrison
Boykin	Hall	Murray, Tenn.
Breen	Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hare	Nelson
Bulwinkle	Harris	Norton
Burton	Havenner	Pace
Carroll	Hays, Ark.	Passman
Case, S. Dak.	Hébert	Patman
Chatham	Hill	Perkins
Chipperfield	Hinshaw	Pfeifer,
Christopher	Irving	Joseph L.
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Pfeiffer,
Combs	Johnson	William L.
Cooper	Kearns	Phillips, Tenn.
Cox	Keefe	Pickett
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Plumley
Dawson	Kilday	Poulson
Dingell	Larcade	Quinn
Durham	Lovre	Regan
Engel, Mich.	Lyle	Rivers
Frazier	McCarthy	Sadowski

Scott, Hardie	Thompson	White, Idaho
Sims	Vinson	Whitten
Smathers	Welch	Wills
Smith, Ohio	Werdel	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1949

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill S. 3809, known as the Extension of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. I shall not discuss the contents of the bill but rather confine myself to the rule.

Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Affairs appeared before the Committee on Rules and requested a rule waiving points of order and asking for a full day's debate. Yesterday afternoon the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], asked unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock so that we could consider this bill in detail.

The resolution also provides for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In view of the urgency of the situation at this particular time, I think this body should be given a full opportunity to hear the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have held a number of open sessions and a number of executive sessions on this subject. I shall, therefore, ask that the rule be adopted immediately.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we have been advised that tomorrow we will receive a message from the President of the United States. I do not profess to know exactly what the President will say in this message or all the recommendations he will make.

He will undoubtedly discuss the disturbing situation in Korea, the present inadequacy of our existing defense machinery, and he will recommend a sizable increase in appropriations for defense purposes.

I think I can say now that such a recommendation will have the overwhelming support of the Congress. Above all else, we are determined that our people have the best possible defense—a defense second to none—prepared to meet any emergency.

There is much that could be said about our tragic lack of preparedness as revealed by the developments in Korea. The Korean tragedy is not the fault of the Congress.

We have been spending around fifteen billions a year for defense purposes. It has been the Congress that has been insisting upon a larger Air Force. It has been the Congress that has prevented destruction of the Marine Corps. It has been the Congress that has repeatedly emphasized the need for supercarriers as mobile air bases, while some in charge

of our defense have tended to scuttle the Navy.

At a later date I shall probably have occasion to discuss the tragedy of errors, diplomatic and military, on the part of the administration that has resulted in the costly Korean reverses.

In view of necessity of increasing our defense expenditures I rise at this time to emphasize again how important it is that we put our fiscal house in order to meet this emergency situation. It is imperative that we reduce the expenditures for other things. We need more roads, more dams, and improved harbors. All these various public works projects have merit. But, Mr. Speaker, they should be postponed.

The omnibus appropriations bill is still pending in the Senate. We can still reduce proposed domestic spending by at least \$5,000,000,000 in order to meet these extraordinary defense requirements.

The greatest tragedy of all would be to destroy ourselves while seeking to defend ourselves. I cannot too strongly emphasize that a sound fiscal policy is as important to our national defense as men, guns, tanks, airplanes, and ships.

I earnestly urge a drastic reduction in domestic spending without delay. We must do it now, or it will again be too late and too little.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the Committee on the District of Columbia into war-scare profiteering in the District. Certain bakers in the District of Columbia, and I am advised the same thing is going on in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, and Boston, are raising the price of a loaf of bread 1 cent, for no reason at all. I am advised there is no justification of any kind for this conduct. It is an obvious and patent attempt by certain elements to take advantage of the existing emergency. This is the Nation's Capital. This is a good place for such an investigation to begin. It can serve as a warning to that element at any other place in the Nation or to any other business that might have the same idea. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia holds a meeting upon this resolution and acts immediately to crack down on this mob as of now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, some so-called Americans have made unconscionable profits out of war at the expense of ordinary citizens, including those doing the fighting and dying.

World War I made many millionaires. World War II, through cost-plus contracts, made more billion-dollar corporations and many more millionaires.

There has never been any excuse for this, and it is unthinkable today that anybody should profit from American blood now mixing with the mud of South Korea.

It is the duty of every Member of Congress and the administration to see to it

that no more profits are made out of wars in which this Nation is involved. And this includes such high-sounding but nevertheless deadly operations as United Nations police action. Wounds are just as painful and our dead are just as dead under the flag of the United Nations as under the flag of the United States. Fancy phrases and slogans provide no consolation in battle, especially when United Nations ground forces consist only of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the shooting started only 3 weeks ago, but already some prices are skyrocketing.

I call your attention to pork. For the week ending June 23, just prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, the average price of butcher hogs at Chicago was \$19.65 per hundredweight or 19.65 cents a pound, according to the Department of Agriculture. For the week ending July 14, the average price of butcher hogs was \$24, an increase of 4.35 cents a pound. Can the farmer be blamed? Of course not. The farmer is the only businessman in the country who has nothing to say as to his selling price. He takes what the buyer is willing to pay.

Now let us follow the hogs through the markets. For the week ending June 23, 10 to 12-pound loins were selling at 45.70 cents a pound wholesale at Chicago, according to the Department of Agriculture. For the week ending July 14, the same grade pork loins had jumped to 64.40 cents a pound or an increase of 18.70 cents a pound while pork on the hoof was increasing only 4.35 cents a pound.

Meanwhile, what was happening in the retail market at the corner store? A Department of Agriculture survey of the retail meat situation at Baltimore, in approximately the same period previously mentioned, showed that center cut pork chops went up from 78 to 85 cents a pound, an increase of 7 cents.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the picture: Live hogs increased 4.35 cents a pound. Retail pork chops increased 7 cents a pound. Wholesale pork loins increased 18.70 cents a pound.

Who is getting fat in the pork barrel?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to call attention to the fact of what this increase means. Four or five cents a pound means a 20-percent increase, which is certainly unconscionable. That is a 20- or 25-percent increase where there is no reason for it whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted the gentleman is calling the attention of the membership to these facts.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the hearings of the International Joint Commission on the subject of the division and use of the waters of the Belly and Waterton Rivers have been completed in the State of Montana and the Province of Alberta.

The people of Montana are hopeful that the Commission will lose no time in arriving at a just decision, based upon the testimony given at these hearings and the first-hand information gained from the Commission's field trip over the area concerned in both the United States and Canada.

I was fortunate to be able to participate in the hearing at Shelby, Mont., and have since read the transcript of the subsequent hearings at Havre, Mont. The individual citizens of Montana are to be commended for their frank and intelligent presentation of the need for this water to irrigate lands in Glacier, Toole, Liberty, and Hill Counties. Men of long experience in the area, including Senator George Wilson; P. R. MacHale; Douglas Parker, and John C. Hoyt, of Shelby; J. P. Seifert, of Conrad; Fred Mundy, of Gildford; Judge E. B. Elwell, of Havre, and many others showed the Commission, from their own long years of experience and their knowledge of the country, that the people of northern Montana are determined to put the waters of the Waterton and Belly Rivers, which arise in our State, to beneficial use on the excellent land of their region, and that such a program will add immeasurably to the development and the economic stability of the area.

I informed the Commission that this effort has the support of the Montana delegation in Congress, of which I was the only one able to be present in person. I spoke not only as the representative of the district, but also as a member of the Public Lands Committee of the House authorized by the chairman, the gentleman from Florida, to represent that body. I spoke also as a private citizen who has taken an active part in the development of Montana's irrigation for many years, and as one who has exerted every effort to save for Montana the first right to the use of the waters which arise in our hills and mountains.

In connection with the discussion of a proposed All-American Tunnel project through which the waters of the Belly and Waterton could be diverted to beneficial use in Montana, I presented the Commission with an exhibit showing a number of tunnel projects which have been constructed, both here and abroad, and which show beyond doubt that the All-American Tunnel could be built if necessary. At the request of the Commission, I am submitting additional evidence on these projects.

On June 15 I introduced in the RECORD the formal statement I presented to the Commission and the letters and statements forwarded by Senators ECTON and MURRAY and Representative MANSFIELD. I include at this time, as an addition to the above, the remarks of the Honorable J. Hugo Aronson, State Senator of Glacier County, who was Senator EC-

TON's representative on the field trip and at the hearings of the Commission:

REMARKS OF STATE SENATOR J. HUGO ARONSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is J. Hugo Aronson and I am State senator from Glacier County, Mont. By way of explaining my presence here, I shall read a short paragraph from a letter which I received from Senator ZALES ECTON.

"Owing to the pressure of legislation now before Congress, it will be impossible for me to attend the hearings pertaining to the Waterton-Belly Rivers reference, and I therefore request that you attend the hearings as my personal representative. You are authorized to make such statements on my behalf as you find the situation warrants. I would consider it a personal favor if you could also participate in the on-the-ground inspection of the area involved prior to the holding of the first hearing."

As Senator ECTON's representative, I have accompanied the Commission on its inspection trip, and have learned with a great deal of interest something of the plans of the development of the flows of the Waterton-Belly Rivers.

I have lived in Montana since 1914, and spent many years in field operations until I entered my present occupation of farming. I have represented Glacier County in both houses of the legislature since 1939. At the present time I am in the senate. I am deeply interested in the future of this great State and want to do all that I can to save for the State a great natural resource, the water that it must have if it is to attain full development. This is especially true here in northern Montana where all available irrigation water is needed to develop the area to its maximum capacity, and at the same time to insure it against recurrent periods of severe drought. I feel that Montana has a just and prior claim to such portions of the waters of the Waterton-Belly Rivers as arise within its borders, and that its needs are valid and real if this great section of our State is to accomplish urgently needed development.

I realize that our Canadian neighbors need some of the water of these rivers for the development of their economy, also. But I have faith in their spirit of fair dealing to believe that plans of mutual benefit can be worked out between the representatives of both countries. However, I feel that we should not lose sight of the fact that the waters to be considered in such plans, according to the reference of 1948 as agreed upon by the Government, includes a large amount which arises in Canada as well as that which arises in the United States. Therefore, the fair plans of which I speak must make use of all of the water on both sides of the boundary and not just that of United States origin.

Otherwise, I feel sure that means can and will be found to put all of the United States water to use in the United States, and I believe that such a program might not be to the best interests of either of our two peoples. Five years have elapsed since the matter first came under consideration, and the Commission has had jurisdiction since January of 1948. It is felt that the Commission should arrive at an early decision.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to ask a question. The Foreign Affairs Committee of this House finished action on the mutual defense assistance bill Tuesday of last week, July 11th. Many of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee felt that the program required immediate action. As you know, men and materials do not move immediately on

the passage of legislation. So looking ahead to the future for 18 months or 2 years, long before which time this equipment will be immediately required, there will be a delay of 1 week in procurement of the whole program.

I would like to know from the Rules Committee, which is, after all, responsible to the House, why this vital legislation was held up a week before it came to the floor of the House for debate. Who is responsible for the delay?

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the appropriations that were authorized for the same purpose last year have been used?

Mr. FULTON. No they have not been used by the Administration. The trouble is that last year even when Congress gave its expression of opinion, the equipment, and material and defense weapons did not move. These required items did not move either to Korea or to China.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that there is anyone opposed to the rule. The bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the rule was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Rules. I believe the membership wish more to hear the observations of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs than those of the Committee on Rules, so I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3809) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3809) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, debate is limited to 1 day, the time to be equally divided and to be controlled by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today Senate bill 3809, a bill extending the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and authorizing appropriations therefor through the fiscal year 1951. Both the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, acting jointly, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had before them for consideration dur-

ing their hearings on this legislation an identical draft of the proposed measure.

The bill, following the general form of the draft, had been introduced in the Senate but not in the House.

Our committee intended to consider the draft, then mark up and pass the bill out of committee, and, following that, to introduce it as a clean bill.

We held many hearings, beginning on June 5, the same day the President's message to the Congress, urging the legislation, was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The committee held 6 open sessions and 12 executive.

The Senate committees, however, completed their hearings on Senate bill 3809, reported it favorably, and, on June 30, the Senate passed it unanimously—not a dissenting vote.

On July 3 the Senate bill was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

On July 10 the committee took up the Senate bill and considered it in the light of the mass of testimony presented at the several previous hearings.

On close examination, our committee found that the Senate bill was practically identical with the draft we had considered; in fact, it had been amended in only three respects, to wit, first, the so-called Taft amendment, which supplied a yardstick for the determination of the meaning of the words "fair value" as applied to reimbursable aid; second, an amendment authorizing the President, after consultation with the Atlantic Pact nations, to supply military aid on a grant basis to any other European country whose defense was deemed necessary to the security of the other signatories to the pact; and, third, the so-called Ellender amendment, authorizing the President to suspend all aid to any country failing to do its full share toward carrying out the MDA program.

The first two amendments had already been considered by the committee and had met with approval. The committee found the Ellender amendment unobjectionable.

In view of these facts, the Foreign Affairs Committee gave its full approval to S. 3809 as it passed the Senate, and reported it out without a dissenting vote—the vote in favor of the bill was 20 to none. The one member of the committee failing to vote was absent on a study mission to Central America, made on behalf of the committee.

S. 3809, the bill as it passed the Senate and as it has been reported to the House by the Foreign Affairs Committee, will authorize, for a continuance of mutual defense assistance for the fiscal year 1951, a total of \$1,222,500,000 of new funds to be applied as follows:

First. For providing military assistance to the North Atlantic Treaty nations, including \$75,000,000 for equipment and raw materials to increase military production in western Europe, and \$12,000,000 for expenses of administering the entire act, \$1,000,000,000.

Second. For equipment, materials, and supplies for defense of Turkey, Greece, and Iran, \$131,500,000.

Third. For the Philippines and Korea, \$16,000,000.

Fourth. For continuing and expanding the program now in operation in the general area of China, \$75,000,000.

Total, \$1,222,500,000.

It should also be noted that for the year 1950, there was appropriated for the MDA program the sum of \$1,314,000,000. Of this amount, approximately \$1,100,000,000 has been obligated for the year 1950, leaving a balance of approximately \$214,000,000 to be carried over. This balance was fully considered in making up the estimates of the requirements for 1951. Therefore, this balance, together with the new appropriation provided by the pending measure, makes a total of \$1,436,500,000 as representing the cost to the United States of the 1951 program.

In reporting this bill to the House, our committee report, beginning on page 57 contains a section-by-section analysis of the pending measure.

There were very material changes made in the basic provisions of the original act. A few of such changes might well be mentioned.

Section 3, amending section 104 of the existing statute, is a clarifying amendment stating more clearly what types of production equipment may be supplied. The amendment is designed to permit the stepping up of defense production on the part of the countries participating in the program.

Section 4 merely amends the heading of title II of the original act. It takes Iran from title III, where it had been placed in company with Korea and the Philippines, and places it with Greece and Turkey in title II. No changes of policy are involved.

Section 7 is a new subsection to section 302 of the act of 1949, authorizing the \$16,000,000 for additional aid to Korea and the Philippines for the year 1951.

Section 8 also adds a new subsection to section 303 of the 1949 act authorizing an additional \$75,000,000 appropriation for the general area of China. It also provides certain restrictions on the disbursement of the fund.

I might interpolate here. Those restrictions were merely on the manner in which the President disbursed this \$75,000,000. The act of 1949 provides that the President could disburse the entire \$75,000,000 without any invoices. In the bill under consideration a restriction is placed to the effect that of this amount the President can disburse \$35,000,000 without such invoices, but of that \$35,000,000 only \$7,500,000 can be disbursed without notification to both the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Section 9: Under the existing statute, excess materials and equipment can be supplied in the amount of \$450,000,000 based on the average original procurement cost of such equipment. The amendment would raise the amount that can be supplied by an additional \$250,000,000.

Section 10: This section amends section 403 and provides for a carry-over until June 30, 1951, of any unexpended balance of the appropriation for the mutual defense-assistance program.

Section 11: This section amends section 404 and provides that certain authority granted to the President under a revision of section 408—to transfer funds from title to title and when aid should be granted under certain conditions to other countries—cannot be delegated by the President but must be exercised by him alone.

Section 12—three subsections—amending section 408 of the existing statute.

The original act authorized the President to transfer not to exceed 5 percent of the amounts made available by any title of the act to the purposes of any other title. The amendment would increase this to 10 percent. The amendment further broadens the President's authority by enabling him, within the 10-percent limit, to aid any European nation whose strategic location makes it directly important to the defense of the North Atlantic area. Before supplying such aid, however, the President must consult with the other nations which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Another subsection authorizes use by the United States of local currencies for administrative expenses of the program.

The third subsection deals at length with the matter of reimbursable aid; it limits the amount of outstanding contracts to a total of \$100,000,000 at any one time.

For the further information of the House, may I add that the following countries have signed mutual defense assistance agreements with the United States:

Canada—has not requested assistance, but is eligible; United Kingdom; Belgium; France; Luxemburg; Netherlands; Italy; Denmark; Norway; Iceland—has not requested assistance, but is eligible; Portugal—has not requested assistance, but is eligible; known as the North Atlantic Treaty states. They have an organization called the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This is aided by a Council, composed of the foreign ministers of each member Nation. See chart, page 17 of the report.

Iran, Philippines, and Korea, have also signed bilateral agreements with United States.

Greece and Turkey: No new agreements necessary. Arrangements had already been concluded under the Greece-Turkey Aid Act of May 27, 1947, Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress.

Our bilateral agreements with the various countries are all couched in practically the same terms, and follow the requirements of the statute.

Mr. Chairman, this program has now been carried forward for 1 year. We had many witnesses before our committee, testifying that great progress has been made. Some objection has been raised to the showing by those who have been in charge of the program with respect to this progress, but it must be remembered that a large amount of the funds appropriated by the act of 1949 was withheld until the various countries which are participants of this aid had established in western Europe plans for a united and integrated defense, which plans had to be approved by the President of the United States. It took

quite some time after the passage of the act for the preparation and adoption of these plans. It was not until January of last year that the plans were approved by the President for this united and integrated defense. More, the question of shipping, the question of organization, and all of the various problems incident to a great undertaking, had to be solved, but the showing has been a magnificent one, and the accomplishment great, as you will find by a perusal of the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I recommend the passage of this bill without amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, acting on behalf of the gentleman from New Jersey, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, our beloved former chairman and now distinguished ranking minority member of our committee, Dr. EATON, 10 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] first of all for doing all the work today that I ought to do, and doing it better, and secondly for permitting me to say a few words at this point in the discussion.

I am, as usual, profoundly impressed with the unanimous interest of our entire membership in this most important international legislation. Judging by the number of vacant chairs here, it would indicate that we are prepared to go the limit in order to meet any circumstance that may arise in the world, good, bad, or indifferent.

I want to express my gratification personally as a citizen in the fact that we are now emerging from the moth-ball era in our history. Immediately after peace came a few years ago we put our Navy into moth balls. Then the rest of us went into moth balls mentally, morally, and physically, and in this moth-ball era our friend, Mr. Stalin, and his devoted followers have made hay whether the sun shone or not. Here we are again facing a tremendous challenge in the world. It would be folly for me to attempt to analyze this very important piece of legislation. It will be done so much better by able men, and has already been done so well by our distinguished chairman.

I wish, at this moment, to pay a personal tribute to the chairman and to the members of our committee for the long and arduous and self-sacrificing toil they have given to the preparation of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time is here when everyone who possibly can will break through the mist and clouds mental, moral, and physical, which surround us and see the actual facts which confront us in this world at this moment.

I do not suppose in all history there can be found an instance where a great concept like communism, world-wide in its application, revolutionary to its methods, has been supported by so able and resourceful and unscrupulous and immoral a force as the present government in the Kremlin. The fact is we are face to face with a world situation which must be resolved either for darkness or for light. There is no twilight zone between.

Either the tireless world-wide program of the Communists to conquer the world, including the United States, will have to be stopped, defeated, and destroyed at great cost, or we will have to surrender everything that we have inherited from that day long ago when—

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

That is what we have inherited—and we stand today facing the world as the champion of everything that we have inherited—everything we hold dear and everything that constitutes the hope of a civilized mankind.

This bill today, apart from its various provisions, costing us immense sums of money and immense sacrifice, must be considered as a symbol of that spiritual struggle that is shaping up in the world, in which the soul of mankind shall remain forever fettered and lost or shall be free and become once more clothed with the dignity that is worthy of the sons of God.

I cannot add anything to the situation. You know it as well as I do. We are exactly in the condition, speaking in the language of the farmer, of the rabbit that climbed the tree when the dog was after him. It is not our nature, but we have got to do it. Either we have got to pull down our flag, raise our arms and surrender, or we have got to stand up and fight. So I say today that this legislation, apart altogether from its actual provisions, its costs to our taxpayers, is a symbol, an announcement to the world that America is still on guard for the soul of mankind and for the freedom that has made life worth while down through the centuries.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the difficulties of this hour, in spite of the uncertainties and sorrow and loss now facing us in Korea and elsewhere, in spite of the glacial advance of communism by every devil-inspired means possible, I take refuge, and I know you will, in the words of an inspired poet—

Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
But behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above his own.

And it is no claim for special virtue when we say, in all humility, that the ideals of our American civilization are in accord with the purposes of the Divine Creator.

Therefore, we might as well pass this bill without delay and get on with the next task that awaits us.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have already heard the details of this bill explained, and also the background and setting in which it should be considered.

It is my province perhaps to go into some other phases of it. For the first time in a number of years you have seen a bill come from our committee with no amendments. Our committee has a habit and practice of trying to improve

whatever we receive but the bill that is before you is exactly as it passed the Senate. I want to explain the background of that unusual circumstance.

In the first place, this is simply an extension of an existing law and policy, with some minor changes made necessary by time and experience.

In the second place, in the consideration of this legislation, we had more cooperation from the State Department and the administration than we have had for some time. Officials came up and discussed with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee the problems that needed attention in this extension, and asked for suggestions as to how best they might be solved. We gave our suggestions and asked that they prepare a draft bill incorporating their suggestions and ours, and agreed that the committee would then consider that draft. That was done. When, therefore, the bill we now have before us, S. 3809, finally came before our committee it already contained a number of suggestions made by our committee to the administration officials and their staff that had been incorporated before it was filed in the Senate. Included was the floor amendment on "fair value" offered by Senator TAFT which represented the House committee views on this question. Thus we had a very short horse to curry. When this bill came before our committee, we could act on it promptly and without amendment; and we are not recommending any amendments here.

In the third place, another circumstance that perhaps made consideration easier was that the Korean aggression had changed things. I want to refer to that a little later. It has become perfectly clear that probably more money is going to be needed both for our own defenses and for mutual defense in the near future. In reviewing this with the State Department and the Armed Forces officials yesterday morning in our committee, however, they did not make any recommendation for increases in any part of this bill, but urged only that it be promptly considered and adopted in its present form.

I want to point out three things we ought to bear in mind as we consider this bill.

First, this is a Mutual Defense Assistance Act. As the great leader among the free nations we adopted in this act last year the policy of furnishing military assistance to other free nations "based upon the principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid * * * for individual and collective self-defense." Based upon performance up to date the Soviets have done better in arming aggressors than we have in arming defenders of the free—witness Korea. We have found out that when aggression comes, if the free people are not armed and are not ready to take their own part in mutual action in their own defense, the burden falls where? It falls squarely on the United States. Thus one of the lessons the tragic events of the past few weeks has made clear is that we on the side of the free must become more effective in mutual defense

than the forces of communism are in the policy and practice of mutual aggression.

Second, and most significant, both the United States and the United Nations have looked through form to substance in this Korean aggression; they do not pretend that it is a mere civil war. That was the pretext used for doing nothing in China. Events in Israel, in Palestine, and in India in recent years have been recognized as having had the elements of civil struggle in which other governments should not intervene; but in Korea right after June 24, it was crystal clear that this was barefaced, inexcusable, premeditated aggression. Aggression by whom? By the 9,000,000 North Koreans against their southern neighbors, more than double their numbers? We look through form to the substance; we all recognize where the aggression is coming from. Nations larger than Korea have had bloody civil wars in recent years, without United Nations intervention. In spite of the diplomatic words used in United Nations resolutions and our official statements, 52 nations realize this is different. That realization is going to require some further thinking, and planning, and acting in the future.

Third, at last we have got a far eastern policy of sorts. We arrived at it the hard way, but we have got it, if we do not lose it.

I want to make a brief review of some of the events leading up to the situation in Korea.

Korea was recognized by the United States as independent on January 1, 1949. Korea was peculiarly the child of the United Nations, and peculiarly the child of the three great nations, the United States, China, and Britain, who joined in the Cairo declaration in 1943, then ratified the Cairo declaration at Potsdam in 1945, and peculiarly the child of the Soviet Union that ratified the Cairo and Potsdam declaration in its tardy declaration of war against Japan. But up to June 30, 1949, our Army furnished Korea's defense and our GARIOA funds—for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas—bolstered their economy. These funds lapsed on June 30, 1949, and at the same time our troops withdrew under the United Nations resolution for withdrawal.

From then on until June 27, 1950, the administration's amazing policies, statements, actions, and inactions can only be understood if we realize that up to June 24, 1950, they were following in Korea the Lattimore line, cynical, cowardly, and disastrous, but logical, once you grant his premises on Russia and China.

Here is what Lattimore recommended on July 17, 1949, in the Sunday Compass, successor to PM:

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it. Hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000.

The Korean aid bill (H. R. 5330) that was before our committee at that time was for \$150,000,000.

Here is what Lattimore recommended in his memorandum to Jessup in the

State Department on far eastern policy in August 1949:

South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interests and policy of the United States.

After urging no delay in establishing relations with Communist China, Lattimore wound up by recommending:

The United States should disembarass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea.

So the administration followed the Lattimore line. Although they had known for 6 months what was ahead, it was not until June 8, 1949, that they brought in H. R. 5330, a bill authorizing permanent economic aid to Korea, with \$150,000,000 for the first year and \$385,000,000 for the first 3 years. It had to pass, and appropriations implementing it by June 30, or there would be a gap. They knew this could not be done, they did not try to hurry the bill.

Our committee learned in executive session the things everyone knows now, that Korea could not defend itself against a Communist attack, that it was not part of our security perimeter, that there was no commitment or promise to support Korea.

We also learned of the dust-settling policy for China that was later developed publicly by Secretary Acheson.

The bill came out of committee. I appeared before the Rules Committee with a group of my colleagues and urged that no rule be granted. I said:

If this bill comes to the floor, it will be defeated, but in order to explain it, some things must be said that will hurt Korea and the prestige of the United States in Asia.

I asked for an executive session of the Rules Committee and got it, and explained what we had learned.

The Rules Committee held up the bill until September 27, and the House leadership never let the bill come to the floor until January 19, 1950. On that day, as I had predicted, this \$385,000,000 economic plan was defeated. During the debate on January 19 I said on this floor "It may be that in the future as we develop a new policy—Korea will receive aid under some mutual-aid plan, some far eastern plan that makes sense. I hope that day will come. But in the present state of our policy, or lack of policy, we should not vote money down the Korean rat hole that will not save them militarily, that we will not add to our military security—that will not solve their economic problem."

Then a Senate bill on Korea, S. 2319, was taken up in our committee. Every word of it was stricken out, including its title, and it was brought to the floor on February 7, 1950, labeled "The Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950," and extended economic aid to both Korea and Formosa until June 30, 1950.

I supported this bill because it kept Formosa going, by extending the China Aid Act of 1948 and with the hope we would arrive at a policy before the bill ran out on June 30, 1950. We arrived at that policy on June 27, 1950.

I said on February 7, during debate on this bill:

This is a stopgap measure * * * It only runs for less than 5 months. * * * It is not strictly rat-hole money—in fact, it is not much of anything, but it seems to be the best we can do at this time toward getting this administration to make a stand against Communist aggression in the Far East. * * * I hope a real plan is developed by next June. At best this is a stopgap. At least it is a continuation of the bipartisan congressional policy for the Far East. At least it means Congress is not retreating in Asia.

That bill was passed on February 9, 1950, and became Public Law 447. Not 1 cent authorized by this bill ever got to Korea before the attack on June 24, 1950. The money authorized was appropriated in Public, No. 533, a deficiency bill, which did not become law until June 29, 1950.

There was \$100,000,000 authorized for economic aid to Korea in the Foreign Assistance Act and \$94,000,000 for China, including Formosa, and southeast Asia. None of this was available by June 24, the time the attack came. Korea got along on some stopgap appropriations made last summer and fall.

Meanwhile, military aid for Korea was included in the MDAP bill which passed the House on August 19, 1949. But it was obvious that \$27,400,000 for Korea, the Philippines, and Iran was not enough to defend them against a real attack. The Lodge-Walter amendment providing \$100,000,000 military aid and up to 500 officers and men to China and southeast Asia was defeated on a teller vote August 18 by 94 ayes and 164 nays. The best that could be done was \$75,000,000 for the general area of China in the conference report September 28.

Once more, it was impossible to get into the law over administration opposition, any direct military aid to China, any positive policy of resisting the spread of communism in Asia.

Now for some reason or other, information as to the amount programmed for Korea under MDAP and the amount that got there is still secret. Obviously, it is no longer a military secret. However, I will observe that secrecy and put it this way. No one is now claiming that one dime's worth of the weapons or ammunitions programmed under the Korean section of MDAP ever got there before the attack on June 24, 1950.

Now there is going to be political weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth about the votes on these Korean-aid bills, military and economic, for a long time, but amid the charges, hokum, insinuations, and lies, a few simple facts should be kept clear in Congress and in the public mind:

None of the economic aid involved in these controversial bills ever got to Korea before the attack; none of the military aid is claimed to have gotten there; no responsible witness before any committee ever claimed that the economic aid or the military aid requested would prevent an attack, or turn back a full-fledged Communist attack, if it did get there.

A number of Members of Congress were willing to vote for something for Korea anyhow; a number like myself were willing to vote for something for Korea whenever we could commit the administration to do something for Formosa at the same time, with the hope that we could hold the line until we got some sort of policy in the Far East; a number of others took a dim view of all military assistance so long as it did not provide any real plan for the Far East; but the administration, with millions authorized by a majority in Congress, followed the Lattimore line until the attack on South Korea of June 24, 1950. Our military intelligence can be criticized for not anticipating this attack; our diplomatic unintelligence from Yalta on, set the stage for a successful attack.

Then, in 48 hours, a revolutionary change came in our whole far eastern policy. We sought United Nations action on Korea, for Korea was not in our security perimeter; it was everybody's business, an international police problem; the palsied United Nations came to life and responded magnificently, and acted promptly. The President at last stood firm on Formosa, and the Philippines and Indochina, and the country was united. It took all of this to unite our country. It will take all of it to keep us united. There are faint-hearted souls here and in the United Nations who do not yet see that Korea and Formosa are both United Nations problems. We must lead in making them realize that the same kind of appeasement brings the same kind of aggression everywhere, and that the forces of the free must stay united to resist aggression anywhere. The international posse that is gathering to stop aggression in Korea must hold together to meet and stop and turn back Communist aggression wherever it starts; if necessary, at the place where it is plotted and planned.

This is right, and we must have faith that right makes might. I realize the free people are deficient in arms right now. We probably have the advantage in atomic weapons, but we hate to use them. We will probably have to provide more money for our mutual defense than is authorized by this bill, and take that action soon. By our action today, however, we will show the world that we are united in mutual defense assistance; not behind the President, not against the President, but shoulder to shoulder with the United Nations of the free.

As I look through the fog of war over Korea I become discouraged, and I am terrified and I shudder at the possibilities for suffering and degradation and despair that lie ahead of us if we fail; and then I see the free people of the world getting together some way or other with just one clear determination, that we are going to stop this thing and we are going to revive and maintain peace on earth among men of good will; I see white and colored fighting shoulder to shoulder in a common cause, and more coming, as policemen for a united free world and I see the glory of it if we do not fail; not glory for our side, but a greater glory. I wonder if you see it. I wonder if you ever feel as I do as you

look through the fog of war over Korea and at what is happening there and all over the world. I feel—

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is tramping out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible, swift sword; His truth is marching on.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND].

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly just to make a short statement at this time. I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] should be commended for the inspirational note which he set in the closing paragraph of his speech. However, I hardly expected to sit here on the floor today and hear such a white-wash of the record of opposition which some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have had to the entire international program which has been put forth by President Truman and our administration.

I think that at this time it would not be a matter of partisanship if we stopped to actually look at the record and go back to the time when Greece and Turkey were threatened and President Truman, with great courage, announced the Truman Doctrine. I will say he had pretty strong bipartisan support for that. Then the President went ahead and, with a fine Secretary of State, proposed the Marshall plan. I think we should give credit for strong bipartisan support at that point. But only to some of the members of the administration was given the foresight to see the terrible conflict and struggle which lies before this Nation of ours. When the mutual defense assistance program was announced only a year ago, we could begin to see a defection in bipartisanship from the opposition which came about at that time. Even at the time of the explosion of the atomic bomb in Russia many of our friends did not have the farsightedness to join with President Truman and the administration in supporting and passing the beginning of the mutual defense assistance program.

The vote in the Senate in recent weeks has shown just how strongly Members of that body are rallying to the defense of President Truman and the administration by the passage of this legislation by a vote of 66 to 0.

I think if there is one thing the Korean situation emphasizes today it is that our military assistance program in Europe and throughout the world is not nearly extensive enough. It is estimated that this crisis in Korea will run in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000,000. Today we are considering a bill for \$1,222,000,000 to carry on a program in Europe involving a dozen or so member nations.

I have a little editorial here which appeared in one of the Scripps-Howard papers several months ago. One paragraph of this editorial says:

Russia will spend more than \$45,000,000,000 on her armed forces this year, United States intelligence sources say.

That exceeds our entire Federal budget for the current fiscal year. We are spending \$13,000,000,000 or 32 percent of our budget for national defense. In any comparison between the two programs, however, it must be borne in mind that 25 percent of our military budget is payroll, and Russia's salary scales, on the other hand, are very puny by comparison.

This certainly illustrates the great disparity of defense expenditures by the freedom-loving nations as contrasted to the nations behind the iron curtain.

You know it is facetiously said that the Congress of the United States is about 2 years behind the people. Well, my fellow colleagues, this is one time in the history of the world that Congress cannot afford to be 2 years behind the people. When I was home for a special July Fourth celebration, talking to the man on the street and the people in drug stores and in the barber shops, this thought was given to me, that 90 percent of the people of America realize the seriousness of this international conflict which is going on.

They are willing to make the sacrifices that are going to be necessary in the years ahead. If there is one thing that we Members of Congress should do, as we go out in these coming months, it is to be honest with the people of America and to tell them not only that this conflict has been long in the making and has been building up for years, but that the solution of the peace and security of the world is likely to be a problem which will be with us many, many years, and that we here in the Congress may be struggling and fighting for peace for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of the mutual defense assistance program which calls for an appropriation of \$1,222,500,000 for 1950. This legislation is most important at this time in the history of this Nation—in the history of the world.

In ancient fables there is a story which demonstrates the strength of unity. Two men were gathering sticks in a forest. One tied them into a bundle and wagered that his companion could not break it in two. Try as hard as he might, the man could not break the bundle of sticks. He turned to his friend after the attempt and stated that it was too strong for either of them to break. The other man immediately untied the bundle of sticks and proceeded to break them one by one.

The principle of strength in unity has been demonstrated in history since time immemorial. As 13 separate States, the American Colonies could never have survived to grow into this great Nation of ours. But in the Federal Union under a Constitution we have grown into the greatest Nation in the world.

Today we are discussing the continuance of the military assistance program or the arms aid bill.

The recent aggression of North Korea against South Korea makes extremely clear to everyone the Soviet intent of world domination. If there was ever any doubt in any of our minds as to this ultimate intent, it should be removed by this most recent act which has been

perpetrated by the planning of the Kremlin.

Even prior to this act of totalitarian aggression, the whole pattern of Soviet activity has demonstrated that there is no let-up in the intensity of the Communist pressure.

As long ago as September 1949, the atomic explosion in Russia made it painfully clear that the Kremlin was pursuing its plan with utmost determination. Even with this terrible warning, many Members of both Houses of Congress failed to realize the communistic threat in the world and voted against the first arms aid bill which was the beginning step in building up the defenses of the freedom-loving countries of the world.

Also, recently the destruction of an unarmed United States plane over the Baltic demonstrated the contempt of these forces for other nations of the world.

For many months under the guise of a police force, Russia has been building up large armed forces in eastern Germany. Other satellite nations behind the iron curtain are armed to full capacity.

Throughout the world Communist propaganda has been stepped up to attack the United States as a warmongering nation, while Russia has been continuing her program of aggression. She has at the same time sponsored through Communist effort peace petitions and resolutions such as the Stockholm resolution calling for the abolition of the atomic bomb. Once world public opinion should be mobilized against the use of atomic bombs, even to stop aggressor nations, the great armed might of the Soviet Union could be used without fear of retribution.

There have also been attempts on the part of the Communists in France to provoke strikes to prevent the delivery and unloading of mutual defense assistance equipment in the form of arms and matériel.

Surely no more evidence than we now have is needed to make it plain to all of the democratic nations of the world the ultimate intent of the forces directed by the Kremlin.

President Truman and his administration are to be commended for a far-sighted program in meeting this threat to the peace of the world. This plan has been placed into effect with the bipartisan support of certain Members possessed of foresight in both Houses of Congress, and it will work to weld the freedom-loving nations of the world together in a common opposition to the Communist program of totalitarian enslavement.

For more than 2 years now the United States has had an economic program through the Marshall plan to build up war-ravaged Europe and to prevent the conquest of western European democracies by the forces of communism. This has been an extremely effective program, and it is generally conceded that it has done much to prevent the spread of this totalitarian ideology.

On the military front, we have gone ahead with the North Atlantic Pact which set forth that it is the determination of the signing parties to defend their

territories and their democratic institutions against those who would seek to destroy them. It makes plain that an armed attack against any one member is to be considered an attack against all members. It also provides in the event of such an attack that there shall be collective resistance to the utmost by all other partners to the pact.

To supplement the North Atlantic Treaty, and to coordinate the efforts of the members of the North Atlantic Pact, the mutual defense assistance program was devised. During its first year, it was successful, and it has started democratic nations of Europe on a program of defense and rearmament.

By coordination of the work on the economic front and the program on the military front, our country has been able to make great accomplishment on the political front. In the final analysis, if we are to achieve victory, the battle for men's minds is more important than the battle for territorial conquest. Through this program of mutual defense assistance, it has been possible to help strengthen the economic and moral fiber of freemen in Europe and throughout the world.

The mutual defense assistance program has already resulted in concrete achievement. Through this program of building up the defenses of Europe, a basis has been formed for general cooperation in peace to help solve mutual problems. It has brought about a meeting together of the representatives of many nations, a discussion of common problems, and a determination of solutions and a plan of action to meet these problems.

For instance, one of the results of this entire program of cooperation has been the establishment of a European Payments Union which should do much to improve the economic welfare of the member nations.

The program which I have just outlined is largely responsible for the historic proposal of Foreign Minister Schuman to pool the steel and coal production of western Europe under joint direction of member nations. He has also invited Germany to come in on an equal basis with other member nations. This proposal still remains to be worked out. However, the fact that the offer was made by France, a nation three times at war with Germany in the last hundred years, is indeed a tremendous accomplishment in world cooperation.

The military defense assistance program is under way, and the formulation of an integrated defense plan is at hand. An integrated defense plan means not only greater strength, but more defense per dollar expended. The stronger the Atlantic Pact nations become, the lighter is the defense burden on the United States. It is not contemplated to build up a fighting force to match the Soviet, division for division, but it is planned to set up a fighting force with equipment of modern weapons and modern matériel which is so important in warfare today.

This program of opposition to the forces of communism has given Marshal Tito and Yugoslavia the courage to make the first crack in the iron curtain. It

has given him the courage to work independently for what he considers the welfare of his Communist country without complete subordination to the masters of the Kremlin. Even though we deplore communism, this is very desirable from our standpoint.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the mutual defense assistance program is that it has encouraged the European nations to help themselves. As individual nations, the leaders of these countries realized that it was useless to embark upon a program of full-scale preparedness which would exhaust the country economically. Therefore, there was a tendency to forget about preparedness completely. With the North Atlantic Treaty and mutual defense assistance program, these member nations are, for the most part, spending a greater amount for national defense than they would otherwise. By coordination of these expenditures, a program of integrated defense planning is being accomplished, with each nation concentrating on that military production which it is best able to perform.

Without the leadership of the United States, this whole program could not have come to pass. The question in my mind today is whether we are doing enough in the way of an arms-aid plan. With the current fighting in Korea estimated to cost about \$5,000,000,000, it makes painfully evident to the average layman what a really small amount we are now investing in the future defense and preparedness of the democratic nations of Europe, Indo-china, Greece, Turkey, Philippines, and Iran. It is my opinion that this program should be doubled or tripled at this time to meet the opposition of the Kremlin which lies ahead.

As one high governmental official put it in testimony before the Senate committee, "only by forceful, concerted action along the lines which have been initiated can the countries which practice democracy preserve democracy."

The long-range objective of the entire program of economic assistance and arms assistance is peace and not war. The best way to obtain this peace is by a show of strength and unity which is uncompromising in its magnitude. The strength of Europe through development of this program will be one of the deterrents to war. The history of the past 5 years has shown that strength and might is the only way to impress the masters of the Kremlin. This program which we have under consideration is an attempt to bring about this greater strength and preparedness without exhausting the economy of any of the nations concerned.

I think it is always well to remember that at the present time the free nations of the world control a majority of the productive power of the world, the productive power which is available, not only in the waging of war, but in the providing of goods and services for the peoples of these countries. Until Russia believes that she has a preponderance of manufacturing and industrial might, she will hesitate to thrust a general war upon the world.

This fact demonstrates also our need for unity in our opposition to the forces of communism. Since the institution of the Marshall plan, industrial production in Europe has increased about 35 percent above the prewar average. Agricultural production will soon exceed the prewar levels, and in nearly every nation inflation is under control. These are achievements which the Soviet Union cannot match. The way to peace and security is not an easy one. It will undoubtedly require sacrifices from all of us, from the men and women of America and the people of the other freedom-loving nations of the world. There is no alternative. The sacrifice necessary to obtain this peace and security is worth it to all of us.

This conflict between the forces of democracy and the forces of totalitarianism has been long in the making and the solution may be nearly as long. It is hard to estimate what lies ahead, but I have faith that the people of this Nation and other nations have the courage, the will, and the tenacity to win out in the long-run battle for peace.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have a few moments to express my feelings in regard to this legislation and in regard to the world situation generally.

I need hardly state that I join strongly with the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House in support of the extension of the military-defense assistance program. There is one phase of the over-all world situation today which causes me grave concern. It is quite obvious that the Soviet Union is attempting to hold itself up at this time as the true respecter and advocate of peace. There has been submitted through diplomatic channels a proposal for ending the Korean crisis. I do not at this moment know the exact details of the proposal which has been submitted. I am advised, however, that, among other things, the following two conditions are set forth as conditions precedent to a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict: First, admission of Communist China to the United Nations; and second, withdrawal of American and United Nations forces from Korea.

I have every faith that those conditions are going to be rejected, but I would like to sound a cautious note at this time for those who might in the future be misled and fooled by such international chicanery and blackmail. Let us not forget that the avowed purpose of international communism is the achievement of a Communist-dominated world. If we in America or if free men the world over ever capitulate to such nefarious and ill-conceived proposals as are proposed at this time, I say unhesitatingly that that day will go down as the most infamous, the most tragic day in the history of this country.

We in America and free men the world over aspire to peace. We do not seek "peace at any price." We seek enduring peace with justice; we seek a world in which men can enjoy freedom to follow

their own pursuits, to raise their families and to live decent lives. We seek an honorable peace and not one that must be purchased through loss of our character and loss of our freedom.

The admission of Communist China to the United Nations would for all practicable purposes prove to be a long step toward slavery and toward rendering the United Nations impotent. It would in addition signal to the international Communists that the door was now open for conquest of the entire Far East. There is no question in my mind but what we will continue to stand fast, and there is also no question in my mind but what truth and justice shall ultimately prevail.

I am now far more convinced than I was a week ago that people throughout America and free men throughout the world are strongly united and recognize the grave peril to our civilization. I personally feel as a citizen, as a legislator and as a veteran that America and our civilization today is in the greatest peril in its history. We cannot underestimate the danger.

Last week a young and distinguished colleague of ours, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], who had a magnificent record in this last war, stood on the floor and advocated the use of the atomic bomb. It shocked some people, but LLOYD BENTSEN tells me that his mail has been running about 10 to 1 in favor of his proposal. I can well understand, on certain grounds related to the military phase of the problem such as the terrain, dispersal of troops and the like, that there might truly be a question whether the bomb should be used; but I cannot forget, as one who experienced combat in the last war, that it matters little whether you are being bombed, shelled or attacked by other weapons of warfare. Americans today are not only being killed in combat on the battlefields at Korea; they are being butchered and murdered in cold blood. I have a strong tendency to go along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and his proposal, if such is necessary to save civilization at this time. Free men had better stand together at this moment and forget politics as usual and business as usual and get down to the more important business at hand. This is a time calling for complete unity and for taking all steps necessary to protect free men as against those whom we know seek world domination. I earnestly urge that we take every necessary step in order that we may be prepared in a military, industrial and psychological sense. I wish to further add that I think we must act as soon as possible to strengthen our laws to handle the unquestioned menace of communism within our own borders.

Were it not for those who down through the ages have been willing to fight and die for their fellowman, we would not have a nation wherein we could worry about business, economy and politics as usual. Our sacrifice is as nothing compared to those who carry the burden at this time. We can and we must meet the challenge.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before I go into the subject matter that I am to cover, I want to express my appreciation of this Committee on Foreign Affairs, upon which I have served for 9 years. We stand together as good Americans. Yes, we argue, and we should, but we work together. We have a thoughtful, careful, meticulous, and splendid chairman. We have a very unusually fine ranking member of the minority, who for 2 years served as chairman. We have a membership of thoughtful and experienced people.

HELEN DOUGLAS is leaving us, and I would like to say a little personal word, HELEN, for in one way, I wish you luck; in another which you readily understand I must wish you ill. But I am happy to know you as I have known you.

For a little while I shall be the only woman on the committee. Let me say here that on this truly wonderful committee no differences are made. We work as a group, we work as individuals, we disagree as individuals, but we have come to you with this bill without a dissenting voice. We have had long hearings, and we have spent much time on the measures involved and on the problems involved.

I am not going to discuss the details of the bill at all; others will give them to you but I want to talk for a few minutes about the causes, about the reasons why we have to have such a bill. I have not been able to escape the conviction that my 2 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements gives me the obligation to speak of these matters as we present to this House S. 3809, amendments to the 1949 Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

Why has it been necessary for us to recreate military strength to protect the road to peace? For peace is the ultimate goal toward which we are striving. The subcommittee to which I referred a moment ago was responsible for a piece of work which has become the textbook on world communism. You have all had copies of it. I hold it up that you may see what it looks like. The Senate committee sent copies to you in 1948; some of you have had other copies since then. It is called the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism and is House Document No. 619. In this original volume there are several supplements, one of which is called One Hundred Years of Communism. Another is Official Protests of the U. S., and Various Other Documents. Three other supplements, one on Czechoslovakia, one on the Near East, one on China. This last is probably the most accurate document on the methods of the Communist take-over of China.

Why do I bring this up? Because I want to make it very clear not only to the Congress but also to the people of this country that there has been an awareness in this body of the goals set by the Communists, that there has been an alertness. Granted, we have had to struggle against rather heavy odds sometimes to make ourselves heard.

On page 4 of this book printed in 1948, The Goals of Communism, you will find the following:

1. The Communists have one goal—world revolution.
2. They assume that the revolution will be violent.
3. They are incapable of accepting the idea that peace can endure from now on, and they expect one more catastrophic war.
4. The Soviet Union is regarded as the main force of the revolution.
5. They fear a coalition against the Soviet Union.
6. They therefore fear reconstruction or federation in the non-Communist world.
7. They utilize the most modern and effective means of cold warfare to strengthen their own forces and to weaken all others.
8. The Communist Parties outside the Soviet Union are junior partners or auxiliaries.
9. The tactics are based upon a definite theory, and the central propositions of that theory do not change.
10. The division of Europe and Asia between the victors of World War II is to be settled by power politics and not by negotiation.

Mr. Chairman, as I have read through these 10 goals, I hope you will see clearly why Communists everywhere have done some of the things they have done. Every act of theirs is definitely toward their one goal. They fear a coalition, therefore they have pronounced themselves as against everything we have been trying to do in Europe to strengthen Europe. On the same basis they would fear a federation in the Pacific. They fear the action of the United Nations because it draws together and emphasizes the power of the free nations of the world.

We have had difficulty, of course, to get our people and our Government to recognize the seriousness, the actuality of the Communist determination to take over all the peoples of the earth. We have forgotten that 100 years ago Marx and Engels lived and propounded a doctrine of world revolution and world control. We have forgotten that 80 years ago Communists took over Paris for a few months. We seem to have forgotten that there was a bloody revolution in Russia itself. We certainly should not forget.

We do not read what they have written nor what they have spoken vividly and widely. They have told us everything they expect to do.

Mr. Chairman, you will find in this volume, this subcommittee report, quotations from many Communist writings and speeches. You will find suggestions as to where you can find the whole text, because we were very aware as we were working at this that it is always dangerous to lift out small portions of any text. So we have given very clearly the sources and suggest that the libraries of this country have these documents in which you will find the full texts.

Based on the knowledge we had at hand there is no excuse for us, as a Nation to do what we have done and what we have failed to do except that we permitted ourselves to become confused by the changes in their tactics, by our inability to follow their advances and seeming retreats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio five additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, one of the very interesting monographs of Mr. Lenin is on the importance of learning when and how to retreat. But when they retreated we thought. "Why, it is all wrong what we have been thinking about these fellows. They are really very nice people. They are going to be free people like ourselves. They are going to build up the free satellite countries."

Unfortunately we were so beclouded that we not only permitted them to take over one border country after another, but we assisted them. We gave them territories; we gave them power.

One of the greatest friends we ever had was the eternal, inexhaustible, wonderful country of China that we gave into Communist hands.

We forget that these Communists are Asiatics, too, and that they understand the Chinese mind. They knew that if they were to put their own people into China they could not get an inch of the way. So, they took many Chinese to Moscow, into their oriental school of communism, and trained them and sent them back. Mao-Tze-tung is a very good example of this kind of teaching. Thousands of them were so taught and sent back long ago, and do you think for one moment that they have not taken many Indochinese, Burmese, and every other kind of oriental people and are not at this moment deploying them out into these other areas? Unfortunately very few Americans know the differences between them. We think of them as being friends and brothers, imagine all kinds of things about them all. Not so the Russians; not so the Communists; they know. And remember that the Russian people are controlled by a small group of the police state determined upon the complete control of the world.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I feel I must express myself in relation to the suggestion made by our colleague from Texas the other day, which was commented on again a few moments ago, the suggestion that we say to the North Koreans. "Go back behind the thirty-eighth parallel or we will use the atomic bomb." Mr. Chairman and Members of this House, it seemed impossible to me that such a thing could be suggested at this time. For what purpose? To kill a lot of Koreans just because they are Communists? Would that stop the war? Do we know where the tanks and the guns and the airplanes are being manufactured? Do we not know that they do know where ours are being manufactured, and that one atomic bomb dropped by the United States of America would open us to atomic bombing? But, more than that, it would prove to the oriental mind the validity of the propaganda that has been poured out upon them by the Communists that we really are against Asia. Under no conditions must we do any one single thing that will give the people of Asia the right to feel that destruction is to be our purpose, when our

one purpose is the peace of the world, of understanding among the nations.

In closing let me say that whatever we do in S. 3809 or in any actions that follow in the course of the next weeks and months, let us remember above all things that what we do must be done only after the most earnest and prayerful consideration, because we represent the believing nations and it is in God that we trust. As my Ohio colleague so well said, it is His truth that is marching on. But people do not like to face truth. Yet we must face it and act upon it and we must declare ourselves.

I hope there will be so few dissenting voices to this bill that they will hardly be heard. I hope above all things that in the consideration of this legislation and in all legislation pertaining to the future of mankind on this earth we as a legislative body may be governed entirely by the long view of man's responsibility to Deity.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for the very kind things she said about me. I want to say to the members of the committee that it is with very real regret that I leave the House, with very real regret that I leave the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If nonpartisanship has any reality at all, I think we have come very near achieving it in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The differences of opinion of that committee, as Mrs. BOLTON, the gentlewoman from Ohio, has said, have been individual differences for the most part.

We have been able to create in the committee a healthy atmosphere that has been very productive. Much farsighted legislation has been proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to this body. I think an objective appraisal of the performance and record of the committee will prove this.

I have enjoyed serving on the committee under the great chairmanship of the late Sol Bloom, then under the very distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES A. EATON, and now under the farsighted and wise chairmanship of Judge JOHN KEE, whom all of us in this House love and admire so greatly.

The bill before us today, S. 3809, which would bring up to date the Mutual Defense Assistance program to Europe and to other parts of the world, I support wholeheartedly. I supported it before the committee when it was initially presented. If my memory serves me right, I think I was the first one on the Foreign Affairs Committee to state my full approval of this legislation when it was first discussed by the Secretary of State, the Hon. Dean Acheson. Through weeks of executive session, I fought for the bill as it was presented by the Defense and State Departments. I opposed any cut in the bill last year, both in committee and on this floor. I now support the bill to extend the mutual defense assistance program which is before the House today. I believed then and I believe now that the military

aid program which was conceived and has been carried out in consonance with the United Nations Charter, is the only possible step we can take at this time toward creating the international police force which the world needs if aggression is to be checked and peace secured.

I still believe that the establishment of such an international police force is the goal toward which we ought to strive.

Mr. Chairman, the Members would do well, I think, to go back and read the findings and declaration of policy in the mutual defense assistance bill which the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought to the House last year. I quote the statement in full:

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest. The Congress hereby finds that the efforts of the United States and other countries to promote peace and security in furtherance of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations require additional measures of support based upon the principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. These measures include the furnishing of military assistance essential to enable the United States and other nations dedicated to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter to participate effectively in arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in support of those purposes and principles. In furnishing such military assistance, it remains the policy of the United States to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter of the United Nations require additional control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion.

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

The Congress recognizes that economic recovery is essential to international peace and security and must be given clear priority. The Congress also recognizes that the increased confidence of free peoples in their ability to resist direct or indirect aggression and to maintain internal security will advance such recovery and support political stability.

In the findings and declaration of policy which I have just read you will note that the committee goes on record to declare that the United States should take the leadership in bringing about disarmament, with proper safeguards among the nations of the world, while providing the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter. But it must be recognized that disarmament is impossible unless it is universal.

In bringing the mutual defense assistance program to the floor last year, the Committee on Foreign Affairs had not given up all hope of achieving a permanent peace in the world, but we felt

the steps outlined in the Findings and Declaration of Policy of the Mutual Defense Assistance bill were essential if we were to prevent war and if there was to be real progress toward the accomplishment of a permanent peace in the world. The measure was brought to the floor as the beginning of a preventive program. That is why I felt it was foolhardy to cut the program, since the military said they had given us the basic minimum of what the first step toward such a preventive program ought to be.

If there were doubts about the program in the minds of some members a year ago, I am sure there are no doubts today in anybody's mind as to the soundness of this program. I do not suppose there will be many votes against it now—nor will there be any motion this time to cut the program.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that there were 209 Members of this body who voted last year to cut the program the military had presented as a basic minimum, if security was to be secured within a reasonable number of years.

I want to discuss at this point the Korean program as it relates to the European situation and to this mutual defense assistance bill now before us. We found ourselves in Korea as an accident of war. Korea had become a protectorate of Japan in 1905. It became her puppet in 1907. It was formally annexed by Japan in 1910. It was one of the conquered areas of the Japanese Empire awaiting liberation at the end of World War II. At the Cairo Conference, on December 1, 1943, China, Great Britain, and the United States were party to the pledge to guarantee Korea's independence. That pledge was later underwritten by Russia at the Potsdam Conference on July 26, 1945. Immediately after the Japanese ended hostilities Korea was occupied by forces of the United States and the Soviet Union. That occupation was solely for the purpose of receiving and administering the capitulation of the Japanese forces. To meet the immediate problem of coordinating the acceptance of the Japanese surrender in Korea, military authorities agreed on August 11, 1945, on the 38th parallel as the administrative line between the two forces. It approximately divides the country. It was a clear line on the map. That is the simple explanation for the line drawn on the 38th parallel.

The Russians entered first, on August 12, 1945. They were already just over the border of eastern Siberia. Our nearest forces were in Okinawa and in the Philippines. It took us almost 4 weeks to get to Korea. Someone might ask, "Why did it take so long?" The wonder is how we got there as fast as we did. Our troops were in a tropical climate. They had to be reequipped for a cold climate. Furthermore, Japan had first priority.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentlewoman said the thirty-eighth parallel was a line drawn only for receiving the surrender.

Is that actually true, or is there any division there as between people? Is there any division of the country that naturally heretofore had been divided?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. GRANGER. Then the thirty-eighth parallel was just a division to receive the surrender of the Russians on one side and the Americans on the other?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is all. As I say, the Russians got into Korea faster than the Americans did, because they were right on the eastern Siberian border. As a matter of fact, they came down below the thirty-eighth parallel, but when the United States forces came in the Russians went back above that thirty-eighth parallel.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Certainly, I yield to my chairman.

Mr. KEE. As a matter of fact, at the time of the surrender of the Japanese Army, the nearest troops of the United States were in the Philippine Islands. The Russians, as you have said, were poised on the northern border of Korea, ready to march in. That agreement was made at that time for the sole purpose of taking the surrender of the Japanese Army, and the Russians took the surrender down to the thirty-eighth parallel, and the United States, when we got our troops in Korea, took it up to the thirty-eighth parallel. The Russians went in on August 2, 1945. It was not until September 12 that we were able to get our troops from the Philippines into the southern part of Korea, and then we found the Russians had moved in and had come south of the thirty-eighth parallel. We had to persuade them to go back. The line at the thirty-eighth parallel was never intended to have any political significance; it was solely a military measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the events that followed have been stated in the House. I made a speech about it a few days after the invasion against the Republic of Korea, and I will not repeat it here, except to brief those incidents.

The Russians dropped what amounted to an iron curtain at the thirty-eighth parallel. We sought to fulfill our pledge of Korean independence. We remained in Korea in order to fulfill that pledge. We endeavored for 2 years to negotiate with the Russian military in northern Korea so that that pledge could be fulfilled, but we were unable to get anywhere. We sought, first of all, to negotiate with the Russians in Korea, our military men talked with the Russian military in Korea. Then, it was taken up by the governments. When those attempts failed, we laid the problem before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 17, 1947, and ever since that time, which is about 3 years, we have been the servant of the United Nations in Korea.

The United Nations decided that there should be a free election held in Korea

under the supervision of a United Nations Commission. They sent a commission to Korea. We sent a commission to Korea. The Soviets were asked to send a commission into Korea to help supervise such an election. Russia did not send any such commission, nor would she allow the United Nations Commission to go into northern Korea. So that in southern Korea elections were held which ended finally in the establishment of the Republic of Korea. The United Nations declared that this was the only legitimate government in Korea.

As talent was developed among the Koreans, as their own governmental agencies were set up, our authorities transferred functions to them.

Finally, a year ago our military units were withdrawn in compliance with United Nations instructions.

At this point we could have abandoned the young Republic of Korea.

Up to this time any economic aid that had been given was given under our military government and after January 1, 1949, under the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Congress did not have a voice in establishing the policy in Korea. But it was the belief of the President of the United States, the State Department, and the military officials and concurred in largely by the Foreign Affairs Committee that if we did abandon the Republic of Korea she would collapse. It was recognized that the Republic needed economic aid over a short period of time in order to put it on its feet, especially since the country was divided. You will remember that we had in Korea just the reverse of what we have in Germany today. In southern Korea we have the agricultural half of the country, and in northern Korea we have the industrial half under the influence of the Russians.

The Foreign Affairs Committee brought to the floor a Korean aid bill which, you will remember, was defeated by one vote. I strongly supported that bill. I agreed with the findings of the military and the State Department that to abandon Korea would in a very real sense undermine our security in the Far East. We cannot hope to have security in the world or to have a peaceful world, or a free world, unless we have the confidence and trust of the people of the Far East. Had we abandoned Korea, had we not insisted on bringing through the House the Senate bill that provided aid to Korea, I am convinced that the Russians would have been in control of all of Korea today without a struggle. The failure of this Congress to act would have given to the Russians by default Korea which the Communists are now trying to take by force.

If we had not passed the Korean aid bill we would have lost the confidence, I am sure, of the peoples in the Far East. But we did pass the Korean aid bill through the insistence of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. We also enacted some military aid under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of last year.

The question now is—it gets very interesting—the question now is, why have the Koreans not been able to withstand this onslaught from the north? Why

were they not given tanks and heavy equipment? First of all, the money proposed for military aid for Korea was \$10,000,000. Do you know what we have spent in Greece to date? We have spent over \$500,000,000. And this is not economic aid; this is military aid, and part of the economic aid that was given was made up of military items that were used in the military program. In the first year of our program in Greece, hardly any of the money went for economic aid; it all went for military aid.

The military did not propose the same kind of military aid brought to the floor of the House for Greece. You cannot furnish the arms to stop full-scale invasion with \$10,000,000. The program passed by the Congress last year proposed to give to the Republic of Korea only the light arms and ammunition necessary to maintain internal order and to ward off the kind of skirmishes that had been going on along the thirty-eighth parallel. Had we brought to the floor of the House, Mr. Chairman, a bill for one, two, or three hundred millions, does anyone seriously support that the Congress would have authorized any such measure?

Then there is a much wider consideration that we must also keep before us. How much could we have afforded to put into this part of the world, considering the pressures in Europe and our commitments there?

The very same people who last year scoffed at military aid to Korea are now the greatest self-styled boosters of military aid. Before then they clamored, "This is money down a rathole." Now they shout, "We should have given Korea more."

What if this Congress had appropriated half a billion of military assistance to Korea, and instead of an attack on Korea, we were now faced with an attack on Burma or Indochina or Iran or on one of the North Atlantic Treaty countries? The answer is obvious: The same professional experts on criticism would be crying, "Why so much on Korea and so little on Burma or Indochina or Iran or the North Atlantic Treaty area?"

This whole matter is one of doing the most with a given sum of money and using it according to carefully considered plans and priorities designed to serve the total security interest of the United States. Those strategic decisions must be evaluated on the judgment made upon then existing facts and not upon events which later transpired. The mutual defense assistance program has emphasized the solidarity of western Europe, and I believe correctly so. There we have a collective self-defense organization which is functioning and which is making definite plans for the North Atlantic area. We are trying to do the same thing for the Far East. We have just declared unanimously that we favor the negotiation of a Pacific pact for the common defense of the Pacific area and the participation of the United States in that pact. But in western Europe we have a functioning collective self-defense organization which is developing over-all, integrated defense plans. We must therefore concentrate our energy on working through that or-

ganization, insofar as western Europe is concerned, and in building up a similar organization in the Far East.

The program of mutual defense assistance is a program to attain reasonable security. Nobody can guarantee absolute security.

Now, referring to the Korean situation today, I support the President's action 100 percent. If he had not moved, the United Nations would have been a dead thing today. Because he moved with dispatch to implement the United Nations Security Council resolutions on Korea he has buttressed the United Nations as a great instrumentality of international cooperation. The fact that the nations have responded to the request of the Security Council for aid to the Republic of Korea has brought the establishment of an international police force within the body more nearly in sight.

As a result of the police action in Korea there are certain steps that are clearly indicated at this time. First, the United Nations itself. We could not have taken the immediate action that we did in the United Nations if Russia had sat on the Security Council and had exercised its right of veto. Happily Russia was not there. Had she been there, we would then have had to turn to the General Assembly. It would have taken at least 3 days, maybe more, before a resolution from the Assembly of the United Nations could have been passed condemning the aggression against the Republic of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 5 minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Had it taken that long for the United Nations to act, the Republic of Korea might have fallen in that time to the aggressive forces from the north.

It is clearly indicated that the action that has taken place in Korea is not a single, isolated incident. I think we may expect a series of such aggressions throughout the world. Looking ahead to the future, should we not at once within the United Nations take the kind of action which will make it possible for that body to act instantly, even if there are those sitting on the Security Council who might want to veto such instant action?

No. 2: The Korean incident high lights our own deficiencies as far as military preparedness is concerned. We are going to have to appropriate more money for preparedness. We are going to have to have our Armed Forces better equipped. To do this will mean that there will have to be a greater drain on our economy. I do not believe, and I have not believed at any time since the end of the war, that the way to do this is to cut taxes and arbitrarily begin to reduce across the board. That is as detrimental to our position in a free world as not to have any defense forces at all. For instance, we talk about preparing ourselves militarily, and very few people will object to that today, but will they take the other steps that are demanded? Let us take steel. Today we are produc-

ing steel at 100 percent capacity. In other words, we are using our entire capacity in steel at the present time. If we increase our Armed Forces we have got to produce more steel. We entered World War II with an excess capacity of power—public and private—of between 30 and 40 percent. Never at any time during the war did our reserves of power drop lower than 18 percent, and today, my friends, I would point out to the Members of the Committee that we are below that figure; dangerously below that figure. Today the margin is only 12 percent. You cannot live without power; you cannot run your great industries without power. You cannot make aluminum without power and you cannot make planes without aluminum. When people blow off the tops of their heads with the cry, "We will cut off the Department of the Interior," they are cutting away the very strength that will enable this country to defend itself in war. We must give some real study to this. I believe that the situation in Korea can be an eye opener that will save us in the long run. I think we can point out our shortcomings, point out the things we have not done that we must do, maybe make us talk some sense for a change, and not try to appeal to the voters, to "cut taxes" when it means maybe that this man's son or that woman's son would have to die on the battlefield because of a few dollars cut in taxes. No, nobody likes to pay taxes, but we have got to expand our economy if we are to seriously plan for peace in the world.

What is Russia afraid of? She is afraid of the great potential of this country to mobilize our industrial strength, and I believe she is afraid more of that than of our soldiers at various places in the world. She knows that this country can out produce her. This will do more to hold her, to restrain her, than any other single thing.

So, I think it was foolhardy when the power program was cut in this country. I think it has been foolhardy ever since the end of the war when those of short sight or selfish interest moved to cut that power program.

We must try to achieve the goals that we all want. There are those who are rather shortsighted; some may be a little more absorbed with their own desires than they ought to be, but basically we all want the same thing. I think we have got to sit down very realistically and see what it will take, and then we have got to proceed and do the things that are necessary. Peace is not cheap, but war is a lot more expensive. Mr. Hoffman testified some months ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I believe, that the cost of the war, when it is finally added up, will be over \$1,350,000,000,000—that is one trillion three hundred and fifty billion dollars. So, in terms of money there is no comparison between what war costs and what it will cost to build an enduring peace. But, we have to build it; we have to build it brick by brick, and stone by stone. What those of us who pointed to the importance of Korea have said has been borne out. I think in terms of peace and in terms of security for our own children. Let us learn by it. Let us

not spend our time in recriminations. Let us profit from our lessons, and let us all, together, wisely plan for the future, a future that has strength in it; a future that is mapped along courageous and hopeful lines, and let us rid ourselves of the fear that is every day being deliberately injected by some into the bloodstream of America. We have nothing to fear except our failure to face facts and to take the action they call for.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 19 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this legislation. I think that whatever differences we may have had on this kind of assistance in the past we must now close ranks, and the command is "Forward," together.

I wish it might be as easy as that, Mr. Chairman, to satisfy my people. They are asking many questions today and they want to know how we came to get into this situation. The bill before us contains some money for Korean assistance. In the time allotted me I shall address myself to that problem.

Many Members who have opposed aid for Korea in the past did so on the ground that it could not be defended with Communists in control of China. Certainly economic aid without adequate military support was an unwise operation.

Then there was a further reason and that was the testimony of both State Department officers and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that South Korea was untenable if the Red Koreans or the Russians decided to attack.

There never was justification in my opinion for the investment of American dollars for permanent improvements in Korea when the Red Koreans could take it over at will.

In order to keep the record straight and not in the spirit of "I told you so," I shall refer to pertinent testimony by administration witnesses from hearings before our committee in support of the Korean programs.

In February 1948, in the Eightieth Congress, Gen. George Marshall, then Secretary of State, testified:

Mr. JUDD. There is a military attack upon the governments in each case and the economic aid can do no good if the governments go down; is not that correct?

Secretary MARSHALL. That is correct.

And further and at the same time, apropos Korea, Secretary Marshall said:

Mr. JUDD. * * * If North Korea and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable.

Hearings on H. R. 5330; providing aid for the Republic of Korea, June 1949: Developed interesting testimony on the questions of economic aid and the futility of it, without military support. Also that the administration did not want to support Korea militarily. Excerpts follow:

Page 43:

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. If we would draw our troops out of South Korea, is there anything that would stop the Russians from taking over South Korea if they decided to do so?

General HELMICK. If the Russians decided to do so, they could take over South Korea without any great military difficulty, sir. They are right there with large armies. Any troops that we have there would suffer another Bataan.

Page 44:

Mrs. BOLTON. General, you made a remark that this would prove militarily another Bataan if Russia were to move down. Does that mean that you feel it is just a matter of time before they would simply move on?

General HELMICK. What I meant was a military force on a peninsula like that would be out of luck with an overwhelming force coming down from the north. I think Russia could do it any time that she decided it was worth while.

Mrs. BOLTON. That might well happen at any time if she made up her mind. Now, that she has all of northern China, she would want that little peninsula to hop off to Japan with?

General HELMICK. I think she would have to estimate the effects of her doing it.

Page 52:

Mr. JACKSON. * * * Now it has been said so often that Korea is absolutely untenable, or would be, in the face of any determined opposition, whether that opposition be military or whether it be by infiltration. That is a fair statement, is it not, General?

General HELMICK. From a military point of view, yes.

Page 120—Mr. George F. Kennan, director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State:

Mrs. DOUGLAS. * * * Is it sound to withdraw United States troops from Korea, July 1, having only technical forces to further train the Korean army? * * *

Mr. KENNAN. I do not think, myself, that the retention of American troops there will be what it takes to do the thing we want to have done in the next year in Korea. * * *

General BOLTE. With respect to whether the tactical units should come out now or whether they should remain for an additional period of, say, a year, we feel that they should come out now. * * * We feel that they not only could come out but that they should come out, and their place be taken by the Korean military advisory group.

Gen. Charles L. Bolte testified as director, Plans and Operations Division, Department of the Army.

Page 137:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Kennan, there is an interesting article in Time magazine on Korea. * * * I understood you to say that you thought in a battle between North and South, the South Koreans would have a pretty fair chance. Do you suggest that this information in Time magazine is erroneous or do you think that 300,000 North Koreans would have a very difficult time against 100,000 armed South Koreans?

Mr. KENNAN. I would like to refer that question to General Bolte.

General BOLTE. I believe that is an exaggeration. * * * We feel that the forces in South Korea are far better equipped than the North Korean troops.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why did the general make that statement? What basis did he have for making that statement? The gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, ought to be able to answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that was a military question, if you please.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, what I mean is, I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have asked the general on what basis he made that statement, and make him put it in the record, because we have to depend upon you to get the information for us. I do not think he had any basis on earth for making that statement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Page 140:

General BOLTE. If I may, I would like to make three comments in the interest of clarification of what was said yesterday. First, that the Army as the executive agent for the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the Far East, is not only agreeable to the withdrawal of the tactical formations from Korea, but are heartily in favor of it, as they feel that the point has been reached in the development of the South Korean forces and in the supplying of material aid as well as advisory aid to the South Korean forces, that it has reached a point where the tactical units can and should be withdrawn.

The second point I should like to make—and I think it has been made before this morning—is that we have provided very substantial material aid to the South Korean forces in the way of small arms and other military equipment.

This has been estimated to be \$125,000,000.

Page 141:

Mr. SMATHERS. I have not had the benefit of the general's direct testimony, but I understood Mr. Kennan to say that it was the policy, General, to withdraw what small troops we have in Korea. Is that right?

General BOLTE. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then the withdrawal is solely in conformity with the United Nation's resolution?

General BOLTE. Yes, but the Army is definitely in favor of it for other military reasons.

Page 143:

Mr. LODGE. You feel that the Korean Government is able to fill the vacuum caused by the withdrawal of the occupation forces?

General BOLTE. Definitely.

Page 160:

General TIMBERMAN. * * * From the Army point of view on the military significance or impact upon our position in the Far East that attends the tactical withdrawal of our forces in Korea, we will be in much better shape militarily when the tactical forces have been withdrawn from Korea.

Page 163:

General TIMBERMAN. If we left troops in Korea, I do not think anyone would suggest we enter into combat with the Korean forces.

Page 169:

Mr. SMITH. Yes, but I have asked you from a military standpoint how will this aid program increase our security. I would certainly like to have some conclusion by the military on that question. In what way? That is what I am concerned about. * * *

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me that you have just admitted that from a military standpoint it does not affect our national security.

General TIMBERMAN. No; it does not. As an agency of the government we help where we can. I do not think the military part of the matter enters into the economic aid at

all, besides we might get into trouble later on, after we are in there militarily, which would be unfortunate.

Page 170:

Mr. SMITH. Assuming it (Korea) went down because we did not give the aid, would it follow from that, that we might have to go in there with military force and defend ourselves or our national security?

General HAMILTON. No, sir; I do not think it is a question of direct military security in that sense. I do not think, unless we were to put absolutely inordinate forces in Korea, that we could guarantee by military force against economic collapse. The military phases are over.

Page 177:

Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to ask one question: Is it your position * * * that it would not be wise to keep troops in Korea? * * *

General TIMBERMAN. Yes, sir; it would not be wise. * * *

Admiral WOOLRIDGE. I concur.

General HAMILTON. I concur fully and that has been the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been unanimous. There has been no difference so far as I know.

Page 178:

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff this question: Do I understand correctly that the Chiefs of Staff advise the withdrawal of troops from Korea at this time?

General HAMILTON. That is correct.

Admiral WOOLRIDGE. That is correct.

General TIMBERMAN. That is correct.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The Army, Navy, and Air Force?

General HAMILTON. That is correct.

Page 181:

Mr. JUDD. You do not deny that the Army has wanted to get out for a long, long time? Mr. JOHNSON of ECA. No, sir.

Page 186:

General HAMILTON. * * * It has unquestionably been decided long since by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that there is nothing further that we should do militarily.

Mr. JUDD. * * * I believe sincerely that the Korea economic program, accompanied by military withdrawal and without a program to keep the Chinese Communists busy, does not have more than a 25 percent chance of success and therefore I question whether we are justified in approving this. * * *

Mr. JOHNSON. I think this committee will admit that I have been very honest and candid with you. I frankly believe this program has a 90 percent chance of success.

Mr. Chairman, until last June 25 there was great reluctance on the part of President Truman and Secretary Acheson and his advisers—Jessup, Lattimore, and Service—to come to grips with the real problem in the Far East, in fact, they deliberately avoided it. They were perfectly willing to let the dust settle and wait for results. They also appeared ready to recognize Communist China and do business with it. When the blow fell on the 25th of June it was obvious that our far-eastern policy or lack of it was a colossal blunder and it has put us in another war 7,000 miles from home.

Mr. Chairman, the record of our foreign policy in the Far East has been made. Our mistakes live after us but the people are entitled to the facts. We

had a good yardstick to follow in the Wedemeyer report contained in the State Department's so-called white paper on China. We chose to ignore General Wedemeyer's recommendations. Here are his words:

In order to preclude defeat by Communist forces it is necessary to give the National Government sufficient and prompt military assistance under the supervision of American advisers in specified military fields.

American military aid to China, ground, sea, and air, would, if appropriately supervised, contribute to gradual development of stability in the Far East and lessen the possibility of a Communist-dominated China.

So Mr. Chairman, when the Nationalist Government in China went down, our position in Korea was untenable and Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Malaya, and Indochina were placed in jeopardy. It was our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], who fought so valiantly for the program in China that General Wedemeyer advocated. Had the advice of Mr. Judd been followed by the State Department, there would have been no war in Korea and American boys would not be dying 7,000 miles from home.

But do I hear someone say, "But that is all water over the dam"? Quite true, but dumb indeed must we be if we do not profit by experience.

As has just been shown, the administration's conduct in Korea and other places is full of contradictions. It has demonstrated its inconsistency, its incompetence. That being true, in these tragic days, when the very security of the Republic is threatened, we should not look for guidance nor entrust our future to those who are responsible for the position in which we now find ourselves.

In November the people, regardless of their political faith, should elect a Congress, and in 1952 a President, who will always have first in mind the welfare and future security of this Republic.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Battle].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because it is part of a program necessary to bring about peace in the world.

As a result of the tragic invasion of Korea, we should learn the hard lesson that it will be necessary in the future for us to abandon the policy of retaliation and invest our time, money, and efforts in a policy of war prevention.

Our whole defense is built on the basis of retaliation. On the basis of what we will do, after we have been attacked. We all remember Secretary of Defense Johnson's speech a few days ago when he said that within an hour after we are attacked we will be ready to retaliate. Irrespective of our state of preparedness or unpreparedness, Secretary Johnson was reflecting the policy established by the American people and the American Government under which the military must operate.

Korea emphasizes the fact that the overwhelming odds favor the aggressor. An aggressor nation knows what it is preparing for, knows what it is going to

do, knows where it is going to attack, and is in a position to choose the time and place for a knockout blow with the least effort. Our policy has been to wait, to sit back, to take a beating, and then struggle to our feet and whip the bully. We have always been saved by time, distance, and strong allies. But we have none of these things between us and the enemy now, and we had better not count on them.

In the warfare of today it is not a question of being knocked off our feet and getting up to retaliate. If we wait until the global battle lines are formed and until an aggressor delivers a sneak knockout punch at America—then it might be too late to act.

The United States and the world must be ready and prepared to stop war before it starts. Plenty of danger signals have warned us that an aggressor nation was on the move in every instance, long before the attack came. That is the time to call their hand. We must never again underestimate the ability of a nation that has clearly demonstrated that it is following a policy of world aggression. We must adopt a policy of war prevention and discard our old policy of retaliation if we are to escape man's inhumanity to man in this twentieth century of technical geniuses and social idiots. Investment in a peace offensive will be cheap indeed as compared to the money and lives we spent in emergencies such as we are facing today, after they have developed.

Of course, in this crisis we must remedy our weakness as quickly as possible and build up our armed forces to whatever strength is necessary for defense. If the successful conclusion of this crisis takes total industrial and military mobilization, then I am for it. If the successful preservation of peace in the world takes the greatest defense effort we have ever made, I am for that too. The quicker we face the realities and the graveness of the situation, and prepare ourselves and our allies to meet this crisis, the closer the world will be to peace. While the Mutual Defense Assistance Act is only a small part of this program, it is necessary at this time to give the friendly, peace-loving countries throughout the world this moral and material protection against invasion. Supplying arms to the friendly nations under this Mutual Defense Act is a dangerous program, there is no doubt about it. But the alternatives appear to be more dangerous.

We have learned the hard way that there is no peace in appeasement, that dictators make slaves out of pacifists, and that isolationism is a fiction in this age when we can fly around the world in just a few hours.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to this necessary mutual defense assistance program, I think very definitely we had better develop a Pacific pact similar to the Atlantic Pact, to insure mutual participation in the Pacific against aggression and to insure a strong arm in the Far East as well as in Europe.

Neither the United States nor any one nation alone can afford the men and

money necessary to police the entire world indefinitely. Therefore, it behooves us to not only support but to strengthen the best instrument for a peace offensive which we have in the world—the United Nations. Russia made her biggest blunder in her campaign to enslave the freedom-loving nations of the world when she boycotted the Security Council of the United Nations in this Korean crisis. Withdrawal from the Council by the Reds made possible the unprecedented swift sanction of military action which is necessary to stop the Kremlin-planned aggression in southern Korea.

I would like to pause to say that the action of our representatives in the United Nations and of our Chief Executive in this crisis is certainly to be commended, and certainly has my support 100 percent.

The usual veto would have rendered the UN helpless again in its most crucial hour. A Communist victory over the democratic country of South Korea, which was established by the United Nations with the full backing of the United States, would make world war III almost certain. Other nations in the Far East and in Europe would bow to Stalin's superior forces which could overrun any of her neighbor countries unless America helped to stop them. Now we have a fighting chance for peace. Freedom-loving people the world over should press the advantage of our combined peace offensive which will be implemented by this mutual defense assistance program. When this fight is won, as it will be, let us not stop short of reorganizing the United Nations, to make it capable of preventing war under any conditions. World peace must not depend upon the wrong moves or blunders by Russia, or by any other greedy nation. Hitler proved that the waiting, appeasement, retaliation process is too costly and deadly. World peace must not depend upon the wrong moves of Russia but must be won and preserved by the right moves of America, the United Nations, and the freedom-loving countries everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, America has taken the lead to stop Russia and save the United Nations. When the shooting is over, and I pray that may be soon, we should take the lead in rebuilding the United Nations into an organization capable of preventing war. Some time ago I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 15, along with several other Members of Congress, which calls upon the President to immediately take the initiative in calling a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to Article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war. Therefore, it is with a deep conviction that I am asking the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Members of this great body to give your most serious consideration to this resolution designed to take the first step in reorganizing the United Nations which is absolutely necessary if we are to have peace.

The idealistic and the best solution to our international difficulties would be a moral reawakening throughout the world. That places a tremendous responsibility upon our religious and political leaders, a responsibility which to date has not been successfully met. Until such time as we are successful in bringing about conditions where nations truly feel that they are their brother's keeper, and until nations will follow the golden rule of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," it will be necessary for us to stay adequately prepared to stop an aggressor nation before it attacks us, and it will be necessary to create a police force for the United Nations to keep law and order. These things are necessary in the smallest community. They are also necessary in our world community.

Mr. Chairman, with the extension of the mutual defense assistance program, the development of a Pacific pact, the strengthening of the United Nations, and the encouragement of a moral reawakening, I believe we can look forward with more assurance to the peaceful world community we all hope and pray for.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, on the 11th of June, the Foreign Affairs Committee, by a vote of 24 to 0, reported S. 3809, an act to extend the mutual defense assistance program of 1949. This bill was passed by the Senate on June 30, 1950, without a dissenting vote. S. 3809 authorizes funds to continue the mutual defense assistance program through the current fiscal year. Since the substance of the Senate bill incorporates the provisions of the measure on which the Foreign Affairs Committee held long and extensive hearings, it was decided to report S. 3809 to the House without further amendment.

This is a defense measure. The security of the United States is closely entwined with the security of all free nations throughout the world. We cannot follow a policy of arming ourselves in isolation and thereby insure our security. We are assisting our friends not that they will defend us, but so that we and they will be able to defend ourselves and together defend the free world.

COST OF ECONOMIC AND MILITARY PROGRAMS

Since the termination of World War II and particularly since the inception of the Marshall plan, the United States has been extensively helping in the economic rehabilitation of Europe. To carry on the European recovery program we have spent \$10,230,000,000 to date and have authorized \$2,850,000,000 for the present fiscal year. Last year the Congress authorized and appropriated \$1,314,010,000 for military aid to the following countries: United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Iran, Korea, Philippines, Greece, and Turkey. The measure which we are now considering authorizes a total of about \$1,436,500,000 to continue the mutual defense assistance program until June 30, 1951—\$1,222,500,000 of new

funds and approximately \$214,000,000 carried over from last year.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Title I of Senate bill 3809 provides \$1,000,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty area. This will be used to provide actual military equipment and training assistance and the means to produce more to build up the armed forces of the individual nations according to the integrated defense plan for the protection of the whole area. In addition, \$75,000,000 will be spent for raw materials and industrial equipment for the production of military items in Europe by Europeans in their own factories. The \$1,000,000,000 also includes \$12,000,000 for the expense of administering the whole program.

Title II provides \$131,500,000 for Greece, Turkey, and Iran. The funds will be used in these countries to strengthen the combat effectiveness of their armed forces. The objective of these funds is to increase the capacity of each to maintain internal security and to resist aggression. In Greece the aim is to improve the ability to deal with guerrilla activity, actual or threatened. In Turkey the goal is to modernize and streamline their army to increase Turkey's capacity to resist aggression. A modernized force would permit a maximum military effort at a cost less than at present. In Iran the problem is one of capacity to maintain internal stability, as well as to strengthen the defense against aggression from the outside.

Title III provides \$16,000,000 for the Philippines and Korea. The objective in the Philippines is to provide equipment and training to preserve order and suppress the Hukbalahap guerrilla activity threatening the country. The share for Korea was based on building up the capacity of the Korean security forces to maintain stability in the country and prevent border raids from the north. Since the invasion from the north, the nature of the problem has totally changed. At the present time equipment is being rushed to meet the present crisis. The Korean program obviously must be revised completely to meet the need of the present situation.

Seventy-five million dollars for the general area of China is made available in addition to the same sum provided last year. This will be used to continue and expand programs already in operation, also to begin those now being formulated. The funds are to aid forces in that area that are either now engaged or may possibly become engaged in active conflict with Communist elements.

UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

In adopting the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, the Congress established certain lines of policy to guide the operation of the program. It was recognized that economic strength is a prerequisite to peace and security. In Europe, particularly, this meant that economic rehabilitation was a first order of business. However, it was also recognized that in some instances military assistance might be required to achieve a reasonable degree of order in which economic rehabilitation could proceed.

Economic recovery was given a clear priority, but the committee pointed out in its report that the principle should be generalized in application.

It is a settled policy of the Government to support actively and fully the principles of the United Nations Charter. We are acting in Korea in accordance with this principle. Military assistance was tied closely to this policy by the explicit mandate of the Congress. Support of the Charter included the furnishing of mutual-defense assistance to those nations participating in individual and collective arrangements under the Charter.

It is clear that no individual nation has economic and military strength sufficient to carry the security burden of the whole free world. Therefore, the principle of self-help was laid down as a policy for this program. Self-help means that each country receiving assistance is to exert the utmost effort in its own behalf, but self-help in a collective endeavor of all to provide the needed economic and military strength means that this program is a mutual undertaking. Security of the free world is, indeed, a mutual problem. The policy of the Congress is that assistance should also be based on the mutuality of security.

All of these principles relate closely to another—the confidence of people and their ability to resist aggression, whether direct or indirect. Morale is an important factor in any undertaking. Increased confidence and ability to resist aggression is indispensable to economic recovery, also to political, economic, and social stability. They are essential elements of military strength.

CONCERTED ACTION

Much progress has been made toward the economic recovery of western Europe. Under the relentless pressure of events Europe has moved toward unity as evidenced by the creation of such arrangements as the Western Union and its various subsidiary groups, the European Payments Union, the Council of Europe, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Never has there been a more pressing need for unity. The West faces ominous danger. Unless there is concerted action toward the immediate achievement of military integration and unity, the West will be at an obvious disadvantage in the struggle against international communism. The mutual aid program should be accelerated, and it is most essential to extend at once the help contemplated in this measure. At an early date additional assistance will be required to so increase the defenses of the West that our security will be impregnable.

On the 4th of April 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in the city of Washington. The free nations of the West, realizing the necessity for concerted action, decided to form an association under the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of protecting themselves from a possible aggressor. Under the North Atlantic Pact "the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

Since the signing of this pact the Western World has moved toward unifying the Atlantic community. The North Atlantic Council has been working to achieve unity, and through the mutual defense assistance program we have succeeded in laying a foundation for military coordination and integration which will materially assist in protecting the Western World. The west must hasten rearmament programs to deter aggression and to defend itself if a direct assault is perpetrated.

EUROPE IN DANGER

The free nations of western Europe are in grave danger. The brazen attack on South Korea may be but the beginning of a world-wide program of carefully planned aggression. Free peoples must move to improve their military positions immediately. Only by fully preparing for any emergency will the West be in a position to turn back the Red tide. By continuing arms aid to Europe and by speeding our own military preparedness, the power of the free world will be so augmented that the encroachments of communism can be checked. Time is exceedingly important. We are in a world-wide struggle for keeps. The road to survival is strength.

WORLD DIVIDED

The world is sharply divided. On the one hand is Communist Russia and her satellites; on the other are the democracies. Communism means despotism, tyranny, enslavement and death. Democracy embraces the finest ideas and the highest ideals to which the human spirit is capable of aspiring. Democracy is freedom and the opportunity to live without the constant fear of aggression and attack. We are engaged in a struggle for our survival; communism strives to engulf all the nations of this earth.

RED PRESSURE

A cursory survey of a world map impresses us vividly with the points of rising Communist pressure. The Soviet Union through its satellites are incessantly pushing against western Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia. Within the past few days there have been reports of Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian troop movements opposite the border of Yugoslavia. Demands for the control of the Dardanelles are constant. Iran is being pressed by Moscow to grant concessions. This strategic country could well be the victim of aggression in the not too far distant future. The Far East is now in sharp focus as Red pressure is being exerted on Tibet, Burma, Thailand, French Indochina, and Formosa, and as Communist-conducted warfare is being waged against the Republic of Korea.

We are in a continuing crisis. In view of the unprovoked attack on the Republic of Korea and the mounting pressure against free nations, it is essential that our policy of extending military assistance to free nations be accelerated as rapidly as possible. It has become clear beyond dispute that the only language the Communists understand is the language of armed strength. In this world-wide struggle for survival the democracies can and must prevail. To do this there must be an immediate augmenta-

tion of their defenses. Such a course will discourage future attacks.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

In view of the philosophy and the activities of the Communists, we can expect not less but more aggression. The Soviet Union has a large military force and is in control of thousands of satellite troops. We cannot proceed on the assumption that the satellite forces are militarily second rate. This has been blasted by the operations in Korea. This encounter demonstrates that the Communist troops possess good equipment, employ smart tactics, have excellent leadership, and are motivated by a fanatical determination to spread their tyranny.

It is possible, under the system of international communism, to have the military forces of the free world very heavily committed and in dangerous places all over the earth without the Soviet Union committing any of its huge military machine. It is perfectly clear that satellite forces may initiate a shooting war simultaneously in many places. Thus, world conditions make imperative the immediate passage of this measure. World conditions make it necessary for the democracies to accelerate their military production.

At the end of the Second World War our Allies were exhausted, both economically and militarily. After the termination of hostilities in 1945 the United States disarmed unilaterally. Efforts to reconcile the differences between the free world and the Soviet world have proved fruitless and futile. A quick review of the years extending from 1945 to the present time shows that the Soviet Union has done everything to prevent the establishment of a free world and has done all within its power to frustrate the efforts of those who seek to build a decent international society. This has been accomplished in several ways. The veto has been employed in the United Nations on 39 occasions. The United Nations has been used as a sounding board for vituperative utterances against the free world and particularly the United States. International conference after conference has been wrecked and torpedoed by the recalcitrance and uncompromising attitude of the Communists. The Soviet Union has prevented any basic agreement on the solution of international problems.

Ambassador Douglas, in a statement made when the hearings on the mutual defense assistance program were going on this year, said:

We have learned that only the strong can settle issues with the Kremlin peacefully. Collateral dividends are derived from a condition of strength.

I have held this opinion for a long time. In a speech to the House on December 15, 1947, after having been to the Near East and Western Europe, I said:

In the face of the open hostility being displayed by the dictatorship of Russia, our only course is to strengthen our defenses and make ourselves sufficiently strong to cope with any and all emergencies. There is not the least scintilla of evidence that the Communist dictatorship entertains even the remotest desire to establish a peaceful world. Even the most superficial inspection

of the record leads us to the conclusion that they will not accede to any program other than their own sinister plan which leads to the complete crushing of freedom and to a final and ultimate tyrannous subjection of all people.

The great significance of the President's action in the Far East is that we have now definitely drawn a line against aggression in Asia. From now on aggression in the east, as well as in the west, will be met with determined action.

In a speech entitled "A Bipartisan Foreign Policy," on this floor the 1st of April 1948, I proposed definite action against aggression. The seventh principle reads as follows:

The United States should inform the world and particularly the Soviet Union that we intend to use our force to stop aggression directed at strategic points such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, the countries of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, China, and the islands of the Pacific. We should state clearly that whenever there is encroachment on these areas, or any other strategic positions, the integrity of which we deem essential to the security and the survival of the United States, the power making such an encroachment will meet with our immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance. We should for our own self-interest and the peace of the world establish a line beyond which an aggressor may not move without encountering the full force and power of the United States.

CLEAR AND REALISTIC THINKING

The current crisis demands clear realistic thinking and most competent statesmanship. We must clearly evaluate our foreign policy and more particularly our military policy in relation to our total foreign policy. Military assistance to the countries of western Europe and to the free nations in the Near and Far East has become a part of our over-all policy. The mutual defense assistance program begun last year will have to be continued until this struggle between the free and the enslaved world has been resolved in favor of human liberty.

The lot of Europe is cast with that of the free world. The net effect of an increase in the growth of power in Europe is to increase the power of the West. This is most urgent. Militant communism is not a theory. Militant communism is a program of aggression, seeking to carry the techniques of tyranny to every corner of the earth. It is an inescapable fact that communism, as has been demonstrated very graphically in the Korean situation, does not shrink from aggression—cold or hot. Nothing except superior force will stop communism in its attempt to achieve its sinister goal of world domination.

MORE FUNDS REQUIRED

This bill is calculated to help establish and maintain peace so as to prevent a general world conflict. In view of the tension existing around the globe it is my opinion that the sum authorized in the measure under discussion is insufficient. I am ready to vote for much larger sums to improve at once the mutual defenses of the free world. By adopting this measure and immediately agreeing to the appropriation we will have again made it perfectly clear that

we intend to continue our resistance to aggression. It will be plain that we will employ our power to maintain the integrity and the independence of the free world. Just as we have fought aggression in the past, so we will continue our stand against tyranny until the Communist drive in Korea is halted and until the spread of despotism is arrested around this globe. Nothing less than human freedom is at stake. Democracy today is hanging in the balance. The Western World is waging a life-and-death struggle for its existence. The free nations must, and will, cooperate to win this battle for liberty. The Western World has the resources, the ability, and the determination to prevent communism from dominating the earth.

OBJECTIVES OF THE MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT

In joining the North Atlantic Treaty and in adopting the Mutual Defense Assistance Act last year, we drew a line against aggression in western Europe, and on June 27, 1950, a similar line was drawn in Asia. I supported the mutual defense assistance program last year and voted for the entire authorization, also the full appropriation as requested. I am happy to give my full support to the present measure under discussion and stand ready to vote to authorize and appropriate all the funds necessary to increase the strength of the Western World sufficiently to stop the universal Communist drive.

The 1951 mutual defense assistance program is planned to carry on the objectives of the 1950 program which has changed only in the urgency of achieving the end result. In the present situation there are several important factors which must be considered. The program before the House was planned prior to the invasion of Korea. But the clash of arms in the Far East does not change the over-all plan in substance. Developments in Korea emphasize the urgency and the necessity of making it more effective as soon as possible. Mutual defense assistance program is a potent instrumentality for strengthening the nations that love liberty.

Our defenses should be immediately increased in the Pacific and elsewhere. We must exert our every effort in fully and adequately preparing this Nation for future emergencies. I said in a speech on foreign policy on April 1, 1948, that—

Most important of all planks in a realistic, bipartisan program on foreign policy is the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. Atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs. United States air supremacy is the only road to world peace. All the funds required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress. Having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this determined objective.

CONCLUSIONS

The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and the bill we are considering today for the continuation of this program were carefully drawn to achieve given objectives as soon as possible. This was

a mandate of the Congress. MDAP has been slow in developing. The tempo of this program must be increased at once. Its continuation is essential to our defense and security.

Through the mutual defense assistance program we are assisting our friends in becoming strong, and we are helping them construct military power so that they can make their contribution to the survival of the western world. It is becoming clearer day by day that the next few years will be exceedingly crucial in man's long struggle to acquire freedom. During the years immediately before us the issue between freedom and tyranny will be joined on many fronts. A hot war is possible in various areas. The future of the free world is now being decided.

To maintain the free world and the free way of life we must look to our defenses and do everything to increase our military effectiveness immediately. We are faced with a great challenge and a great opportunity to make an outstanding contribution to the construction of a decent international society. The passage of this measure now under discussion will bolster the West, psychologically and militarily. By swift concerted action the free nations can augment their military power to the point that a third world-wide conflict can perhaps be averted. Firm and resolute action on this measure and future similar measures will enable the West to maintain a democratic society. Time is running out. Quick action is imperative. Failure to arm ourselves sufficiently to meet any emergency would mean that we are not cognizant of the frightful times in which we live.

Strong, resolute, firm, and realistic policies, dedicated to world freedom, backed by the armed might of this Republic and the other democratic states, will guarantee a free world, a world in which nations can exist without fear of intimidation, of aggression, of enslavement, and of ultimate annihilation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, the mutual defense assistance pact now before us for consideration was adopted by your House Foreign Affairs Committee by a unanimous vote. Partisanship and politics never came into the discussion of this legislation. The urgency of this moment requires partisanship to be at least temporarily laid aside. I have never met the man whose hindsight is not superior to his foresight. This bill was reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee by 24 affirmative votes because everyone on that committee recognized that the bill is an essential piece of legislation if the freedom and security of the democracies of western Europe are to be preserved. It is essential if our own freedom and democracy are to be preserved. The men who sit in the Kremlin today have well-expressed ambitions to achieve for themselves world domination and world control. Their forces are world-wide and indivisible. Wherever and whenever they can bite off another group of peoples, another portion of land, they do so, and then they immediately

turn those peoples and that land against freedom and democracy and use them and that land for further and additional staging grounds from which they continue their endeavors to destroy that for which the United States stands. Therefore, when we assist the democracies of Europe and Asia, when we help to strengthen them, to make them able to fight and resist Communist aggression, we are not only assisting them to preserve liberty but at the same time we improve our own position in this mortal struggle with the Communists. We know that today the battle which is going on in Korea—some people say it is not a war, but certainly we must all admit that while it may not be war it is at least a battle—that the Korean battle is just one facet—just one small operation—in this struggle for world domination by the Communists. It really is no more than a continuation of the battle that we waged 5 years ago against the forces of Hitler. The battle we are fighting in Korea is a continuation of the fight against dictatorship and totalitarianism.

It is important that we not at any time lose sight of the fact that the Communists have military forces all over the world poised and ready to move at a moment's notice. The mutual defense assistance pact is a recognition of the type and the kind of a world-wide conflict which we are in, and it is a recognition of the fact that while Korea is most important, that there are at the same time other important areas which must be defended. This legislation is this country's best and quickest way to help defend those other vital areas from being overrun.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is a continuation of legislation which was adopted by the Congress last year. It was bitterly fought last year in its original form by several Members of this Congress. I do not in any way wish to condemn those who opposed it last year. There are many Members of this great body who are sincere in their beliefs that we should adopt a policy of isolationism. They sincerely believe that we are wasting our substance and resources to attempt to assist other democracies in their fight against Communist aggression.

And then there is another group who fought this and other similar legislation. It is that group that somehow believed they saw some relationship between the Communist philosophy and so-called liberalism to which they give such loud verbal support. They were led to this belief because the Communists are smart enough to pick up a few desirable domestic programs and advocate them—then, having ensnared support from these well-intentioned people on those domestic issues, the Communists were able to sell them on some of their foreign programs without at any time our friends being aware of what was happening to them. This tactic is known in fishing as "chumming up." That is the practice which prevails in Florida where, in order to get the appetite of the fish exercised and whetted, you chop up bait and throw it overboard for a little while, then later on put a hook in some of that other bait

and the fish unsuspectingly goes for it and is caught.

I am proud to have not been so beguiled. I am proud to have supported the Truman doctrine and been one of those who firmly believe that the only way we could ever win a peace, or get the Russians to agree to a peace was to make them see the futility of their aggression by our strength and resolve to resist them. I am proud to have raised my voice in pleading that we leave our troops in South Korea until we were sure the Communists had been withdrawn from North Korea. I am proud of having invited Gen. Claire Chennault to appear before our Foreign Affairs Committee in order to impress upon its membership the necessity for holding up the hand of Nationalist China in its resistance to communism. I am proud of being co-sponsor of a resolution calling for a mutual assistance pact with the democracies of Asia and the United States in resisting the spread of communism. I am proud of my record in opposing Communist philosophy and expansion at each and every opportunity. There were times when it was not as popular to be against it, as it is today. However, the situation is changed now. The naked and brutal, the inexcusable and cynical aggression on the part of the men of the Kremlin on the South Koreans in order to further the cause of Communist domination has made everyone, I am sure, realize the real intention and the madness of the men of Moscow. We are all now suddenly awake to the danger. I think we all now believe this mutual defense assistance pact is at this time a must. Certainly it is absolutely essential that at the earliest possible moment we strengthen with military assistance those democratic allies of ours who, operating under the UN just as we are doing, desire to band together in order to protect their people and their government from dictatorship and to preserve their freedom. In the name of common sense and prudence this is the minimum at least that we can do.

I personally believe that we should even go further. When men are dying as they are in the battle of Korea, it is no time in my opinion for business as usual, pleasure as usual, or politics as usual, and certainly today American men are dying in the rice paddies of Korea; and they are dying in order to protect our freedom and our democracy. As grateful Americans who appreciate and understand the sacrifices which are being made, we should immediately gather our strength, firm up our resolve to see that those men now engaged in this battle have every physical, every economic, and every military advantage that it is possible for this Nation to give them. The time has come when we must call on industry, labor, management, and manpower to immediately undertake a program of mobilization for not only the battle which is now raging in Korea, but because of the prospects of a total war which can happen at any moment the Communist leadership decide on it. The gathering up of all of our resources, the readying of all of our people for an all-out effort will not necessarily signify the beginning of world war III, but on

the contrary the evidence of a realistic, determined and unified American people resolved to go all the way to preserve freedom and democracy as a possibility of bringing about a peace. From the experience that we have had with the Russians since World War II, we must all agree that above everything else they are practical men. The men of the Kremlin, while pursuing the philosophy of communism, are nevertheless realists. If once they get it clear in their minds the understanding and appreciation of our resolve, our firm determination not only to fight, but our willingness to fight with every ounce of strength and manpower, and wealth that we have to fight with, they then can see, and probably for the first time, that a continuation of their present course of aggressive expansion will lead them to total war and the devastation and destruction which automatically follows.

Then, and only then, Mr. Chairman, will they as realists and practical men sit down and say to themselves "let's stop, let's look, let's listen." Then, and only then, in my opinion, do we in America, and we of the democratic nations throughout the world have the hope of averting world war III. We must by our acts prove that our fervor and devotion to democracy and our country are as strong and irresistible as is their enthusiasm to destroy it. We must make them see this. This military assistance program is an essential part of our determination and willingness to sacrifice in order to stop the encroachments on freedom. To win a peace this legislation is essential; to win a war, which let us hope and pray will never happen, this program is also essential. I am confident that every Member of this Congress, now that the mask has been stripped from the hearts of the men in the Kremlin will enthusiastically support this program of mutual defense.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this mutual defense assistance program is an important measure. It is not a measure that we should pass over lightly and think of as just the ordinary procurement program. This is the implementing of foreign policy of the United States for the security of the United States.

The people in the Congress and the people in the country often talk of foreign policy as if it were just a method of speaking about a subject which did not concern them, and which was simply theorizing about disturbing and entangling alliances. Foreign policy is only powerful and effective when it is implemented by the force of intelligent public opinion, and when it can be supported, if necessary, by the strength of arms and economic power of the country.

United States foreign policy should be based on clear principles of justice in dealing with the peoples of the world. It should not be used to support tottering imperialistic regimes which peoples are repudiating. The duty of the American people, of course, is to have the kind of a progressive program that will weld public opinion both in this country and the world behind it. As a corollary,

we must have power behind our foreign policy. If necessary, when there is aggression, we must have the strength that these policies can be implemented.

One of my criticisms has been of the general foreign policy of the country, that we have not been accurate enough to assess the impact of fast-moving changes which are occurring in this revolutionary era. We have not been quick enough to realize that often the forces of world public opinion are shut out, and that the forces of world public opinion cannot effectively assist a particular policy so that it can be implemented because of restrictive conditions. In our country we insist that there be certain rules and conditions under which public opinion is free to operate, under which business, labor, and farmer, and production and distribution, can operate. We must insist on such conditions in the world regardless of boundaries, and aim our policies toward promoting world security for the average man today, and a future of hope for him and his family free from repression and exploitation.

Where the rules of public security break down, then the whole economic life of the local community breaks down and the same thing happens in the world. As I felt this program is important for our security if kept within proper limits, I am one of those that has pressed the program ever since its first introduction into the House.

As you know, this program passed the Senate on Friday, June 30 of this year. The House came back into session after a 10-day recess on July 10, 1950. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has been on the job right straight through on this particular program, met immediately; in fact, on Tuesday, July 11 of this year, we reported the Senate bill out without any amendments. The people who had amendments felt that if we held this program up for even the time to consider amendments we were endangering the security of the United States and endangering this program throughout the world.

The people who are our friends among the democratic nations of the world are looking to see whether we are standing behind these United States commitments abroad, whether we mean what we say, that the world shall be a world where free people can live, whether we will provide that bland security force for our allies, and stand behind them; or whether, on the other hand, the United States is going to start into a policy of appeasement and retreat, both geographically and in the world of ideas, whether the United States will gradually pull in its horns and interests to the shores of this country and make the last stand, ourselves, isolated, friendless, and alone. In order to show that we really mean that the United States will implement the United Nations and assist the economic progress and implement the security of the free nations wherever they are, Congress must immediately take action on legislation of this kind in the House.

What has happened? You would think that when the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously, 24 to 0, regardless of party, on a bipartisan bill, reported out a mutual defense

assistance bill on July 11, that the House would take immediate action. On the contrary, the House Rules Committee did not consider this bill until yesterday, July 17. Here we are on July 18 of this year of our Lord 1950 trying to discuss this bill, a whole week after the time when it could have been considered if the Rules Committee had met, and accepted the responsibility of this legislation, and had taken the action to report it out so it could have been debated.

We in this House should have been working on this legislation either Tuesday afternoon of last week or Wednesday morning, July 12. The boys in Korea certainly do not have the time to put off their immediate actions for a week, and we in Congress in backing them and in backing the forces that are allied with us abroad should likewise not be able to take the time for 1 week to let a measure such as this lie idle.

I have asked the Rules Committee for a public explanation because, as I said earlier today, they are responsible to the House, and they are responsible to the country. There can be no committee of this Congress that avoids its responsibility. Someone from the Democratic administration on the Rules Committee should answer this to the country. Why was this vital military assistance program delayed for a week without action? Why, when this bill is so important to our security, was this allowed to lie on the table with nothing being done?

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of responsibility. What has been done with respect to the Joint Chiefs of Staff who set forth one policy before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and now we find that policy completely reversed? Who is placing the responsibility for that sort of thing?

Mr. FULTON. The responsibility for the policies and the execution of the policies lies fundamentally with the administration.

Mr. GROSS. With the Commander in Chief, is that not correct, in the case of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. FULTON. The foreign policy of the United States is placed by the Constitution under the President of the United States. Congress simply implements these policies.

Mr. GROSS. What has been done to remove these generals who gave the Foreign Affairs Committee contrary information?

Mr. FULTON. Several days ago on the floor I raised the question as to the adequacy of our intelligence.

There should be an explanation by the Central Intelligence Agency of this country as to whether intelligence is accurate because there is no doubt we have been deficient in having accurate information upon which to take action.

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

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to yield, sir.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman commented on why this matter was never taken up by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FULTON. As to when it was.

Mr. HERTER. As an individual member of the Committee on Rules I might say my office telephoned regularly to the clerk of the committee to find out whether a meeting would be held to consider this very important matter.

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to have that, because I know the gentleman is doing his job and he thinks this military-aid legislation is important for United States security, too.

Mr. HERTER. After hearing the testimony of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that of the authorization and appropriation made last year of \$1,300,000,000 for this purpose, less than \$100,000,000 had ever found its way overseas, it does not seem, from the point of view of urgency that the matter was quite as urgent as the gentleman makes it out.

Mr. FULTON. Events have proved the program was as urgent as I am making it out, because I have no excuse for any department of this Government failing to carry out the expressed will and determination of this Congress. As you will find through the hearings, there are various of us on the committee who have said time and again that these programs are important and have examined the Government witnesses regularly on why those items of security legislation were not being implemented. You will find there are many members on both sides of our committee, but especially the Republican side, who have cross-examined, saying, "Why the delay? Where is the delay? Is it in the State Department? Is it in the Department of Defense? Is it in Procurement? Is it in transportation? Why are not these policies of Congress carried out?"

I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that Congress generally has done its job, but the question is why have not these policies been properly implemented when Congress a year ahead of time pointed out the direction and laid down the fundamental purposes which the administration should carry out.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, the question comes up as to the particular implementation of the policy. One of the great criticisms of the program in the Communist world and one of the claimed alibis of the program by the Communists is that this is merely a dumping ground for useless and obsolete American military equipment, and chiefly equipment which has passed its present usability, left over from the last war.

In order to meet that question directly I have asked for an authoritative statement from the Office of Military Assistance to find just what type of equipment and the usability and modernity of the equipment is, which is being sent under this program. As of July 18, 1950, I have a letter of transmittal from Major General of the United States Army, L. L. Lemnitzer, the Director of the Office of

Military Assistance, answering that question specifically and authoritatively. The general states this categorically:

The equipment furnished under the mutual defense assistance programs is the same as that now in the hands of our own Armed Forces and it is the same equipment our own forces would use in the event of an immediate war. The equipment coming from our own stocks is thoroughly rehabilitated and placed in first-class operational condition with the latest and improved auxiliary equipment such as armament and electronics. Accordingly, all equipment being provided under the mutual defense assistance program, including aircraft (particularly B-29's), tanks, artillery, anti-aircraft guns and fire-control equipment, is modern in every respect.

As new equipment is developed for our own forces, this new equipment is included in the mutual defense assistance programs. Improvements in our present equipments are incorporated into all the equipment furnished under the mutual defense assistance program.

The equipment being furnished is neither obsolete nor discarded but can be considered the most modern operational equipment available in quantity today for use by our own forces.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman as being the first speaker in 3 hours who has given us any information as to the particulars of this bill. In other words, what they are getting over there is about the same equipment we have in Korea today, which is far from modern equipment, apparently. They may be getting rehabilitated equipment, but certainly medium tanks and light tanks will not stand up to 60-ton tanks, which the Russians are using in Korea, so they are not getting modern equipment.

Mr. FULTON. As you know, the policy of the administration has changed. Previously the policy had been simply to implement the police force for internal security within Korea. It was not for the purpose of meeting major armed aggression against South Korea. We must see our boys in Korea and our allies receive first-class equipment, which I am now assured by General Lemnitzer, is being provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. May I go to one further point, as to how this equipment that we are supplying is being received by the recipient countries.

I believe the Congress should not only look to see that the equipment is good, efficient, current, modern, usable, and effective, but we should also see whether the public in the recipient countries, are receiving the equipment well; whether it is being effectively integrated into their defense establishments or whether it is causing civil strife within those countries. The authoritative statement I have received today from the Director of the Office of Military Assistance is this, and I will quote this as the authoritative

statement by the head of the program, General Lemnitzer—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again? Can the gentleman give us any idea of how this equipment is being distributed as to countries?

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to do that later, but I would like at this point to give this authoritative statement as to how it is being received upon being unloaded, generally, and then the committee can give you those details country by country at a later time in the debate. However, on the general proposition of the receipt of this equipment, General Lemnitzer, who is head of the administration of the Military Assistance, says:

Communist propaganda and, unfortunately, stories carried by the American press, would have you believe that mutual defense assistance equipment arriving in western Europe is received under a virtual state of siege. This is definitely not true.

The Communists made extensive plans to interfere with the unloading of equipment and to prevent its overland movement by means of organized resistance among dock and transportation workers and through acts of sabotage. Thus far they have failed completely. The countries concerned have thus far demonstrated their determination to prevent such interference and the security measures taken by them have been very effective. At all ports the cooperation of the non-Communist dock workers has been outstanding. They have voluntarily unloaded the equipment and are continuing to do so with the arrival of each vessel at European ports. The police and troop protection which has been provided these workers by the governments concerned has permitted the matériel to be unloaded and to proceed to its destination in an orderly fashion.

The only case where equipment has not been unloaded by non-Communist longshoremen and dock workers was in the case of the shipment of naval aircraft from Norfolk, Va., to Bizerte, Tunisia, since this aircraft was loaded at a United States naval base and unloaded at a French naval air station at Bizerte. Both the loading in the United States and the unloading at Bizerte was accomplished by military personnel since civilian unloading personnel and facilities were not available under these circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. First of all I want to refer to what one of my colleagues, Mr. Gross of Iowa, just said about something which I think is very pertinent, and to which I wish to address myself. He said that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] said the first enlightening thing about this bill that has been said during the course of this debate. I propose to confine myself to the bill, as did my colleague from Pennsylvania. Perhaps it was because my colleague from Pennsylvania talked about the particular thing in which the gentleman from Iowa was interested and about which he wanted to hear that he made that remark; but I, too, would like to stick to the facts, not alone upon this bill but upon the situation which this bill is designed to correct. For I think that at a time like this, when we are addressing ourselves to questions of high

policy we are inclined to overlook what a profoundly difficult situation we face in very realistic terms.

The Orient, as anyone knows who has been there, is a vast place with enormous populations, and enormous populations which have extremely low standards of living. And so, before we lull ourselves into a sense of false security about what we have accomplished when we drive the North Koreans back above the thirty-eighth parallel, which I am sure we will do, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the very realistic words of people who are experts in this business, the British, which I read from an issue of the London Times of July 15. I shall quote this and I think every Member should take it very much to heart, for it states the problem which we face in the best and shortest terms that I know:

Events there have several lessons for the Western Powers. For one thing, they underline the need for political and economic changes in southeast Asian countries to counter the Communist appeal. Although the goal of the Communist challenge is dictatorship, the Asian Communists rally their following by cries of: "Land to the peasants," "Efficient government," and "National independence." The Western Powers must be careful to avoid the charge of supporting backward or corrupt regimes, and they must supply the common need for improvement of land and farming methods, for more consumer goods, and for better production and marketing of the staple foods. More money must be spent on both arms and economic help, or aggressors will be invited into areas that are now both rich and weak.

I ask you to ponder that statement very very carefully. This is no superficial job; it is not going to be finished by the driving back of the North Koreans beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, or indeed by the conquest of North Korea; it requires a social, economic, and political concept equal in size to the task.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Nor can we hope to be successful if we put this man Rhee back as President of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly the sort of question the Times was addressing itself to, the political questions in the Far East.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a far-eastern policy, a decisive far-eastern policy; it has not been made by the State Department; it has not been made by the President, but it has been made right here in the Congress, and I think from present indications the Executive and the administration are finally getting the point of the policy and finally getting aboard it, and I hope that they will not again be too little or too late.

I think that we must have in the Far East a program for economic cooperation so that free peoples may help themselves to have better standards of living and better social conditions just like we have in Europe. Our program in western Europe was successful in the defeat of the Communists, it absolutely and decisively defeated them in the two western European powers of Italy and France. That

program was the European recovery program. Let us not forget that, and as men of experience let us apply a good program when it works.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says we defeated communism in France when 183 members of the National Assembly of France are Communists?

Mr. JAVITS. We have, considering the alternative we faced of having France taken over by the Communists.

Mr. GROSS. When the Communists constitute the largest political party in the National Assembly?

Mr. JAVITS. I say that advisedly. As a result of the European recovery program there is a majority of the members of the Chamber who were not Communists. Without it both Italy and France could have been under Communist governments—just so close were they to it in 1946.

Mr. GROSS. But they are still powerful enough to have caused the collapse of the government twice in 48 hours during the last 2 weeks.

Mr. JAVITS. But they were not powerful enough to stop the coalition that supports a government of the middle of Pleven or keep him from taking power; and he is on the side of democracies, not of Moscow.

Our far-eastern program should be based on economic cooperation and on security for the participating peoples. The administration must try to get the nations and states of the Pacific together and to devise, as we did in Europe, a program for economic cooperation which would raise the standards of living of their peoples and give them a material as well as a spiritual stake in anticommunism.

Now, the Foreign Affairs Committee, as you will find on page 3 of the report on this bill, is again perfecting our far-eastern policy, blazing the trail which the administration if it has the wisdom must and should follow. The Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously decided that what it wants is a Pacific Pact, a Pacific Pact on the model of the Atlantic Pact, which will enable these powers of the Pacific which are today admittedly weak in terms of their own physical security, to lean on each other and to draw strength from each other.

It is true there no longer is "a white man's burden" in the Far East and there should not be. The Pacific nations and free peoples there are perfectly able to stand on their own feet and we should be the first to recognize that, but the way to recognize that is to dignify their defensive power and strength as we have dignified the defensive power and the defensive strength of Europe by an Atlantic Pact. So we must dignify it in the Pacific by a Pacific Pact.

If, as the administration tells us, an invitation is required of the Pacific states to get together and to draw upon each other for their own defense, I say to it, and I hope many Members of the Congress in the next 2 days will join

with me in saying that from the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the American people, this is the invitation and we devoutly hope they will accept it.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Just going backward, the record for the Pacific Pact found in the report at page 3, the gentleman having introduced the motion, was based upon a bipartisan statement of congressional policy now found in the findings and declaration of policy of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act?

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. VORYS. Those were preceded by a bipartisan action by both Houses of Congress, going back to the China Aid Act of 1948; so that we have had a bipartisan congressional policy for the Far East for a number of years. The only trouble is it has never been implemented by the Executive.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. Certainly the disposition which is shown on this bill by its unanimous report from the committee, and by the acceptance of the bill without amendments being offered in our own Foreign Affairs Committee, and by what I hope will be a resounding vote of support for this bill tomorrow, shows that we in the Congress are prepared for a Pacific Pact and are prepared to back it.

We often underestimate our own strength, the power of the democratic ideal, and the power of our own allies. It is true the Russians have captured China with its 400,000,000 people and that we have suffered a severe reverse in China. But let us see what support for liberty there is in the Pacific. There are Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaya, India, Pakistan, Burma, Afghanistan, Siam, Indochina, Korea, and China on Formosa, in order to make up a Pacific Pact. There is great power in the Pacific peoples who are still on the side of freedom if we only have the sense and the judgment to marshal them today.

There is one other point which is very important in appraising what we are doing. I think it is high time that we got very realistic about the magnitude of what we are engaged in. Little, to my mind, has vindicated more the action which we took in Europe in backing the Atlantic Pact which this bill to the tune of a billion dollars is to implement—and let us not forget that we are implementing the arming of the western European nations in this bill with another \$1,000,000,000—than reading the papers this morning to find that when the United Nations needed aid for the enforcement of military sanctions in Korea, immediately after us are coming the Brussels Pact nations—Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. It is they who will support us; it is they who have the ideal of freedom so seriously in their hearts. It is still they with the greatest military capability in being in the free world after us. So let us not be confused about where the powerhouse of democracy still is.

We want it created in the Pacific, too, so that the powerhouse of democracy is on both shores of the Atlantic, and of the Pacific.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What assurance does the gentleman have that we are going to get this help he is talking about? We are not getting it in Korea.

Mr. JAVITS. Let us not be hasty. We have been fighting in Korea for about 2 weeks. We were the ones who had forces on the spot in Japan and were able to get the jump. We did the right thing. We did get the jump and we did get in there.

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

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, based upon reports we have already seen and the fact we know the mettle of our allies in western Europe, we will get the necessary units, the necessary help which we want, both in ground forces and otherwise. Also, I remind the gentleman from Iowa that the British Navy's units and the Australian Air Forces' units were immediately put at our disposal and are being used. I have confidence now we will get ground-force assistance from these sources, as well.

Mr. GROSS. When?

Mr. JAVITS. Promptly, that is the most that one can say. They are meeting on it right now, as the gentleman knows from reading the morning papers, and that was the point of my statement in pointing out that the great military capability that resided in that area of the world.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. DOUGLAS. New Zealand and the Canadian and the Netherland forces are also at work.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; that is true, and I appreciate that correction.

I would just like to come to this last point in terms of realism. The United States has an annual income of \$250,000,000,000. That is the totality of our production. That means that every man, woman, and child in the United States has generally a per capita income of somewhere between \$1,200 and \$1,500 a year. Let us compare that with those next in line, the peoples of western Europe, who are a numerous people and next in line after us in industrial capability. They have a population of over 200,000,000 people, with an annual income of \$170,000,000,000 in terms of production, somewhere in the area of \$400 to \$600 per capita. Once you get beyond that—which takes in practically the whole world with the exception of Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and a few South American countries, all with relatively small populations—but once you get beyond that for practically the whole population of the rest of the world, you are in the area of a per capita income of something like \$100 a year or less. When we talk about the appeal of communism and the coun-

terappeal which we must make if we are to decisively defeat communism, let us never forget those figures. Let us never forget that, in terms of standards of living, the people of the world have a very long way to go.

Now, the whole world respects American industrial power, and if they did not respect it, they could not help but respect it, based upon the very figures which I have just quoted and the standard of living which it has given to the United States. But there is a big fallacy which we are still laboring under in this country, which is very strange for businessmen, that for one reason or another that we really are stretching ourselves too far considering the magnitude of the job and the magnitude of our resources, to improve the standard of living of the other peoples of the world, essential though it is if we are to defeat communism, and deliver the goods if we are to show up Communist promises as the lies they are. There is that fallacy in the thinking of many people in our country that somehow or other it will break us or bankrupt us or make us poor or bleed us white to do the job we must do to save ourselves and mankind from Communist slavery.

We are great businessmen, but in this critical instance we seem to forget that business is always best on a busy street; that we sell the most to people who are prosperous; that where there are high standards of living there is a greater income for everybody.

We do not seem to realize that that is the only way in which the enormous economic burden of reconstructing the world's economy and of raising of the standards of living of terribly distressed peoples is possible and that the armaments which we and the rest of the free world need, and which I believe the President will recommend tomorrow and which he should have recommended a year ago, that all of that cannot be carried on for the time it will take solely on the basis of the economy of the United States; that it can only be carried on in terms of a world economy, and that instead of our exports and imports of \$12,000,000,000 a year, now largely financed by Marshall-plan money, it should be for us and on the same scale for other free peoples, \$40,000,000,000 a year on a normal basis. Then we will have a world economy that can sustain the kind of a job which we have to do in the world.

Again I repeat, it is amazing to me that Americans, skilled in business, do not realize that business is best on a busy street. Take a look at the 10 biggest corporations in the United States today. In 1929, a boom year, they had individual resources in the hundreds of millions each. They include General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric, and others of similar size. Today their resources are in terms of \$5,000,000,000 for General Motors and down from that. All of these problems, both of economic reconstruction and of assuring security to the free world have to be looked at in those terms. We are living in a truly new world; if we do not recognize that we can lose, we can lose in this struggle against communism, and nobody knows that better than the people

of Asia. But, if we look at this world in terms of completely new conceptions and new figures, then I am confident that the world can have the most glorious centuries ahead that it has ever had in all of its history, and that the free peoples of Asia and elsewhere, will be with us because we are the hope for a decent and peaceful world and because we are right.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] who has just returned from a mission to Latin America for the committee.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio has stated, I have just returned from 3 weeks in Central America and Mexico on a committee mission intended to develop the present situation with respect to the military, political, and economic postures now obtaining in those countries.

I am very happy to say that during the course of that trip we found a great and almost universal expression of friendship and good will for the United States.

I was surprised upon my return to Washington and to the House to find that those of us who, a year ago opposed economic aid to Korea on grounds which we considered to be valid, were in effect being charged with having sabotaged South Korea and American interests in that part of the world.

Many years ago a great American said:

Gentlemen may cry peace, peace, but there is no peace. The war has actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the crash of resounding arms. Our brothers are already in the field. Why stand we here idle?

Those words might well be spoken today on the floor of the Congress. We are no longer engaged in a cold war but in a war that is as hot as war can ever become.

It is useless to berate at this moment, it is useless to indulge in recriminations as to who is responsible for the position in which our men now find themselves in the rice paddies of Korea, but it is very important that today's RECORD show certain warnings, certain things that were said on the floor of this House a year ago as to what might reasonably be expected if we embarked upon a course of action such as the one that was proposed at that time.

In spite of warnings and in spite of storm signals which were flown over the floor of this House, we proceeded along a course of action which many of us considered in all honesty to be a course of folly. We set up in the form of meager economic assistance a showcase for democracy in the last place any thinking man would have tried to establish such a showcase. There were warnings then that the Russian bear would, when the proper moment came, put his foot through the glass, and that is precisely what has happened. Korea was a soft spot, and in the Russian probings for soft spots it was inevitable that Korea's weakness would be found, and that in due time 2 or 5 or 11 divisions would plunge across the thirty-eighth parallel

to undo the good we were trying to do, and garner the prize being dangled under the Communist nose. However, that is largely water over the dam and under the bridge.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. That may be water over the dam, and I quite agree with the gentleman that we must now look forward and not backward.

But I think the record should contain at this point a commendation of the prophetic utterance of the gentleman now addressing us. The words in the minority report on economic aid to Korea, which were uttered by the gentleman from California, as we read them now, were a complete and accurate forecast of exactly what has happened. The gentleman said that economic aid to Korea would be useless unless accompanied by military assistance. Certainly events have proven that statement. I think the gentleman now speaking is entitled to our highest commendation for the leadership which he took in what has now turned out to be the proper course.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I also want to join in commending the gentleman for the minority report which he wrote at that time when he pointed out to the Congress and used the phrase:

The House should be aware of these facts; that already aggression was beginning back of the thirty-eighth parallel; already Soviet advisers were engaged; and that without the accompaniment of adequate military force, the use of economic assistance could only enhance the prize in the eyes of the aggressor.

I would like to point out here that on page 42 of the committee report there is not only confirmation of the gentleman's prophecy as to economic aid, but there is an admission that military aid voted in connection with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 did not reach Korea. The words used are:

No deliveries of any consequence have been made as yet.

And it goes on to say:

The committee regrets that so little of the aid voted has reached Korea before the attack.

But worse than that is the admission, as the gentleman is aware, that it was not intended to supply sufficient military aid to repel an aggression because it is specifically stated on this same page that the military aid was to preserve internal security; prevent border raids; and as a byproduct to deter armed attack or other aggression from North Korea.

Does the gentleman agree that taking that into consideration plus the testimony of General Lemnitzer and others before this committee that it was intended to leave South Korea as a mere sitting duck in the presence of the greedy Russian bear?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman. In response to his question I can only say that in my own mind during the hearings there was never any question as to what we intended to do from a military standpoint in the case of attack upon South Korea—that was to leave it. I invite the attention of every Member of this body to the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] in which he quotes time and time again from witnesses before the committee of the intention not to defend South Korea in case of attack. But all of that aside we are now confronted with the reality of war which we have tried to avert by every honest means. We have leaned over backward in an effort to appease the Soviet. We have done everything that any reasonable nation might be expected to do and much more besides.

I, too, am a veteran of the last war. I am also a member of the minority party in the House of Representatives. But I am first of all a citizen of this country, one who loves it very deeply and one who has a deep and abiding regard for its institutions and ideals. Although I raised my voice last year against the folly that has proven to be Korea and although at that time, as many of us did who cast our votes in good conscience against the proposal, I did everything in my power to divert what appeared to be a disastrous step, I submitted in the American way to the will of the majority. However, again I think the record should be clear on several points. I read from the minority report which was referred to by the gentleman from New York. I quote:

As desirable as are the aims of those who would furnish economic assistance to Korea at this time, there are factors which indicate that such a program is foredoomed to failure. Korea is hopelessly outflanked by the adjacent land mass of China, and the peninsula has no connecting link with any friendly continental power. Every ton of supplies contemplated to be furnished under the terms of this legislation must be transported vast distances, only to be put down in the midst of a complex and daily shifting Pacific picture, in which the rapid and undeterred spread of communism is the salient feature.

And again:

Every authority who has testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the Korean situation has acknowledged the fact that there could be no effective defense against an armed aggression originating in the northern half of the country.

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of California—

Nor has any satisfactory evidence been produced to indicate that a determined political attack could be long withstood.

And again, and this has reference to the announcement that Soviet soldiers were engaged in an action on the Ongjin Peninsula as long as a year ago:

This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea.

The character of aid proposed at that time was the root of the opposition of the Members who opposed the bill. The thought of sending hydroelectric plants, mine equipment, and other capital investments to enhance the prize to be taken by the aggressor without adequate military assistance to cover, defend, and protect those supplies was the only reason we opposed the legislation at that time.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Of course, the propaganda mills are already grinding, and Members of the Congress who voted against the so-called economic aid to Korea bill last January are being accused of having been against national defense and the defense of Korea. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to the minority report which specifically clears up that matter.

Is it not a fact that there was not a penny of money in that bill for the defense of Korea; not one cent for arms or ammunition? Everything that was authorized to be appropriated was for capital improvements, which it is quite evident now, would have been taken over by the Communists.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The bill was an economic-assistance measure, which was designed to rehabilitate railroads, open entry to coal mines, install hydroelectric plants, and generally rehabilitate heavy industry in South Korea.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I congratulate my friend from California on his excellent statement. As the gentleman knows, I was one of those who signed the minority report on Korea, feeling, as the gentleman felt, that economic aid without military aid was a wasteful performance especially since the military and naval witnesses who came before our committee testified that Korea is not only indefensible but of slight strategic importance. Nevertheless, I voted for the aid to Korea bill mainly in the forlorn hope that something might be done, and because I favored aid to the people of Formosa, I thought that we should do what we could to buoy up their spirits. This aid provided the only hope that was left to the people of Korea. I felt that Korea could not be saved by our aid alone, but I did not want to help in underwriting their doom. I felt that we were responsible for the formation of this young Republic and therefore we must at least give them a chance. Certainly, the distinguished gentleman from California courageously anticipated what has happened. I congratulate him on his foresight and on the remarks which he has addressed to us.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think there should be added to the comment which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] made that not one dollar of the military aid

which we voted for Korea, according to the evidence, has ever arrived there. That was voted long before the economic aid, so that there has been nothing done to implement the action of Congress.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think one important point that every Member of Congress should realize is that the decision to aid and assist South Korea was a diplomatic decision and not a military decision.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The record will also show that the rule for the bill which the gentleman is referring to was adopted by the Rules Committee on September 27, 1949, and it laid in the House until January 19, when the bill was enacted. In other words, during that interim the Syngman Rhee government had been elected, and if there had been any intention on the part of the administration to help, the bill should have been acted upon before we recessed in October 1949.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. Very briefly, to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he was not impressed by the fact that the military aid which we voted for China had apparently been sabotaged? Did not that seem to indicate the entire futility of trying to help these countries?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would say to the gentleman from Maine that I have long since ceased being surprised at anything. But, having been an unwilling passenger on this wave of shortsighted idealism, I accept the inevitable outcome of folly. As a veteran and a citizen to whom the safety of this Nation is of paramount consideration, I accept the grisly facts which have led to bloodshed.

I opposed the arms-aid bill last year. It is my intention to support it this year. We are in such position that our national security and our national safety are at stake, and I cannot in the light of that oppose the pending legislation.

Circumstances attendant on an abysmal failure properly to evaluate the Korean situation has brought us into war, and it is a war that may well go on for the next two decades. Let no one think for an instant that this is not war, hot war of the hottest variety, and a war in which hundreds and possibly thousands of American men are going to lose their lives. Those men are dying this instant because we attempted to meet the threat of bayonets and 60-ton tanks with tons of manure and garden seed.

The time has come for us to realize that the Soviet Union and its satellites intend the destruction of every constitutional form of government in this world which does not coincide in every respect with the political philosophy of the Soviet Union and with the Communist manifesto written in a Paris attic 102 years ago. The time has come to write our own manifesto, a manifesto which

will be unmistakable to the aggressors and to the American people, that we intend to meet force with force, weapon with weapon, on any front where freedom is threatened. Unless we do this we shall continue to take one step forward and two backward to the eventual destruction of all that we hold dear.

I am supporting this legislation not because I have any confidence in the judgment of the prophets who have been consistently wrong or who have consistently fumbled the ball, but only because I am one of 150,000,000 Americans in a fight not for social security, but in a fight for ultimate survival.

At the proper time during the course of the amending procedure on this bill I shall offer again the amendment I offered last year which will open negotiation for air bases in western Europe on which shall be mounted units of the American Air Force armed with the most devastating weapons at our command. In the moment one foot of an aggressor is placed across the frontier of any friendly nation this force should be in a position to take off from bases on the Continent and wreak whatever havoc they can in the ranks of the greatest aggression since Adolph Hitler.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the few Members of this House—and the only Democrat—who voted to oppose passage of the recent so-called tax revision bill, H. R. 8920.

Recent developments in the Far East throw new light on this bill. We have committed our troops to enforce the United Nations cease-fire order. In so doing, we have committed the financial resources of the United States to support these troops. It is now apparent that H. R. 8920 ought to be shelved and a new bill substituted by the House of Representatives.

The bill passed by the House did contain provisions necessary to plug obvious loopholes in our present tax laws. These provisions ought to be incorporated in another bill and passed immediately. If we are to maintain our financial stability in the present crisis, it is imperative that we have additional funds.

It is not a popular thing for me or for any Member of Congress to talk about additional revenue in an election year. If speaking frankly and honestly and being true to my convictions means defeat in the coming elections, so be it. I would be a coward to my conscience and a traitor to my country were I to pursue another course.

The American people are prepared to face the facts. There has been overwhelming support of our action in Korea. There is no war hysteria. But there is a stern realization that this will be a hard struggle. There are serious questions about the prospects ahead and we need to face them squarely.

Whether we want to or not, we are building a war economy. Our recent history has demonstrated that a war economy leads to the attendant dangers of rising debt and inflationary trends. To check both a rising debt and inflation, we must pass sound revenue laws. We

know the tremendous costs of war. And even the police action we have now undertaken is an expensive one, particularly since it is necessary to build our own strength in the interest of national defense and security.

Had we taken early steps to insure sufficient revenue during World War I and World War II, a larger part of these wars could have been paid out of the increased national income. To postpone the day of payment is not only a dangerous fiscal policy; it is an ungrateful one. We send young men to war and then ask those who return to pay for their own war during the height of their earning power through taxes. We have made this mistake twice. Must we make it again?

Our national income increased from \$41,700,000,000 in 1932 to \$221,000,000,000 in 1949. Our national debt rose from \$19,400,000,000 in 1932 to \$251,600,000,000 in 1949. It is true that the cost of World War II boosted our debt to this peak, but we can see now that some of this might have been avoided. Therefore, I repeat that we ought to face the facts realistically and enact a tax bill that will produce revenue sufficient to meet the costs of national defense and security in these troubled times.

Since the end of World War II our military costs have remained steadily high. We have been spending one out of every three dollars spent by the Federal Government for defense. Only a few years before the last war we were spending about one out of ten dollars for military preparedness.

Viewed another way, in the recent years we have been spending six cents of every dollar of national income for military defense. During World War II, the United States spent up to 95 percent of its total budget to carry on a Global War. In terms of national income, about 50 cents of every dollar earned was spent to win the war.

But this was at the peak of World War II when our efforts demanded every human and physical resource at our command. We again need to make this effort now to avoid another war too terrible to comprehend. Foresight will help us to meet the costs in money without bringing disaster to our economy.

To meet the new emergency with still bigger and faster deficits would be folly. It would mean defeat at home while trying to protect and promote peace and security abroad. A healthy fiscal policy is as much a part of national defense in the world now as armaments. If we are not strong financially we will fall prey to weaknesses at home that will make security impossible.

We know that it will now be necessary to increase the volume of defense spending. This increase will be reflected in both the dollar volume of armament spending and in the proportion of the budget devoted to that spending. Unless honest efforts are made now to meet the additional needs of the United States, we will be building a bigger deficit.

More debt and more inflation might well be the fifth column that will undermine our country. To allow these twin evils to run rampant might well nullify any military victory that we can gain. We need only to look to the countries of

Europe to know that financial ruin is the breeding ground of totalitarianism. To fight the false philosophies threatening the peace of the world on battlefronts, while making breeding grounds for them at home would be defeat.

This is one of the most serious problems now facing this Congress. God forbid that we shirk our responsibility and again find that we have done too little too late. Gentlemen, I cannot stress too strongly the need for a sound tax policy now to meet these problems squarely and honestly.

Because the human mind is permitted to choose evil, we have among us those who seek profit from the misery of their fellowmen. We have among us the weak and the men of little faith who would shirk their share of suffering. These are the profiteers and the hoarders, some big and some small, but all traitors to themselves and to their country.

These are the realities of life and society must depend upon government to protect it from this insidious element threatening the common good. The moral bankruptcy of the few can well work grave harm on the good of the many.

None of us want controls, whether political or economic. But we know from sad experience that some economic control is necessary in time of crisis to protect us from ourselves—from the greed which drives men to make fortunes from the blood and tears of their fellow citizens. War wrecks death and suffering upon great masses of people—but it also makes great fortunes for those few who feed on the misfortunes of others. World War I and World War II meant death to our young men—it also meant millions to those who trade in death for their own profit.

Modern war demands the effort of every citizen. Peace in modern times demands the effort of every citizen. Just as the soldier at the front must be prepared for the ultimate sacrifice, so the citizen at home must be prepared to sacrifice at least those material goods which would be empty frills without the freedom which is the natural climate of happiness for man.

The increased expenditures necessary to carry our efforts to secure the peace to a successful conclusion could lead not only to debt but to the kind of inflation we have already witnessed. A wise tax policy can be a major move toward warding off the evil of inflation. Used with moderate economic controls it could protect us from the decline in dollar value which contributed so enormously to the costs of both World War I and World War II. We know that these costs were inflationary costs and many generations of Americans will be called upon to pay them.

Good tax policy has always been recognized as an effective brake on inflation. We knew this in World War II but we were too late and we stopped too early. The result was the 57-cent dollar of 1948. Must we make the same mistake again? Must we wait until the apparent has occurred before we learn that foresight is better than hindsight?

Already hoarders and profiteers with an eye to the Korean struggle are push-

ing up prices and hoarding the materials and resources we will need to force the hand of those who plotted the unprovoked aggression in Korea. I hope we do not wait until extreme controls and extreme taxes are necessary, Mr. Chairman. Now is the time to adopt a sound "middle course" policy of revenue raising and economic controls. Unless we are prepared to enact moderate, sensible legislation now we will find ourselves forced to enact extreme legislation after the harm has been done.

I only ask that we face the facts. Certainly we can do that much. We are not different from the Americans who fought at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, at the Argonne, or at Iwo Jima—then, let us do honestly what needs to be done.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Did the gentleman support the Mutual Defense Assistance Act program last year? Did he vote for or against this program last year?

Mr. MARSHALL. On aid to Europe?

Mr. FULTON. The Mutual Defense Assistance program, the extension of which we are working on now?

Mr. MARSHALL. I supported the recovery programs. I have supported every recovery program that the House has had brought before it. I have not supported the military assistance program.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman voted against that last year when this bill first came up. Did the gentleman support the bill for the 70-group Air Force as against the 48-group Air Force?

Mr. MARSHALL. I want to assure the gentleman I did not. As far as I am able to determine so far that was entirely the wise policy to follow.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman voted against the 70-group Air Force program last year?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. All action to date points to the wisdom of that vote. Our productive resources are in better shape. Up to this time the 48-unit Air Force has been all this country could support. Furthermore, military action demonstrates the adequacy of air strength. It has been our ground forces that have needed more and better armaments.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Was the gentleman the only Democrat that did that in the House, too?

Mr. MARSHALL. I was the only Member of the House who did that.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I want to compliment the gentleman on what he has said here this afternoon. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota upon what he is saying here. Regardless of how he may have voted on any other bill does not preclude him from calling these vital matters to the attention of the House. It is our duty in this House to

have the courage to levy sufficient taxes to raise the revenue to pay for this war as we fight it rather than to leave it for future generations to shoulder. I compliment the gentleman. He is exactly right.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I would like to say to the Members of the House that I have not apologized or tried to find an excuse for any votes that I have cast in the past.

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

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to the thanks of the Members of Congress and the country at large for the remarks he has just made. It seems to me we ought to consider seriously the immediate imposition of additional taxes on the American people, both on business and personal incomes. We should not wait until we have spent millions of dollars and then try to impose a tax. I think it should be done right away.

I seriously question also the decision not to go forward and pass at least a portion of the tax bill the House has already passed and let it become law, especially that portion pertaining to loopholes and that portion pertaining to an increase in corporate taxes. It would have the effect of curbing inflation. It would make business and individuals in the country realize that we are in a state of emergency.

The longer we put it off the more painful it is going to be. I sincerely hope that what the gentleman has stated this afternoon will get widespread publicity. I know that when the people begin to think about it it will have the approval of the vast majority of the people of the country.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think the gentleman has made an excellent speech. The fact that he changed his mind has made me think a great deal more of him, because I was told when I was a little boy that a wise man changes his mind and a fool never does.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have supported the reorganization plans and other measures of economy. I have felt that we ought to have a balanced budget and to that end I believe we ought to have a realistic revenue policy. My efforts in that regard have been consistent. I voted against military aid. I'm going to support this program because to my mind we are at war and are viewing the situation as a war measure. We did not start this aggressive action but it will be up to us to end it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, naturally I favor the passage of this bill to extend further military assistance to certain nations of western Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East—the mutual defense

assistance program. When the first economic recovery program bill came before us in the Eightieth Congress, it was generally presented as a thing we ought to do out of charity or humanitarianism or for solely economic reasons. It was argued that we ought to help the people and rehabilitate the industries in the countries in Europe which had suffered physical devastation during the war. The RECORD will show, I think, that I was the only Member of Congress who said in the debate then—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3872, March 31, 1948—that we could not justify it primarily on such a basis—

that such measures as this (ECA and China aid) could be justified in this present world situation and in the present straitened state of America's finances and supplies only if they are essential from the standpoint of the security of the Nation.

We had hoped it would be an alternative to a military policy. Six months ago it perhaps could have been. But world events and Communist aggression have advanced so rapidly that now it probably is more in support of a military policy than an alternative to one.

The bill before us today deals with that military policy. It is designed to strengthen our allies. It is not that our Government is under any obligation to use our taxpayers' money to help England, France, Turkey, China, Korea, or any other country. But we do owe it to our own people to try to get for them the maximum of security. And they do not have real security in a world where free nations are being taken over one by one by the Soviet Union and its fifth columns.

So I was relieved when a year later the administration finally came along with a military aid program. As between the economic and military assistance programs, you cannot say that one is more important than the other. Both are necessary if either is to succeed.

I should like to approach the problems we face today as a result of the Korean invasion much as a doctor approaches the body of a patient at the autopsy table. That is never a pleasant task; yet every physician knows that practically all the progress we have ever made in medicine came from honest examination of our mistakes. The doctor may have been ever so careful in the examination which led him to the diagnosis that the patient's trouble was, for example, in the stomach. He may have called in half a dozen expert consultants who also decided after careful examination that the trouble was in the stomach. He may even have had a propaganda agency to convince all the relatives that the trouble was in the stomach. But if, when the man is dead and the doctor examines him at the autopsy table, he finds that the trouble was in the liver—then that is all there is to it, it was in the liver.

A doctor conducts an autopsy, not to recriminate, because that does not get him anywhere; not so much to determine who was to blame as to try to find out, if he can, what was to blame. What went wrong with his thinking, that he missed some signs or misinterpreted other signs which the autopsy explains

as plain as day? He wants to learn so that in the next similar case he will not make the same mistakes again.

Just so, in the grave crisis our country faces today, we need to conduct if not an autopsy, at least an exploratory operation, in order to discover if we can how we made the grave miscalculations that have brought us for the second time in one decade to the brink of a world war.

Both times it began with the very same error: Failure to realize how important it is to our own security that the opposite shores of the Pacific as well as of the Atlantic be in the hands of friends instead of enemies; more specifically, failure to understand that it is imperative to the security of the United States and to the establishment of peace and order and security in the world that the nations of Asia be independent and friendly to ourselves and the other democratic free nations of the world, instead of organized and controlled either by Japan's totalitarian militarism or by the Soviet Union's new imperialism—which is no less raw and cruel imperialism because it is called liberation or some other fancy slogan.

For almost 100 years our forefathers did not make the mistake we have made. They saw that the best guaranty of our security on our west was to have there an independent China friendly to ourselves. They supported whatever government was in China, whether good, bad, or indifferent, rather than let China's potential might come under any outside power that might be hostile to ourselves. They recognized China as important to us not because of any sentimental concern for the Chinese but because of the geography of the Pacific area. If China were independent and friendly, then we were secure on our west, because neither of the two Asiatic nations which conceivably might threaten us, Japan and Russia, could move in our direction if in its rear, in the case of Japan, or on its long southern flank, in the case of Russia, there was a strong independent China friendly to the United States.

That was our basic policy and it was sound. We got into trouble in Asia only when we abandoned it in 1931 after Japan invaded Manchuria. To the credit of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Stimson they saw the danger and recommended that the League of Nations take a strong stand, pledging our support. There were many factors in its failure to do so; but I cannot really blame the League for not coming along. We were not a member. Other countries did not know whether this country would stand behind Hoover and Stimson or would repudiate them as it had Wilson. If the League took action, would we support it? They did not know.

In any case, the free world refused to take strong action against that aggression which tore up all there was to show for World War I: Three pieces of paper and the ideas, moral principles, and commitments behind them—the League of Nations Covenant, the Nine-Power Pact, and the Kellogg-Briand Treaty outlawing war as a means of settling disputes. The western world's default set up the situation which led to World War II in the Pacific and to the destruction of the League. Japan's aggression, unchecked

at the start in Manchuria, steadily spread over ever larger portions of the continent.

By 1940 and 1941 President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull reawakened to the fact that it was essential to our security to keep Japan from getting control of the manpower, territory, and resources of China and then of the rest of Asia. So they took a belated stand against Japan's further expansion, which, after we had systematically built her up to the point where she was strong enough to attack us, led of course to Pearl Harbor.

But our Government's return to the principle of maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of China was short lived. As we approached the end of the war in 1945, the desire to get the Soviet Union to join us against Japan and to cooperate with us in forming the United Nations led our leaders to sell out the principles they themselves had declared in the Atlantic Charter. They invited the Soviet Union into Manchuria and gave her control of its major ports and railroads although at Cairo they had promised unequivocally that Manchuria would be returned to China. Thus was set up the situation which has led us in 5 years to the brink of another world war. Even before World War II was ended we had torn up the moral principles for which we had said that the war was being fought.

I shall never forget August 8, 1945. As Mrs. Judd and I at home in Minneapolis were getting ready to go out to a friend's for dinner, the telephone rang and a newspaper reporter told me excitedly that Russia had just declared war against Japan and Secretary Byrnes had issued a statement that the United States had asked Russia to come in as that would shorten the war and save American lives. He asked for my comments.

I was seized with the most intense feeling of dismay I have ever known, a sense almost of internal dissolution. I had come home from China in 1938 and given up my work and my profession to try to report to the American people what I had seen of the Japanese invasion and what I felt sure it would lead to for ourselves, if we did not stop building up Japan's military power. I did not like it, but I was one of the few who had seen first-hand and I was under obligation as an American citizen to report to my people just as a doctor has to report what he finds, however disturbing it may be. If the people would not pay attention, I could not help that, but at least I had to warn them regarding the effects which Japan's aggression in Asia, if successful, would have on our country's security.

At frightful cost, we had now almost defeated Japan's aggression in order to keep China independent and friendly to ourselves. And we were inviting in another potential enemy, Russia, and starting to build it up in Asia. Furthermore our Government officials were endeavoring to justify Russia's violation of its nonaggression pact with Japan, even though we had bitterly condemned Mussolini when he violated his nonaggression pact with France, and Hitler when he did the same with Poland and Russia.

All I could say to the reporter was: "There goes the peace."

He asked, "What do you mean?"

I said, "Well, there goes Manchuria, then China, then Asia, then Europe, and then ourselves—unless somewhere along the line we fight. We will not get real peace."

For without Manchuria, China could not recover, any more than western Europe could recover without the Ruhr and western Germany—a fact which unfortunately it has taken 5 years to discover.

Without China, the countries along her borders from Korea and Japan to India cannot recover or be secure.

Without the resources and markets and trade of those countries—not on the old colonial basis of exploitation, but on the basis of mutual cooperation and development—Europe cannot recover or become secure.

Western Europe has the second best workshop in the world, but a workshop is useless without raw materials; and Europe does not have the raw materials. Industrial capacity and technical proficiency constitute only one of the four main factors of power. Western Europe does not have the other three factors: Raw materials, manpower, and territory—and we cannot supply her out of our resources indefinitely.

There was another consideration which led to my dismay at a time when almost everyone else was cheering. I had long urged that we try to keep Russia out of the Pacific war—including a personal appeal to that effect to President Truman the day before he went to Potsdam. But I had repeatedly stated my belief that in the end Russia would enter the war against Japan because of her understandable desire to have a major hand in the settlements in that area of the world. However, it had not occurred to me that we would be asking Russia to come into a war that I felt sure nothing could keep her out of. So I added to the reporter:

I am sorry the Russians broke their word with Japan, and I am even sorer if we urged them to do so. It is short-sighted expediency for us at a time when we are trying to build a new world order based on the sanctity of the pledged word, to ask an ally to violate its pledged word. If it is all right for Russia to break its word in this instance because it is to our advantage, then how can we expect Russia or any other country, to keep the new agreements we are entering into, whenever it becomes advantageous to them not to do so? That is why I say, There goes the peace. We are cynically violating the international morality on which alone a lasting peace can be built.

The next day the paper reported what I had said and some people jumped on me as being unduly distrustful of Russia or even hostile to our ally. But my dismay was not at Russia's action. I had expected that. It was wholly in accord with her leaders' principles—if that is the right word for the rules of conduct they follow. Rather, my dismay was at the immorality of my own country's action.

We cannot condemn the Government of the Soviet Union for betraying values which it does not profess. To the best of my knowledge, it lives completely according to its teachings. But we had

made moral commitments of another sort. After this war there was to be no aggrandizement—territorial or other. There were to be no territorial changes that did not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. Sovereign rights and self-government were to be restored to those who had been deprived of them, and so on. Remember? The world had rallied around that great Atlantic Charter. It thought it was a set of moral principles—so did I—not a propaganda document to persuade peoples to be our allies against one enemy—until we found it expedient to sacrifice them to another.

So, Mr. Chairman, the first finding in the autopsy is that twice in one decade we made the same mistake of imagining that what happened in Europe was more likely to get us into war than what happened in Asia.

There were plenty of warnings, but few people heeded. On March 15, 1945, when it was clear that we were going to win World War II, I myself tried to warn as best I could against such a mistake, in a speech I made here, the opening sentence of which was:

We got into this war through Asia, and if America gets into another war, almost certainly it will also be through Asia.

This must have been read by many because the speech was reprinted in Time magazine and Reader's Digest. Yet I suppose that few believed it really could happen.

I wish so much that I had been wrong. It is no satisfaction or even consolation to a doctor to have his diagnosis proved right when the one who is going to die is his own loved one—or the youth of his own country.

The second finding is that in both wars we ourselves helped bring on the trouble by putting expediency ahead of principle. In the thirties we helped the aggressor, Japan, instead of the victim, China. It was good business and it appeased Japan—for a time.

In the forties we bribed Russia by giving her China's territory and then appeased communism in China while denouncing those who were resisting it.

In Europe we insisted that in order to get our help the governments must keep the Communists out; but in China we insisted that in order to get our help the Government must take the Communists in.

Mr. Chairman, we have used the Chinese as pawns and the Koreans as pawns, first, in our attempts to buy Russian cooperation and then in our power struggle with the Soviets. The chickens are coming home to roost in Korea—as was inevitable. The unforgivable tragedy is that, as always, innocent young men have to pay in blood for the mistakes in character and brains of those in charge of their Government.

I do not say this for political reasons. I, too, am a part of this Government. I say it more like the publican who smote his breast and said, "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner."

We have had enough of the supercilious Pharisees, saying: "Thank God, we are not like those backward peoples in Asia, so inept, incompetent, inefficient." We

are seeing in Korea what those peoples can do when they have the training and the weapons. Our men, fighting both with them and against them, have quit making light of their capacities. We, too, had better begin to recognize the potentialities in Asia.

For, Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that World War II will eventually be recognized as primarily a war to determine who is to control or whose ideas are to guide the development of the peoples and resources of Asia.

Hitler understood that. He said one time that if Germany had all of Europe that would not solve Germany's problems. Of course not; there are no sizeable undeveloped areas in Europe. He tried to get Europe merely to have a base or springboard from which to move to control of the undeveloped areas of the world. They are in South America, Africa, and Asia. South America and Africa have great natural resources, but they do not have adequate manpower. Only Asia has great undeveloped natural resources and great undeveloped human resources. More than half the people of the world live in Asia. Which way are they to go? That is likely to be the decisive question of this century.

Japan knew it. That was why she worked so hard and so long and sacrificed so much trying to get control of the manpower and resources of China and then of Asia.

Russia knew it. In 1923 Lenin wrote, "In the last analysis, the outcome of the world struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China, and so forth, constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

At the end of the last war the Soviets had about 200,000,000 people under their control. Now, with their satellites in Europe, and what they have seized in Asia, they have almost 800,000,000. We of the free western world, are almost 800,000,000 people. The two roughly balance. Who determines which way the balance is to tip? The remaining 700,000,000, of course. And where do they live? On the periphery of China—from Korea to Iran. They are the spokes of the wheel of which China is the hub. That is why China has always been and still is the crucial area.

Russia did not forget that fact even if we did. Here is a photostat copy of a page from the Daily Worker of September 7, 1937. It reproduces three letters written to Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party in the United States of America. One was from Mao Tse-tung, who signed himself as President of the Chinese Soviet Republic; one from Chu Teh, leader of the Chinese Red Army, and one from Chow En-lai, now Prime Minister of the Communist regime in China. These men had written to him shortly after the outbreak of the Japanese all-out war against China in 1937. They were appealing for help from their Communist brethren here.

Chow En-lai began his letter to Browder:

Comrade, do you still remember the Chinese comrades who worked with you in China 10 years ago?

Now, what had Earl Browder been doing in China in 1927? Well, he was there with other leaders of the Communist hierarchy from all the world to help the Reds seize complete control of China as the Bolsheviks had done in Russia in the October revolution just 10 years before. Chiang Kai-shek in China was scheduled to be what Kerensky had been in Russia—an interim leader to be overthrown by the Reds as soon as he had defeated the warlords in southern and central China.

The original Kuomintang, under Sun Yat-sen, had liberated China from the Manchu emperors in 1911, but the sudden transition to a republic had proved too difficult and the regime had disintegrated. Chiang led a reform movement, revitalized the Kuomintang, accepted a coalition with the Communists, and was unifying China. When his forces reached Nanking and Shanghai in March 1927, the Communist units in his armies staged bloody coups. But Chiang was able to put them down.

Kerensky had not been strong enough to keep the Bolsheviks from seizing control of the young Russian Republic in 1917. Benes and Masaryk were not strong enough to prevent the Communists taking over Czechoslovakia in 1948. But Chiang was strong enough to block their "October revolution" in China in 1927 despite the expert assistance the Communists had from Browder and a lot of Russian advisers on the spot, posing as friends. Chiang expelled them. The Russians and the master minds like Browder returned to their homelands, and the Kremlin licked its wounds while preparing relentlessly to avenge them.

If the Communists had succeeded in their plans to overthrow the young Chinese Government and make China a second Russia, it would have advanced their program of world conquest by at least a decade. Fortunately Chiang defeated them in the only serious set-back they ever had until Tito defected and our aid beginning in 1947 saved Greece, Italy, and France. Naturally they have hated Chiang as fiercely as any man in history has ever been hated, and smeared and reviled him accordingly, seeking always to weaken and discredit him and the Chinese Government until they could take over China, the hub of the Asia wheel.

Mr. Chairman, it will be incomprehensible to historians why some in the American State Department should also have made it a major project for the last 7 years to discredit and destroy the one man who more than all others bought us many years of time in this fight to the death with an enemy which he knew and has warned all along was our enemy as much as China's. But that is another story.

Apparently Browder in 1937 was still an agent for communications between the Chinese Reds and the Kremlin. For Chow En-lai continues in this letter to Browder:

In China at the present time, the concrete process of bringing about the united front and the content of the united front is very devious and complicated. As to what actually happened and what is the present status

of the negotiations, I have already transmitted this to you.

I fervently hope that you and the party under your leadership will give us more support. I am also anxious to get your opinion on our united-front work.

Doubtless he received it, for the American Reds have certainly been skillful in forming united fronts to deceive and use the gullible.

Now may I read also one sentence from the 1937 letter to Browder by Mao Tse-tung, now president of the Communist regime in Peking:

We feel that when we achieve victory, this victory will be of considerable help to the struggle of the American people for liberation.

You see, after they have conquered and subdued China, then they will be in a position to help "liberate" us too from the capitalist tyranny under which we are supposed to be suffering.

They understood correctly what our Government refused to see, that Communist victory in China would gravely weaken our position in the world, would make us vulnerable to attacks like that now going on in Korea, would increase the burdens and drains on our strength, would tip the scales against us.

There it was, 13 years ago—all written out for any who would bother to read. Hitler too took the trouble, inasmuch as he had to sit in jail anyway, to write it all down so that everybody would be sure to know long ahead of time. We wouldn't pay attention; but that was our tragic error, not his.

Now, if you do not want to go back so far, may I take you to the Daily Worker for December 2, 1945. Here are the official instructions given by William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in this country, to the national committee of the party at its meeting on November 18, 1945, shortly after VJ-day. How can we be sure that these are the Kremlin's orders to the Communist Party in this country? Because had Foster deviated by one iota from what the Kremlin wanted him to say, there would have happened to him what had just happened to Earl Browder for getting slightly off the Moscow beam—he would have been liquidated as leader. Instead Foster is still in good standing.

Let me read. Remember this is the Kremlin speaking:

On the international scale, the key task, as emphasized in Comrade Dennis' report, is to stop American intervention in China—

Which is Communist lingo for "stop American assistance to China." Assistance to an ally grappling with a rebellion cannot rightly be called intervention.

Now, why should the Soviets think that the most important thing for American Communists to do right after the defeat of Japan, was to get American assistance to China stopped? Because they knew, as everyone else should have known, that without the right kind of outside assistance the Chinese Government could not possibly recover. It had been through too much stress and strain, beginning in 1937 before it had had a chance to become strong. It had had to

struggle with too much poverty, too much illiteracy, too much provincialism, too much traditionalism, too long a Japanese war, too much Communist sabotage and rebellion, too much inflation, too much hunger and disease, too many millions of displaced persons, along with too few trained civil servants and administrators, too few who understood that nationalism means putting country ahead of family—a brand new idea in China—and so on and on.

General Marshall said the other day before our committee that we must be patient and generous with the European countries because it took our South 50 years to recover from 4 years of war. But China had been engaged in war with Japan for over 8 years, and internal struggle with Communists for 20 years. China could not possibly recover without patient and generous assistance of the right sort from us—any more than Greece could or Italy could or France could. Even Britain would have gone down if we had not come to her aid with enormous quantities of money and material, in comparison with which China's needs were small indeed.

So if by constantly repeating the theme song that the Chinese Government was feudalistic, dictatorial, reactionary, inept, incompetent, inefficient, undemocratic, corrupt, and all the other derogatory words—if by playing up all the weaknesses in China and never mentioning any strengths or China's vital importance to ourselves, the Communists and their stooges, both inside our Government and among the writers, lecturers, commentators, professors, and so forth, could divert our attention from our own national interests and persuade us to withdraw from China and stop effective assistance to her weakened government, they knew that its power to resist would be worn down and China at last be taken over. Russia would then have the giant hub of the Asia wheel and be able to move out into any of the surrounding spokes when and as she wished. What other task, I ask you, could be so important to the Kremlin's plan for conquest of Asia, then of Europe and then of ourselves as beguiling America into stopping effective assistance to China?

Foster summed it up in this sentence:

The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front—

Not Japan, not Germany, not the Mediterranean, not the Balkans, not the oil of the Middle East, not the North Atlantic or any of the other areas where we have focused our efforts—but China. The Kremlin 5 years ago instructed its followers that the war in China is the key of all—I repeat, all—problems on the international front. While we were seeking to forget China and its troublesome war against Communists, the Kremlin was already working to win that war and the crucial victory which that would represent in its never-ending warfare against us and all the free world.

How was the party to carry out the task assigned to it? Let me quote further:

On the question of China, which is our key concentration, . . . we want to hold

500 meetings all over the country to mobilize all the forces of the people that we can reach to put a stop to the intervention in China. Our party must use every ounce of its strength and skill and organizational ability to make these 500 meetings a success.

These struggles will be a supreme test of the ability of our party to function effectively in such a complicated and difficult situation as we now confront. We must keep clearly in mind that if we concentrate on these two key problems of the wage movement and American intervention in China as the most burning and urgent of all the tasks confronting us, this does not mean that we can neglect the many other vital problems I have mentioned. * * *

For example, would it not be a big mistake to neglect the fight over the atom bomb? On the contrary, we must find the ways and means to participate to a much greater extent than we are now doing precisely in the mobilization of the people over this vital issue. * * * We must while concentrating on these two key questions of domestic and foreign policy—the wage movement and intervention in China—learn how to link up all the other struggles we are carrying on.

Never in all its history was our party called upon to use such generalship. * * * It must find more and more effective ways to ally itself with the broader masses of the people and to set these masses in motion. This is a supreme test of the maturity of our party.

I wish I had time to read also the report to the same meeting in 1945 by Comrade Gene Dennis, secretary of the party, now in jail for contempt of Congress. He, too, demanded withdrawal of American troops and supplies from China, hammering on the slogans of the "reactionary Kuomintang dictatorship" and the "proved patriots of China"—meaning, of course, the same Reds who have now made China a colony of the Soviet Union. Also in his report you will find many phrases which soon appeared in the speeches of innocents like Henry Wallace, and reappear in the phony peace petitions and propaganda being promoted so vigorously just now by the Communists and their unconscious dupes.

Let me show you one illustration of how rapidly the Kremlin's instructions to "get resolutions of protest adopted" produced results. The instructions were transmitted by Foster to the national committee on November 18, 1945. In the same issue of the Daily Worker in which they were published only 2 weeks later, the lead story occupying two-thirds of the front page is headlined: "Protests forcing show-down on intervention in China—Representative DeLacy speaks up for aroused Nation."

The story begins:

The American people have only just begun to speak up against the Truman administration's military intervention in China and its atomic diplomacy throughout the world.

On behalf of himself and five other west coast Congressman, Representatives John Coffee and Charles Savage, of Washington, and Helen Gahagan Douglas, Ellis Patterson, and Ned Healy, of California, DeLacy submitted a resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of all American troops and military equipment in China.

DeLacy * * * pointed to the democratic character of the great mass movement led by the Chinese Communists and to the dictatorial character of the Kuomintang clique led by Chiang Kai-shek.

The text of the resolution is printed in full and, of course, is couched in the same party line double-talk about peace, unity, democracy, and so on.

DeLacy did not mention that to withdraw assistance and support from the Chinese Government before it had a chance to restore order in the country, would be decisive intervention in favor of the Communists. American withdrawal looked like peace; but led, of course, to war—in China then just as later in Korea. That was what it was designed to do. It threw away that which 108,000 Americans had just died in the Pacific to win. It gave China to Russia, and China, I repeat, is the hub of the Asia wheel.

Once their key task had been explained to American Communists, they had their faithful followers and those whom the faithful could influence or use, doing the job effectively within 2 weeks. Do you wonder why as a result of the skillful drive to induce us to abandon China to the Red armies, we are fighting some of the same Red forces only 5 years later in Korea, fighting because we now see that it is that or lose the rest of Asia too?

So the third finding in the autopsy is that the Kremlin has been vastly smarter than our Government in understanding where the real keys to world power are and more effective in extending its conquests than we have been in advancing the cause of freedom and our own security.

Is it surprising that the Kremlin was so successful in putting across its gigantic hoax about Chinese communism when there were eminent American officials including Members of Congress who, however unknowingly, allowed at least their names to be used to further its purposes?

The Chinese Communists did not need to drive us out of China. The Moscow directors of the world conspiracy and their agents and dupes inveigled us into leaving voluntarily.

Let me pursue further the question of why the loss of China to Communist control is the key to present events in the Far East. It is due in large part to China's central geographical position in Asia. State Department spokesmen for years have talked almost casually of writing off China and then building up the countries around her. But if you let the hub of a wheel be chopped out, how can you hold together or make anything useful out of the individual spokes?

Or, to change the figure: China is like a giant hand and the surrounding countries like the outstretched fingers. God made them that way and we have to deal with the situation that exists, whether we like it or not. Here is the hand, mainland China, and here are the fingers—11 of them: Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, India, Pakistan, almost to Iran. These fingers are where the 700,000,000 people live who can tip, one way or the other, the balance of power that exists today between the Soviet world and the free world. These people are still on the fence. Which way are they to go—with us or with the Soviets? All the other problems on the international front do indeed depend on

that. And what happens in the fingers depends largely on what happens in the hand, China.

Some who were charged with our protection have argued that it did not make much difference to us what happened in China, apparently because they did not happen to like certain leaders in China or what those leaders were doing as they struggled with their gigantic problems. So instead of pitching in to help the Chinese with their otherwise insurmountable difficulties, our experts sat up in the bleachers and gave them moral lectures. We maintained our pose of pious propriety, but the Commies won the victories.

Communist forces have now moved out into the Korea fingertip and we find ourselves fighting desperately to hold that tip. But if we push them back to the thirty-eighth parallel or even back to Manchuria, they can move right into that same finger again, as soon as our attention is turned elsewhere, or into other fingers, Indochina, Burma, or the Philippines; or into two or three at the same time. They can bleed us to death in the fingers all around the periphery of the hand which is China, here in the center.

Plenty of people besides the Communists have long understood this. I was in the Far East in October and November of 1947 and on my return I made this report on November 14, 1947, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In addition to appearing in the hearings I inserted it in the Appendix of the Record in order to make reprints and distribute them as widely as I could. In it and in many talks over the country I reported what General MacArthur had said to me in a long interview he graciously granted me. I did not identify him by name at the time; I merely referred to him as a great American out in the Far East.

He said he was no longer anxious about Japan as such. What worried him was the situation in China. He put it this way:

Our failure at the end of the war to help the Government of China effectively with its otherwise insuperable problems particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out, I fear, to be the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States. For the first time in our relations with Asia, we confused the paramount strategic interests of the United States with an internal purification problem in China.

He was concerned because he knew that Japan could hardly recover without China. Why? Because the Japanese have to eat. They cannot raise enough to feed themselves. They have got to get food and many raw materials from outside. We put \$856,000,000 into Japan last year alone—about half of it for food and materials. We cannot do that indefinitely. But they must get food and raw materials from somewhere. If they are to pay their own way they must use raw materials to manufacture products to sell to the billion people on the Asia Continent in order to get more raw materials and food supplies for themselves. If the Communists have China and get more and more of these other fingers around China, and the day comes when

we cannot longer hold the Japanese up economically or continue to defend them with our troops, then the Communists do not need to invade Japan. The Japanese themselves will have to knock at the Red door and beg, "Please let us in behind the Iron Curtain, too. We have to eat."

When General MacArthur gave me some of his views on the whole area, and they were so different from what I had heard from our Government here about the supposed unimportance to us of Communist expansion in China, I said to him in perplexity, "Is it possible that our Government has sent you to do a job in Japan and has not consulted you as to what you think is necessary on the continent in order to enable you to succeed in Japan?"

To which he replied, "That, of course, I cannot answer." He did not need to. I had the answer. Do you wonder why he has been eating his heart out in Japan as he saw America's position in the Far East steadily deteriorating from its all-time high on VJ-day to its recent all-time low?

A few months later, when our committee was holding hearings on the ECA program and considering aid to China, I urged it to send a cable to General MacArthur to ask him to come and testify in person; or, if that were not possible, to send his views on American policy in the extension of aid to China. Let me read two paragraphs of the cable he sent to the committee on March 3, 1948. Every word deserved most careful study, yet it was scarcely mentioned in the press. It did not fit the "line" that was being promulgated so skillfully about China. Here are his words:

I can say without the slightest hesitation that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world and to the position of the United States. It is the fundamental keystone of the Pacific arch. Underlying all issues in China is now the military problem. Until it is resolved little progress can be expected toward internal rehabilitation, regardless of the extent of outside aid. Once it is resolved, however, there is little doubt but that China's traditional resiliency will provide the basis for rapid recovery to relative stability.

Please listen to this:

The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety in the orientation of American policy. Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world will not bring an integrated solution. The problem insofar as the United States is concerned is an over-all one and can only be resolved on the broadest possible global basis. It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all.

That was an inspired statement in its accurate understanding and analysis of the whole picture. One of the personal tragedies of the present Korean invasion is that General MacArthur is now called upon to retrieve an almost impossible situation in which we would never have been if his counsel and advice had been sought and heeded.

Instead, you will recall that right after the Japanese surrender he was officially lectured and put in his place by Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Under Secretary of State. General MacArthur was on the spot and he outlined policies for the occupation of Japan. The leftists and those who always know how to reform others objected to it as soft. The State Department announced that—its decision for social and economic revolution in Japan would be carried out.

MacArthur went ahead with his judgment that—

by utilizing the Japanese Government structure to the extent necessary to prevent complete social disintegration, insure internal distribution, maintain labor, and prevent calamitous disease or wholesale starvation, the purposes of the surrender terms can be accomplished with only a small fraction of the men, time, and money originally projected.

But that was not the policy that was desired by the State Department "experts," as was proved by the secret statement of policy—the notorious FEC-230—which they prepared. Under it General MacArthur, as the representative of a capitalist economy in the United States was to produce a socialist economy in Japan, with as much dislocation as possible. They had sent over Mr. George Acheson to be MacArthur's political adviser, and manage the social and economic revolution. I am glad to report that he had a conversion from his leftist views before he was killed in a plane crash. On his staff were men like John K. Emerson and John Service from the Far Eastern Office of the State Department. At the same time, another man Mr. John Carter Vincent, who frankly told me that for 3 years he tried his best to get the Communists into the Chinese Government, was made Director of that Office. Altogether they were set to transform Japan into a nice little streamlined socialist "democracy" overnight.

Under Secretary Dean Acheson publicly spanked General MacArthur for having different policies. He seemed to be especially provoked because the latter's policies were succeeding so well that MacArthur predicted on September 17, 1945, that the occupation army could probably be cut to 200,000 in 6 months. In Acheson's statement of rebuke made on September 19, 1945, he said:

The occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy.

According to the New York Times, MacArthur said:

It is extraordinarily difficult for me at times to exercise that degree of patience which is unquestionably demanded if the long-time policies which have been decreed are to be successfully accomplished without repercussions which would be detrimental to the well-being of the world, but I am restraining myself to the best of my ability and am generally satisfied with the progress being made.

Fortunately General MacArthur's position prevailed because his prestige with the American people was such that they stood by him rather than the State Department. How tragic that he was not

in charge of our affairs in China as well as in Japan.

Now, coming to Korea, one of the fingers projecting out from the China hand. I reported when I came back from Asia in November 1947 that the Communists would get China unless we changed our negative policies, and if they got China they would get Korea too. I did not like it, but it seemed to me clearly inevitable, so I had to report it. I told of a long conversation I had with a great Korean patriot, Mr. Kim Koo. He had been head of the Korean Provisional Government, in exile in China, where it had been organized to carry on agitation and underground activities against Japanese rule of Korea. The Chinese had been wise enough to give it asylum until it was able to go back to Korea after the surrender in 1945. Mr. Kim has since been assassinated. I talked to him in Korea one evening, and the following is from my report:

I said to him, "What should America do now? We have delayed 2 years hoping we could get agreement with the Russians that would reunite Korea, but cooperation with them hasn't worked here any better than anywhere else. Should we delay longer, waiting for the UN Commission to see what it can do? Should we go ahead in South Korea anyway, hold elections, set up a defense force, and try to get the country on its feet and withdraw our forces? Or what?"

He studied a minute and then said, "It doesn't make any difference what you do now. There isn't any way to get Korea so that she can be independent and secure and self-sustaining, until you solve the Communist problem across the border in Manchuria."

I asked various other questions, to all of which he replied in substance, "There is no way you can solve the problem so that we can be independent and secure until you help China remove the Communist menace in Manchuria."

He knows that if Russia controls Manchuria, the Communists, when we leave Korea, will take it over too.

Our Government ought to have known it also. Or if it did know it, then it had no business to be so complacent and inactive about Manchuria, which at that time had not yet fallen to the Communists.

Our boys now have to go over to Korea to fight and die in an effort to save something out of the smashup there which inevitably followed our refusal to pay attention to the wisdom and foresight of the many men who did understand the problems of Asia as thoroughly as the autopsy makes clear that the State Department policy-makers in recent years did not understand them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our Government to call back into emergency service statesmen like Grew, Hornbeck, Dooman, Berle, and others—men who are real experts on Asia or on communism, men whom the left wing boys pushed out of the Department. You will recall that Alger Hiss was a key man in the Far Eastern Office from 1939 to 1944 when the pattern of building up the Chinese Communists and building down the Chinese Government was established.

The genuine experts had long warned about the miscalculations regarding Asia

which were leading to the crisis of today. We need them now. We need every bit of brains and ability and experience and understanding of so complicated and dangerous a situation, that the country can muster; for, as MacArthur warned would be the case, the breach of the Asia front already threatens to engulf all.

It was considerations like the above which caused me to say when the committee hearings on the bill for Korean economic aid were opened June 8, 1949:

Mr. Judd, Mr. Chairman, not since I have been in Congress have I been faced with a more difficult decision than this bill presents. I have worked for Korean independence all these many years since I lived in the Far East. I have a great affection and regard for them as a people and confidence in their capacity to govern themselves well, if they have security and wise help and encouragement for a while.

Yet, I can see no possible justification for setting up democratic governments in Korea and the Philippines and then allowing the continent to be taken over by the Communists, which in my opinion will make it impossible for those democratic governments to survive. I do not know an informed citizen of any country in Asia who thinks these marginal countries can long stand if all China is taken over by the Communists.

If China is free, Korea and Japan have a good future. If not, then no matter how much we pour in, they cannot become self-sufficient and secure.

China can get along without them but they cannot get along without her. Everybody in Asia knows that.

To me Korea is merely the first of the rat holes that we will have to pour money into all around China if we do not plug up the basic rat hole in China.

Two years ago we reversed our policies with respect to Europe. We recognized we could not get recovery or security piecemeal. We took an over-all approach which made sense and we of this committee fought to get it through and it was a wise piece of legislation.

If we will make a similar reversal of policy in Asia, see the area as a whole, of which the Korea program is merely a part, then this can be justified because it too makes sense.

But a fragmentary approach, trying to sustain some countries while allowing others to go down is, I fear, doomed to failure.

Despite the refusal of the administration to support the sort of program which I thought was necessary if it were to have much chance of success in either Korea or Asia, I decided to go along and, as you know, spoke and voted for the Korean economic aid bill when the leadership finally brought it before the House on January 19, 1950—7 months later.

During that debate I said, as the original transcript shows:

I am willing to predict, although I shall take this remark out of the RECORD, that it (Korea) will be overrun and our money will probably be lost.

Then I added—and this appears in the printed RECORD (p. 651):

But despite those reasons, and despite my fear that as a result of our actions at Yalta and our inaction in China, the odds are against this young republic and the difficulties we have helped to pile up for it may prove beyond its strength, still I am in favor of passing this bill because the reasons for it outweigh those against it. It provides the only hope Korea has.

Unfortunately our fears have become sad facts.

That brings me to the place in the autopsy where we must report eight or so of the specific mistakes that have led to this Korean tragedy. In not a single one is it hindsight either, because the bad results were foreseen and warned against by many people—long before the autopsy.

The first mistake was at Yalta. Mr. Acheson said to a group of us one day, in attempting to justify our granting to Russia rights in Manchuria which did not belong to us and without the consent or even the knowledge of the Chinese to whom they did belong and to whom we had solemnly and publicly promised at Cairo that they would be returned:

Our concern was to get Russia into the war against Japan in order to shorten it and save American lives. I myself had a son on a destroyer out in the Pacific.

Now that is certainly a laudable objective—to save American lives immediately. But is it the only concern, or can it be the decisive consideration? What will it do to the hopes of enduring peace, which is the way to save the greatest number of lives? What will it do to the lives of people in countries that are our allies, like China, Korea, the Philippines? And to the lives of the Americans who have to go out later to try to undo the damage done by the decision?

Mr. Chairman, Wendell Willkie told the whole truth on this difficult problem when he said early in the last war, "Every drop of blood saved through expediency will be paid for by twenty drawn by the sword."

Perhaps some American lives were saved by the Yalta deal. And, if I had been fighting out there then, I realize that probably I would also have been praying that the Russians would enter the war to save me from having to land on a Japanese beachhead. But the fact remains that for every life saved by Yalta scores of Americans and thousands of Koreans are dying there today.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way a nation can sell out its moral principles and escape the day of judgment. There is no way we can build a world order that will be just and peaceful without international morality, and we cannot get international morality by breaking commitments. It was wrong when Hitler did it; it was wrong when Japan did it; it was wrong when the Kremlin did it; it was wrong when we did it. Most of our troubles today, in Korea and elsewhere, flow right from the expediencies of Yalta. Mr. Roosevelt was very, very sick, and I do not want to speak of him in the least uncharitably. Doubtless he was trying desperately to get our relations with Russia on a firm basis. But that cannot be purchased with other peoples' rights and territory.

Lest anyone dislike to take my views on this, let me quote the findings of two devoted Democrats.

In his book entitled "Where Are We Heading?" Sumner Welles has written of the Yalta agreement to restore to Russia the rights formerly possessed by the Imperial Russian Government to

dominate Manchuria through the control of the Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian railroads and the port of Dairen and the naval base at Port Arthur:

These concessions, which will make it altogether impossible for a new, unified China to exercise full sovereignty within Manchuria, are all the more objectionable in view of China's absence from the conference table when they were decided.

Robert Sherwood cites this quotation in his book "Roosevelt and Hopkins" and adds this comment:

Such criticism from Welles can hardly be dismissed as coming from one who did not know what he was talking about or who was embittered by hatred of Roosevelt.

Stalin insisted that these agreements must be put in writing and must contain the statement: "The heads of the three Great Powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated."

This, in my opinion, was the most assailable point in the entire Yalta record * * * for, if China had refused to agree to any of the Soviet claims, presumably the United States and Britain would have been compelled to join in enforcing them.

Again may I say that I report these things not to blame or recriminate, but if possible to prevent our Government's ever again imagining that we can get good faith with one ally by bad faith with another; that we can buy the good behavior or goodwill of the strong by sacrificing the weak; or that might makes right, even if the might be our might. It must be driven home right now that just as the expediencies of Yalta did not end our troubles but multiplied them, so we must not be tempted to try to get out of our present predicament by making another deal at the expense of someone else or of our own principles, no matter how sharp or clever or desirable the scheme may appear.

A second mistake was the decision by military men here in Washington to divide Korea along the thirty-eighth parallel and assign the Russians to accept the Japanese surrender north of that parallel while we were moving our troops in to accept surrender south of the parallel. Despite extended questioning of representatives of various Government agencies, we were not able in the committee to get a full and satisfactory picture of just how and why this was done. There are certain facts, however, which seem to be established:

First, Korea was divided solely on our initiative, without any request or suggestion that that effect from Russia.

Second, It was proposed by the War Department on August 11, 1945, when the Russians did not have a single soldier in North Korea.

Third, It was done here in the Pentagon but we could get no testimony from anyone that it was ever requested or suggested by General MacArthur, although he was commander-in-chief of the whole theater, including Korea.

Fourth, There was no testimony that the State Department or those officials responsible for winning the peace in Asia and making good on our commitment at Cairo that Korea would in due

course be given her independence, were consulted; or that any consideration was given by anyone to what the political and economic effects of a division of Korea would be, especially a division at the thirty-eighth parallel.

Fifth, The line chosen was just about the worst possible line that could have been picked. Korea as a whole has a reasonably balanced economy. But division along the thirty-eighth parallel made it impossible for either side to survive without a lot of assistance from the outside. The best agriculture is south of the line; most of the good coal, minerals, water power, and industries are north of it. There are factories on the south side whose power and raw materials come from the north side—or rather did come from the north before we gave it to the Russians.

No one was able to explain why the particular line was picked. Someone suggested that it may have been chosen because it is roughly midway between the two biggest cities in Korea and it thus gave one, Pyongyang, to North Korea and the other, Seoul, to South Korea. Perhaps as good an explanation is that the map at which someone in the Pentagon was looking already had a line running horizontally across it, which the map makers had put on it—as they usually put on maps to indicate latitude.

Sixth, There is no evidence that any division at all was necessary. May I quote from some of the testimony before our committee in June 1949. Because this portion of the hearings was not printed, I shall not identify the authors of any of the statements except my own:

Mr. JUDD. Were the Russians threatening to move into North Korea at the time this ad hoc military decision was made?

General —. It was almost simultaneously but they had not moved in. However, the intelligence estimate made at the time was that they would move in, that they could, and that they could overrun the peninsula before our forces could get there.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, they could. They could overrun Berlin, too, if they wanted to. Was General MacArthur not commander-in-chief of the whole theater?

General —. Yes; he was.

Mr. JUDD. * * * Why could the line not have been set at the Korean border? What reasons were there to believe that the Russians would not stop at the Korean border if the commander-in-chief set the line there?

General —. I cannot say what other offers were made, if any, as to a border further north, but my information is that it was offered to the Soviets in the plan that was made as being one they would accept rather than something further south.

Mr. JUDD. We cannot have it both ways. If the Soviets were insisting on moving into Korea, then we should have been alerted at that time to the fact that they did not intend to cooperate with us in the peace * * * and governed ourselves accordingly.

If they did not insist on moving in, then the only other conclusion is that we invited them in, completely unnecessarily. That is one reason I feel we must pass some sort of bill for Korea, because I think we ourselves created the mess. How can we blame the Koreans for the bad results of a situation which is the result of our decision? The Koreans did not have anything to do with it, that is sure.

Seventh, We were not able to find out from anyone whether Korea was

discussed at Yalta. It was stated that General Marshall and his staff there consulted with Russian military men to work out coordination between Russian forces and our forces in the expected attack upon Japanese troops in Manchuria. We could get no information either way as to whether there was an understanding that Russia intended to enter Korea, and if so, whether there was discussion or agreement on coordinating her campaign and our campaign into Korea.

Mr. JUDD. It is a question that is bound to be asked until it is cleared up. If it was discussed at Yalta how we were going to meet and handle our joint operations not only in Manchuria, but also in Korea, then our Government had months to make some political plans as far as Korea was concerned. * * * If it was not discussed and no agreement was reached at Yalta, then you faced a different situation. Too often you men in the military do brilliant jobs winning a war * * * and then because we have not thought ahead—all of us are to blame for it—how we are going to hold on to the fruits of victory, it slips through our fingers.

Korea is a tragic example of our failure, while still fighting, to think beyond the military objectives to the political objectives for which the war was being fought, supposedly. Just off-hand, without preparation, without forethought or planning by our political experts, our military decided to divide Korea, naively supposing it would be temporary; and picked the thirty-eighth parallel, which was about the worst possible from the standpoint of Korea.

A third mistake was the use of the term "trusteeship" for the arrangement worked out at Moscow in December 1945 by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Russia, and the United Kingdom (China was later included) for ruling Korea while a joint United States-U. S. S. R. Commission was supposed to form a Korean provisional government. When word got to Korea that such a proposal was being considered, the effect upon Korean public opinion was so inflammatory that General Hodge, in command of the occupation, cabled twice urging that the word "trusteeship" not be used. The English word "trusteeship" is translated into the same Korean term as the word which the Japanese used when they established in 1905 a so-called protectorate over Korea. The Koreans remembered vividly that 5 years later the Japanese annexed Korea outright and they were enslaved. Naturally they feared that the same thing would happen to a "trusteeship" established by other great powers, especially one including Russia.

It is certain that the Koreans wanted to be under our military government at first—if it were to be merely a transition stage from being controlled by Japan to real independence. But they did not want to be under us if it were to be merely a transition stage from control by Japan to control by the Soviet Union. Yet the conferees in Moscow went right ahead and ignored the urgent representations of the responsible man on the ground, General Hodge, and announced on December 27, 1945, the establishment of a joint "trusteeship." It all but wrecked Korea's confidence in our integrity and our intentions.

A fourth mistake was that for the first 3 years after VJ-day we refused to train and develop armed forces to defend South Korea, although we knew the Russians were feverishly developing large forces in North Korea, and had large and experienced units made up of Koreans across the border in both Siberia and Manchuria. We were, as usual, perfectly correct and proper—and weak; the Russians made haste to become strong.

The situation, however, was understood clearly by the people of Asia. It was described in the following editorial of September 22, 1948, from a Shanghai newspaper, the China Press, published in English by Chinese trained in and friendly to the United States:

The Soviet's offer to withdraw its troops from Korea by the end of 1948 is timed to synchronize with the opening of a Communist offensive in Asia. What we see in China, Malaya, Burma, and elsewhere are only the opening shots of the campaign—the first step, as it were, on the road to conquest.

That the Soviets are in an advantageous position in Korea appears almost axiomatic. Until a short time ago, the United States followed the terms of the trusteeships to the letter—and to the advantage of the Communists. Instead of training a Korean army the way the Soviets did, the United States prevented and forbade all military training in its occupation zone. Until the United Nations supervised an election and a Korean assembly was elected, all real power was kept out of the hands of Koreans.

The Soviets, on the other hand, began their training of a Korean army almost from the time the troops entered the territory above the thirty-eighth parallel. The Korean Communist Party was given every incentive to organize and build itself up into a future government, while all opposition was ruthlessly wiped out. No wonder the Soviets are willing to withdraw today, knowing that all the trump cards are in the hands of their supporters in Korea.

For the United States, there is now no recourse but to be placed at a diplomatic disadvantage while working for the best interests not only of the Korean people but of all democracies. Unpopular though this course may be, it is the only one providing an opportunity for the people of South Korea to build up their defenses and build up an efficient administration. So long as communism is prevented from seizing all of Korea by force, we are confident that they cannot win the country over by Pyongyang-manufactured "democracy." The only question is: Can the North Korean bear be held off long enough for South Korea to get on its own feet?

It could not. The 3 years lead we presented to North Korea was too great. The North Korean bear has walked in.

One hears people ask, How did the North Korean armies become such fanatical fighters, such skillful warriors? First, because those who are actually North Koreans have been in training for as much as 5 years. Second, no one yet knows how many of them are not North Koreans but Siberian and Manchurian Koreans. A missionary friend wrote me from Korea back in March of 1945, warning what would happen if Russians came into Korea. But our Government dreamed along until the following August and then the military, without advice from the political people, made an ad hoc decision to invite Russia in.

He wrote:

There are 200,000 Koreans living in Siberia and sixty to eighty thousand more are in the Russian Army. If Russians should come into the war before we land troops in Korea, the impact of the Sovietized Koreans, not to mention the Russians, would be tremendous.

He had written about it also to the State Department, but apparently was ignored.

Many of the Koreans in Siberia were fiery patriots who fled Korea years ago to escape Japanese control. The Soviets, thinking always of achieving their world objectives, took them in, trained them, and used them in the last war in their own armies. They are hard, experienced, battle-trained veterans up against our green boys who have been trained for occupation duties more than for combat.

On top of that, there are somewhere between 50,000 and a hundred thousand Manchurian Koreans who have been trained and have fought with the Chinese Communists in Manchuria. They, too, have had battle experience and long indoctrination.

Some ask if the South Koreans can make as good soldiers. Certainly they can, if they are given adequate training and suitable weapons under good leadership. If the Russians can do it, so can we, if we are willing to make the effort. But for years it proved impossible to get our Government to make the necessary effort in either South Korea or China.

It is hard to believe, but our officials told our committee several times that there was more danger of South Korea attacking North Korea than of North Korea attacking the south. So, as we frequently have done, we kept our own side weak. The ones we have been counseled to guard against most in both Korea and China, you know, have been our proved friends, Rhee and Chiang; not the Communists, our enemies. It is fantastic.

The autopsy makes clear that a fifth mistake was the withdrawal of our own troops in June of last year, the same month in which the President sent his message recommending the Korean economic aid program. The last unit was out even before the hearings were completed. I opposed complete withdrawal of our tactical forces as strongly as I could. It was not fair to the young republic. A mother bird does not push her nestling out until it has at least a couple of feathers. We were the ones who had held back Korean military development. It was we who waited 2 years trying to get Russian agreement. It was we who delayed another year for the United Nations to decide upon and then to conduct an election and to get the new Government established. Only then did we allow them to start building even a substantial constabulary.

On November 20, 1948, the new Korean National Assembly passed a resolution urging United States troops to remain in Korea until the security forces of the Republic became capable of maintaining national security. Instead, our Army turned economic aid over to ECA and got out in 7 months. It decided that

Korea was not of great strategic advantage to us—and it was not. So it pulled out before they had had a chance to build the strength necessary to hold their own against the northerners known to be backed by the Russians and the Chinese Communists in Manchuria.

The Army gave as its reason that our American troops could not defend South Korea if the Russians were to attack. Of course they could not.

But neither can our troops in Berlin. We have only a few thousand there. The Soviets, with their satellites in east Germany, can seize Berlin over the week end. Why do they not do it? Because of the strength of the American forces there? Of course not. It is because the American flag and a few military units are there as the symbol of American power and determined interest in Berlin. That is why Russia has not moved against Berlin, although she doubtless wants it more than almost anything else as the stepping stone to seizure of Germany.

Members of our committee practically begged representatives of Defense and State to keep American forces in Korea for another year or two—even if only a battalion as the symbol of American power and determined interest in the security of a republic which in so many respects is our own child and that of the United Nations. If the Russians were to make an all-out attack, we would be no worse off than we would be in Berlin—and our presence certainly would be the strongest deterrent to an attack. Contrariwise, military withdrawal was an open invitation to invasion.

Surely the autopsy proves that if Korea is important enough to our overall interests to justify our sending troops back in this June after an attack was well under way, then it could not have been right to pull out last June.

Or, if it was right to pull out last year, how can we justify fighting back in at such cost now?

Then this House refused to support the Lodge-Walter amendment last August—a sixth mistake, in my opinion.

It was a bipartisan amendment offered by two Members who have demonstrated their understanding of the issues in China, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. It was offered to the bill establishing the Mutual Defense Assistance program which the bill before us today extends for a year. The amendment provided the administration with authority and funds to give military aid to those resisting Communist aggression in China and in areas around China. If the President and his Cabinet wanted to take the responsibility for not using it, wanted to make no real effort to prevent communism from conquering the remainder of China, Formosa and other endangered areas, then they did not have to do anything. But, as I said here then, I was not willing to be responsible before God and my country and my children for not doing my best to make available to the administration whatever it might need to help all those still free in China

and Formosa to resist further enslavement and to keep the advancing Soviet glacier as far from our positions as possible.

The administration would not give us the green light on the amendment, and it was voted down with almost every Republican voting for it and with only a few Democrats following the wise example of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], a man who knows the score on Communist activities.

Later the Senate put in \$75,000,000 for aid to be used in the general area of China, and it became the law. But did the administration use it? Not a cent until recently. The Russians, of course, knew that and naturally interpreted it as meaning that we would not make a real effort to help either Korea or China with military supplies.

That brings us to the biggest error of all—the announcement by the President on last January 5, that we were not going to provide any military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa, those Chinese who have been fighting communism for 23 years—most of the time alone—and who still have the courage and intelligence to fight it—although still alone. The Secretary of State enlarged upon the President's statement in a press conference. He said:

We are not going to get involved militarily in any way on the island of Formosa.

Whatever else those statements did, they certainly gave public notice to the Kremlin that the door to Formosa was open as far as we were concerned, and they could walk right in.

Then on January 12, 1950, in a speech before the Press Club, the Secretary of State was publicly reported as saying that our security line which we are going to defend runs from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. Since Formosa lies beyond that line, it reaffirmed that we would not be concerned if Formosa were to be seized by the Communists.

Somebody over in the Kremlin apparently said, "We have a map around here somewhere. Let us take a look at it." They found Korea was also beyond our line and therefore would not be defended by us. So they moved in. Why should anyone be surprised?

Parenthetically, the Russians must have been shocked and outraged indeed when the policy announced so positively in January was reversed in June. It is my impression that our return to Korea is the only time we have ever double-crossed the Kremlin. That is treatment we have usually reserved for our friends.

Mr. Chairman, the last great mistake I shall mention was the policy of putting reform ahead of security. Our first preoccupation has been to produce economic recovery and development, based on the thesis that communism wins by propaganda, that people voluntarily choose communism—and especially in countries where people are in poverty. No, it has never yet won a country by propaganda. It has not gained control of a single country on the face of the earth, beginning with Russia, except by force of arms. The really powerful and

successful propaganda comes after, not before the conquest.

Some blithely accept the myth that it is by means of their ideas that they seize power. No, the wonderful slogans about all the benefits their regime will supposedly bring win some so-called intellectuals, but in the main propaganda is merely the softening-up weapon, the smoke screen behind which they build up and then use brute force—armed violence. It is after they get control that the real indoctrination that turns people into fanatics begins. They black out every word or idea except what they want people to hear, from the time a baby is nursing at his mother's breasts until he goes to his grave. It is thus that they are able to change men into the fierce fighters with which they intend to conquer the world.

Many kindly but innocent persons in our country have been led to think that if we help people to higher standards of living, that will prevent the spread of Communist imperialism. It is not so. The South Koreans with our assistance had a considerably higher standard of living than the North Koreans. Did that give them protection? No, it reduced their protection because it made them a more desirable target while diverting attention from their first need—security.

Some argue that this is not a war of armaments but a war of ideas and that the better idea and the system which produces most benefits for people will of course win. That is not so either—in the short run. All of history proves that bad ideas supported by arms regularly win over better ideas not supported by arms.

I am completely confident that communism will ultimately fail, because of its own immoralities; but it can and will destroy us and our civilization first—unless we are at least as well organized, determined and strong.

In short, I am not afraid of Communist ideas; I am afraid of Communist arms. Once they overpower you, you do not have any opportunity to do anything with your ideas, no matter how much better they may be.

In his inaugural address, President Truman stated clearly the necessity of securing if there is to be maximum economic improvement. He said that only when countries are "no longer concerned with the problem of national survival" will they be able to work as our partners "to improve the standards of living of all their peoples."

But apparently his State Department did not believe him for it demanded impossible internal reforms as the first condition of our assistance even at a time when in some cases like China, Korea, and the Philippines, their very survival as independent nations was in mortal peril. Both reform and security are necessary and each assists the other. But it is demonstrated that when a nation is threatened by Communists, it must give first priority to its security because only if it remains free is there any hope for democratic reforms. Once taken over by communism there will be no more chance for internal improvement than there is today in Poland or Manchuria.

The chief reason for this military aid bill is that we have found we cannot get the peoples of western Europe to make an all-out effort at economic recovery and reform until they have a greater sense of security. Why should we have expected it of the Koreans? Or the Chinese? I hope we will learn something for ourselves from our mistakes which have led to such tragic experiences for them.

For the Koreans, both north and south, have been the victims not of any bad intentions on our part, but of our ignorance—ignorance of the history of Asia, the geography of Asia, the nature of the Communist world conspiracy and its methods, and the real factors which determine power including both words and weapons.

They have been the victims of expediency on our part—our thinking we could thereby save American lives.

They have been pawns in our struggle with the Kremlin.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why we cannot adopt the suggestion a colleague has just made that we use the atomic bomb against North Korea.

It was we who invited Russia to enter the Pacific war.

It was we who divided Korea.

It was we who withdrew our troops when the Koreans were still almost defenseless.

It was we who announced we would not do anything to defend them because they are beyond a certain line.

How in God's name can we drop the atomic bomb on people who are engaged in this terrible war as the result of decisions that we ourselves made, and on which they were not even consulted? It is hard to say that, but it is true. To save some American lives right now is terribly appealing. But surely we know that it would cost us our moral case, and far more lives, too, in the long run.

It would not save civilization; it would destroy it.

Well, then, in view of all this past history, why take the action we did on June 27 when the President reversed the previous policy and sent troops back into Korea? First, it is not because Korea is valuable as a piece of real estate. Second, it is not because it has strategic value to us. Third, it is not because there can be any possible material or physical gain to ourselves.

We had to do it, when it came to a show-down, Mr. Chairman, because of the moral factors involved and the political objectives at stake. If we had failed to take a stand against this further and particularly bald and unprovoked Communist aggression, then not only Korea but the United Nations would have gone down just as the League of Nations did when it failed to act against aggression. Who in Asia—or Europe for that matter—could put any confidence in us or in the United Nations?

Formosa would go.

The Philippines would go. You will recall that just a year ago its President, Mr. Quirino, warned us here in solemn prophetic words that the time runs short in which we have a chance to define our

policy with respect to Communist aggression in Asia, as we did define it in 1947 with respect to Communist aggression in Europe. We have not been willing to pay attention to men from the Orient who knew their own countries and their own Communists.

Indochina would go and soon the rest of southeast Asia. Without access to its materials and markets, Europe could not recover. Certainly we cannot support her indefinitely.

Then Africa and South America would go. They are already honeycombed in large areas.

Then where would we ourselves be?

Mr. Chairman, we had to either resist this aggression in Korea or else prepare to withdraw to the North American Continent. Those were the only choices we had.

The Kremlin embarked long ago on a vast program of world conquest. Never in history has such a military expansion stopped until it was checked. Never can one stop until it is checked.

Therefore, our choice has never been between checking it or not checking it. Our only choice has been between checking it early while still strong ourselves and with strong allies and much of the world on our side; or waiting until we stand alone and then try to check it with just our own strength, and probably lose ourselves and our freedom in the process.

You ask, May this action lead to all-out war? Of course it may lead to war; but not to take it certainly will lead to war, and very possibly to our destruction. Great as are the risks of the decision that has been made, the risks of further indecision would be greater.

As a matter of fact, there are some grounds for encouragement:

First. There is nothing fundamentally worse in the situation than there was before. The disease is only more apparent. It is visible to more people. Since it has been there all the time, that awakening is good, not bad.

Second. Our own mistakes and miscalculations are also more visible. They are being recognized and in some quarters acknowledged. That is the first step toward their correction.

Third. We are arriving at last at a clear diagnosis: Communists in Asia are not likely to be accepted much longer as simple agrarian reformers. Communist movements in Korea, China, and the other countries are seen to be spontaneous peasant uprisings to gain land, peace, bread, liberation, democracy, people's governments, and all the other trick slogans; they are organized aggression, completely subservient to and directed from the Kremlin.

Fourth. We have quit running backward. We are facing forward on our west as we started facing forward on our east 3 years ago. At last we are beginning to grapple with the problem instead of deluding ourselves that it does not exist, or at least is not serious. That gives hope.

Fifth. For the first time the doctrine of containing communism until it breaks from its own inner weaknesses and cruelties has a chance to succeed because, for the first time, we are to try it. I am

convinced that the Soviet system, if its expansion is checked, will crack from its own inability to deliver on all the fancy promises it makes. But we cannot check it by holding in Europe and the Middle East and leaving the other end of the barrel—Asia—wide open.

We have never yet put into effect the policy of containment that many have talked about. Unless it is complete containment, then, of course, it is not containment at all. I hope that we intend to contain from now on—while presenting to the confused and discouraged peoples of the world the better alternatives that only genuine independence and security can make possible for them. If we do, I believe that the utter immoralities and viciousness within the Soviet system itself will break it down.

A sixth favorable factor is that in some ways it is better to have the show-down over a case of naked, premeditated aggression against the United Nations-sponsored Republic of Korea, with a government chosen in a supervised election in which 92 percent of the people voted, than to have the issue drawn over Hong Kong or Indochina, for example, or even Japan. Our moral case is stronger because the moral issues in Korea are clear and uncompromised.

A seventh encouraging factor is that presumably we will at last try to develop in Asia programs of mutual effort on the pattern that was worked out successfully in Greece: (1) Moral support to give hope to those who had almost resigned themselves to Communist enslavement. The effects on morale will be dramatic. (2) Military and economic aid including advisers to the key countries, where requested. And we ought to send those who have succeeded in the past and have the will to win, not those who have failed or who are sure nothing much can be done and therefore spend their time explaining why they cannot succeed. (3) Political support. The administration ought to send to the hot spots, such as Formosa, the Philippines, and Indochina, the ablest trouble-shooters we have. Without top-notch political, military, and economic advisers with real authority from our Government, no amount of military and economic aid can be expected to be effective.

Eighth. I hope that the State Department will now exercise some real initiative and leadership toward the Pacific pact that last year's law called for but under which nothing was done. We have reaffirmed the unanimous view of our committee that in Asia, just as in Europe, no one of the nations can stand alone against Soviet might and intrigue. Furthermore, all of them together cannot make it without our full participation and support. It is time to get going in making clear to them that if they are willing to work and work together, the United States stands with them. Although it is very, very late, I am convinced they will make a better effort than the defeatists expect—if they believe, as a result of our new actions and attitudes, that we are becoming mature and dependable.

Ninth. There should be a real chance to strengthen the United Nations so that it can begin to assume more and more

of the burdens which we have had to carry because no one else was strong enough to do so. Surely it is clear now that the Soviet Union joined the United Nations not to get peace but to be in a position to further and protect her own aggressions. Surely the lengths to which Russia is willing to go to get Communist China seated in the Security Council make clear how critical she knows that to be to her program of conquest in Asia. If China is to her the key to all problems on the international front, then it cannot be less important to us. To send American boys to die to stop Communist aggression in Korea and then to give Communist aggression in China the prestige and power that seating that regime in the United Nations would bring is unthinkable.

Tenth. One may hope that the naive Titoist myth about Chinese Communists which has befogged so many official minds, will now be recognized as a delusion and abandoned. The line has been, you know, that if we would just help the Chinese Communists succeed, somehow that would make them fail. That was the way the State Department was going to win Mao Tse-tung away from the Kremlin.

But let me read this quote from the speech Mao made at the closing session of the big Communist political conference in Peking just 2 days before the attack on Korea began. The Communists themselves broadcast it to the United States:

Internationally we must firmly unite with the Soviet Union, the various people's democracies, and all peaceful and democratic forces (this should be read "all Communist forces") throughout the world for our great aim. There cannot be the slightest indecision or wavering on this question.

It always was fantastic to imagine we could convert our enemies into our friends by treating our friends as if they were our enemies. I hope events have ended that phantasy for keeps. If so, it represents the beginning of the long road back to sanity and safety.

Now, one last word. There are only two things that I am afraid of in this whole world situation. One is that we might fail to understand the nature or underestimate the strength, the determination, the wide infiltration, the cruel ruthlessness of the forces of the Kremlin that are against us. Americans dare not kid themselves longer. It would be fatal!

The other is that we might fail to understand the nature or underestimate the size, the strength, the wide distribution, even behind the curtain, of the forces of freedom that are for us. That would be just as deadly a mistake.

If, as a result of this cruel attack upon the free people of Korea, we come to understand at last the full import of communism's crusade for enslavement of the world and rededicate ourselves to the crusade for freedom which has been America's historic mission in the world, then what looks now like total disaster can conceivably bring some ultimate benefit; it can be the beginning of the end for the Kremlin's tyranny. If the Kremlin had not shown its hand so unmistakably in Korea, we might have

slumbered on until its strength became so great and the free world so divided and demoralized and weakened that we could not match its power. Then we would have had not only a third world war, but a war that the free world could not win.

Mr. Chairman, from July 4, 1776, to 1931 when Japan invaded Manchuria, the areas of freedom in the world steadily expanded and the areas of slavery contracted. But from 1931 down to the present there has been an alarming expansion of the areas of despotism and slavery in the world and a corresponding contraction of the areas where men can choose their own rulers and determine their own destinies. This trend must be stopped—and reversed—or none of us will be free.

A lot of time has been lost, but thank God we are at last awakening. It is late, but I believe not yet too late. If we will mobilize fully and organize effectively the moral, the material, and the military resources of ourselves and of all free peoples under imaginative, courageous, and inspiring leadership, then the tide of tyranny that threatens everything we count precious can be turned back. Only thus can we secure once more the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us to strengthen the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, and broaden its scope, is one of extreme importance in the fateful situation with which our country is now faced.

The bill provides for the authorization of funds necessary to continue military aid not only in the European area but also in the Far East with particular reference to Korea and the serious situation that now exists there.

The bill was unanimously reported to the House after hearings were held. Testimony as to the nature of the problem that confronts our Nation in different parts of the world, and the military necessities, was given by Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense; Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; W. Averell Harriman, special representative of the United States in Europe; and Gen. George C. Marshall, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army and former Secretary of State. Statements were also received from many members of our diplomatic service serving in many of the troubled spots of the world.

The underlying purpose of the bill is to make effective the findings and declaration of policy adopted by the Congress in 1949. It reads as follows:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest. The Congress hereby finds that the efforts of the United States and other countries to promote peace and security in

furtherance of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations require additional measures of support based upon the principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. These measures include the furnishing of military assistance essential to enable the United States and other nations dedicated to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter to participate effectively in arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in support of those purposes and principles. In furnishing such military assistance, it remains the policy of the United States to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion.

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

The Congress recognizes that economic recovery is essential to international peace and security and must be given clear priority. The Congress also recognizes that the increased confidence of free peoples in their ability to resist direct or indirect aggression and to maintain internal security will advance such recovery and support political stability.

In view of the changed situation in the Far East, and, particularly because of the events in Korea, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has unanimously adopted a motion that—

It is the sense of the committee that the report of this bill contain the statement that the committee favors the negotiation of a Pacific Pact, consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, for the common defense of the Pacific area, and the participation therein of the United States.

The necessity for this bill and the assistance that has and will be given, I think is recognized by all. There is no disputing the fact that the situation is serious and world peace is threatened. The world is being rapidly divided between Russia on one side which is attempting to destroy principles of freedom and enslave nations and people against their will, and on the other side the free peoples of the world, led by the United States, who are determined to maintain principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, as against communism, and resist enslavement to a totalitarian dictatorship.

It has become increasingly clear that if the people of Europe and Asia were to maintain their freedom it would be necessary to do two things. First, strengthen the economic life of the freedom-loving nations that had been devastated as a result of World War II, and, thereby give hope to the crushed and disheartened people of these nations, and, second, assist them in creating defensive strength so they could have some assurance of protection and not be scared into quick surrender and consequent serfdom by a display of power by Russia or any of its satellites. In

providing these two forms of aid the United States has had to take a leading part. However, it is not intended that our Nation shall carry the entire burden and consequently a system of cooperation has been developed that calls upon each of the nations assisted to help themselves and to give aid to others to the extent their resources will permit.

We all deeply regret that Russia does not give that assurance of future peace to the world which we would like to see. But, our conscience as a Nation is clear. There has been no desire upon our part for the land of other nations, nor to hold dominion over the people of other nations. As a Nation we have sought and will continue to seek only the acknowledgment and recognition of those principles of justice, freedom, and democracy that will tend to make the peace of the world permanent and secure. The peace of the world is the deepest desire of the heart and soul of America. To the fulfillment of this desire our Nation and its people are dedicated. May God give us the vision and the courage to accomplish that to which we are dedicated.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I think there has rarely been a more enlightening and inspiring statement from the floor of this House than that just given by the gentleman from Minnesota. I was so interested in it myself, so carried away by it, that I had almost completely forgotten that I was scheduled to follow him.

Mr. Chairman, this is a grave hour for the people of the United States. Americans are dying in the rice paddies of Korea. Thousands more are faced with the same grim prospect as compulsory military service reaches out for them. The Korean fiasco has made it abundantly clear that the very existence of the United States is threatened by a two-fold menace: First, the ruthless ambitions of the Kremlin and, secondly, the blundering incompetence of the Truman administration. If the United States is required to make an almost major effort to cope with what the President has so lightly characterized as police action against one of the most insignificant of the Kremlin satellites, how indeed can we expect to meet the menace of Soviet power in more vital areas when we have one hand tied behind our back through the proven incompetence of this administration.

Prior to Sunday night 3 weeks ago, it had been an accepted premise of the Truman foreign policy that Korea was indefensible and was not of vital strategic interest. Our occupation troops had been deliberately withdrawn. Obviously our military plans were made upon the basis that it would not be necessary to defend Korea. And yet in a few hours on a Sunday evening, without consulting Congress or his Cabinet, the President completely reversed the position and ordered American military intervention in Korea. He could not have been right both times, that is, when it was decided to abandon Korea and withdraw Amer-

ican troops and secondly, when that policy was reversed and it was decided to intervene without the military power to do the job successfully. What a grim demonstration of the administration's inability to formulate a consistent foreign policy and sound military strategy.

The whole story is a tragedy of errors for which Americans are paying with their lives and which must greatly weaken our position throughout the world.

The American people are caught in a grim squeeze between the ruthless ambition of the Kremlin and the blundering incompetence of the White House. The United States can survive the Soviet challenge alone. The double threat, however, is a menace to our very existence. We can hardly expect to successfully meet Soviet ambitions and power, shackled by continued incompetence at the top.

The administration, of course, will make impassioned pleas for unity in the face of foreign aggression. There can be no true unity without confidence. The record of the White House over the past years justifies no confidence. On the contrary, it excites only the most lively apprehensions. If the United States were operating under the parliamentary system, there can be no doubt that this administration would now be voted out of office in response to the indignant demand of an outraged people.

In view of the known failures of administration policy, Congress and the American people should completely reappraise their situation and seek to establish a responsible relationship between our foreign commitments and the strength and resources available to maintain them. We are brought face to face with this problem by events in Korea. If there should be further deterioration in that situation, as now seems possible, we shall have to make an immediate decision as to how far we may safely permit the commitment of American military resources in Korea, in the light of our far-flung obligations in Europe and elsewhere throughout the world.

Congress has a very real responsibility in these unhappy circumstances which it cannot duck—the responsibility to protect the American people from further disastrous follies of the administration. The administration must be curbed—its power to blunder must be limited as far as possible. Only an independent-minded and vigilant Congress can do this. It alone can act. Congress must establish a firm curb upon the power of this irresponsible administration. There should perhaps be established a joint committee to sit continuously for the purpose of controlling the administration's actions during this perilous period. There should be appointed to such committee the ablest Members of both Houses, regardless of membership on committees or seniority. This may be a time of life and death for the American people. It is no time to be fooling around with politics.

As to the bill now pending before us, I expect to vote for it for one reason and one reason alone. I have no illusions as to its purely military value. I do not be-

lieve that the small amount of weapons and military equipment that may be authorized by this bill will make any decisive difference, in the short term certainly, in the ability of the western European nations to defend themselves if the Kremlin should undertake to move in. As the gentleman from Minnesota remarked a moment ago, the Soviet could take Berlin in a week end, if it wanted to, and presumably that goes for the rest of that fringe of Europe which we are committed to stand by in case of aggression. However, we have a policy the Congress decided upon last year. It is represented by the North Atlantic Pact and the accompanying military agreements. I fear that the moral effect of not continuing this program at this time might well be devastating. I think under the circumstances we have no choice. We must sustain this policy. We must pass this bill and we must go forward with it, hoping, indeed praying, that it may prove effective.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee about this bill, and I am sure that even before they spoke no one in this House would oppose it. We all favor it and we favor it for many reasons. First of all, it seems that we must favor it because at this time in our country's history we have finally reached the stage where we need friends, where we cannot stand alone. Secondly, we need it because it is in effect an economy.

I notice on page 57 of the committee report that when General Marshall was asked in the committee what it would cost to arm the United States of America to stand alone and to defend itself against communistic aggression all over the world, he replied that he was not sure but I quote: "I would say something around well over \$30,000,000,000 a year." Now the fact, is, Mr. Chairman, that this country is being bled white and that it cannot go on spending at the rate of \$30,000,000,000 a year for any cause, however worthy. Lenin said years ago that the way for the United States to be destroyed was for her to bleed herself white. That is the Russian propaganda and the Russian idea, and we are very likely to see it happen if we do not watch out. That is why this measure is a good measure. Because in this measure we are building up our friends, we are giving them strength so that they can stand with us, so that they can also carry their weight in the world. We have come to the point now where we need strong friends, where we have got to give up championing all the weak and feeble people of the world who cannot fight for themselves. No; we want to be with people who think as we do and also who are willing to fight as we are willing to fight.

We hear a great deal these days about the lack of money, the lack of preparedness of our troops and of our Government all over the world. I would like to ask a question right here on the floor of this House. I hold in my hand the fig-

ures for the total military expenditures from 1946 through 1949. I would like to point out that, of course, in the fiscal year 1946 these figures represent the last year of the war and are so startlingly high that I have checked and double checked them, as I am always fearful of figures, remembering the words of Dr. Johnson when he said that there are "lies, damn lies, and statistics." But, after checking these figures most carefully I find that since 1946 we have expended in the neighborhood of \$80,000,000,000. The breakdown is as follows:

For 1946, for the activities of supporting defense, military defense and naval defense—and I will put all these items separately in the RECORD—\$45,065,933,859.

For 1947, Air and Army-Navy, activities supporting defense, \$14,280,559,774.

For 1948, \$10,923,637,230.

For 1949, \$11,913,515,099.

Expenses for 1946

Activities supporting defense.....	\$3,026,676,195
Military defense.....	25,276,061,313
Naval defense.....	16,763,196,351
Total.....	45,065,933,859

Expenses for 1947

Air and Army.....	\$6,293,869,844
Navy.....	5,557,349,692
Activities supporting defense.....	2,429,340,238
Total.....	14,280,559,774

Expenses for 1948

Direction and coordination of defense.....	\$828,227
Air.....	1,116,798,224
Army.....	5,247,196,653
Navy.....	4,197,848,030
Activities supporting defense.....	360,986,096
Total.....	10,923,657,230

Expenses for 1949

Direction and coordination of defense.....	\$9,291,369
Air.....	1,754,222,334
Army.....	5,237,323,096
Navy.....	4,377,420,026
Activities supporting defense.....	535,258,274
Total.....	11,913,515,099

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we do not have the best Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world, if we do not have the best equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world, it is not the fault of this Congress; it is not the fault of the American taxpayer. It is because someone has blundered; someone in the executive branch of the Government. They have been given the tools; they have been given the money, and I subscribe heartily to the words of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] when he said, "Bring back the men that knew how to do the job, such as Grew, and others." But I would go one step further, Mr. Chairman, and I would say, "Get rid of the men that do not know how to do the job."

This is a question that the American people want answered. What has happened to this money, what has happened to this treasure, the greatest treasure ever spent by any nation in peacetime

on any armament? That question should be answered.

Yes; we will go forward, we will spend more money, and we will spend more blood. We are determined to win. But in justice to those boys who are dying over there, some of whom are dying because they are not properly equipped, we should have this question answered. Above all, we should see that this never happens again. That is our job in this Congress. That, it seems to me, is particularly the job of the women of the Congress. We cannot go out and fight, and for that reason we have all the more responsibility to see that those men who are doing the fighting and the dying are properly equipped.

So I say at this time, there is but one prayer for us, and we should mean it morally and physically, "Lord, give us strength."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee or one of his experts one or two questions about this bill as far as it refers to material things.

Section 1 of the bill provides that we shall authorize the President to have \$1,000,000,000 for military assistance. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if any member of the council and the defense committees of the North Atlantic Pact organization had requested any part of this \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. KEE. All of the pact countries with the exception of two have requested aid. There are two countries that have not requested it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am asking specifically now if the Council and the defense committees created by the North Atlantic Pact, who shall define how these funds shall be used, or any members of those committees, requested these funds officially. That is a very simple question.

Mr. KEE. I would say they have, because that is the only way those funds can be allocated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This bill states that the President shall be authorized to furnish military assistance. I am going to discuss this bill from the angle of material things. Material assistance in the form of what? "In the form of equipment, materials, and services to such nations as are parties to the treaty and request such assistance." That is the reason I was trying to find out if this assistance had been requested.

Secondly, any such assistance furnished under this title shall be subject to agreements, further referred to in section 402 of the original bill.

These funds are to be used in accordance with the plans by the council and the Defense Committee under article A of the North Atlantic treaty.

And you realize unified direction and effort, and after the agreement by the Government of the United States with the defense plans as recommended by the council and Defense Committee.

Now, I understand these funds must be used in accordance with the plans made by the Council and Defense Committee.

Military assistance however shall be furnished only in accordance therewith.

Here is some strange language which I find in this bill and to save my life, under present conditions, I do not understand why the committee would recommend its enactment. It provides that none of this money shall be used and none of the funds made available for carrying out the provisions of this act to construct or aid in the construction of a factory or any other manufacturing establishment outside of the United States, or to provide equipment for any such factory or other manufacturing establishment.

Here we want the members of the North Atlantic Pact to help us build military equipment and help defend the group and we say that none of the funds shall be used for the purpose of putting them in position to do that very thing. To me that is poor business procedure. I cannot understand it. I am very tempted, if it were permissible under the rules, to move to strike that language out.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The language the gentleman is referring to is partly my product and partly the product of Senator VANDENBERG. There were a number of us who take a dim view of using our funds to build up factories for arms production over there which might be subject to sabotage or capture. On the other hand, the section represents a compromise between our views and those of the mutual defense assistance planners who seek to have military production. The amendment made this year, which includes production equipment as well as machine tools, will make it possible by an expenditure of \$70,000,000 to produce somewhere between four and seven times that amount of equipment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The remarks I made a moment ago were not meant to be as critical as they might have sounded. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has explained the situation.

In the original bill I can understand why that language was put in, but I am sorry I was not around when this bill was drafted to help further modify the original language so as to put this in condition for us to go ahead at full steam. So I imagine the gentleman went just as far as he could go, considering the situation.

Now, the gentlewoman from California, [Mrs. DOUGLAS] was discussing a while ago the expanding of our industrial production at this particular time. After having talked with the spokesmen for the five biggest steel companies they tell me that their steel plants are running over 100 percent of rated capacity. They tell me they have on their books at the present time about 120 percent worth of backlog orders for each 100 percent of capacity which they are now producing. So you are not going to get a big expansion of any production of capital goods under these conditions unless the consumers of durable and nondurable consumers goods are willing to eliminate from our consumption budget a sufficient amount of goods to let war material step

up very high in production and use the machinery for producing consumer goods to be devoted to the building of war goods.

In wartime you are not supposed to expand your domestic consumption. You are supposed to deny yourself and produce goods for the boys on the battlefields.

I think the hour has arrived when we should do that very thing. I do not know what the President is going to talk about when he comes here tomorrow, but I hope he will recommend restriction in the use of installment credit. In view of the fact that this sort of operation has to do with costs—living costs and industrial costs, I hope the President will also bring into operation on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation a release of some of these enormous surpluses that we are piling up in the form of cotton, wool, fats, and oils where the ready markets are moving along at the rate of 110 percent or more of parity prices and where we sit and hold those goods in reserve and let the markets skyrocket and the price advance. One woolen manufacturer indicated that he will have to advance the price of woolen goods per yard to the point where a man's suit will be increased in cost by two or three dollars.

The Congress and the American people have been alerted to a message that the White House is expected to deliver on Wednesday noon. It has been hinted that the message will be a complete report on the Korean situation and will be accompanied by President Truman's recommendations for additional legislation necessary to put the country on a degree of war mobilization. It has been further hinted that the message will contain recommendations for a great number of controls including control of prices and rationing.

The White House and the Secretary of Agriculture have recently deplored the rise in commodity prices and have asserted that they were not justified. The prices of cotton, wool, and fats and oils have recently established new highs and are unquestionably the playthings of the speculators. Textiles have recently announced advances because of increased cost of raw materials. One manufacturer has predicted that the recent price rise will increase the cost of a man's suit by two to three dollars.

I am informed that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and controls approximately 50 percent of the country's cotton stocks—and incidentally, on the basis of the present spot market for cotton it is selling at an estimated 110 percent of parity. The Government also owns large stocks of cottonseed and cottonseed oil, and practically controls these markets. Prices of these commodities have likewise shown sharp increases recently. The Commodity Credit Corporation also owned on May 31, 1950, over 12,000,000 pounds of wool, which is currently also selling far above parity.

If the administration truly wants to hold the lid on prices, I suggest that they utilize the stocks acquired with the taxpayers' money by the Commodity Credit Corporation, offer them to the domestic market at the current market price, and

thereby stop further inflationary price rises resulting from the operations of speculators. Where the Government is hoarding large stocks of commodities there exists no valid reason for speculation or wild inflationary price increases. Use of these stocks to stabilize commodities is more to be desired than another OPA and its resulting mass of orders and controls.

To me, those prices have to do with the facilities of the provisions in this bill, wherein we are to provide, as the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out, these material goods. Personally, I think we should further modify this language to let a part of these funds be used to enable other countries to actually get into production. The argument can always be made that these things may be used against us. That is true. That is true in connection with everything we put out under the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, and all of these other benefits that we have sent to off-shore areas. I would like to see the committee recommend such an amendment when the bill comes up for reading under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation, and it is a high honor and privilege indeed to make the closing statement of this debate.

American troops today are engaged in active combat. They need every assistance we can give them and our Nation must put its shoulder to the wheel unitedly and to our utmost capacity in order to maintain American prestige in the family of Nations.

The discussion today in the House of Representatives has been one of the best and most informative proceedings I have witnessed during my entire service in Congress. There have been many speeches so outstanding that I plan to keep the record of this debate in my permanent files and I know that students of history will have occasion to refer to these proceedings many times in the years ahead.

I deeply appreciate having the privilege of joining in the discussion long enough to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the historical background bearing on the great issues confronting us here.

While the discussions today have primarily covered the events and the policies of the immediate past, they are the inevitable outgrowth of more than a century of rivalry and conflict between the free nations of the world and Russia. Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831, visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, De Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of national developments in Europe which, in view of subsequent events, he described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his *Democracy in America*—P. F. Collier & Son, 1900, volume I, page 441—he summarized his views with unusual clarity:

There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place amongst the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the other by the sword.

The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the czarism and its methods as follows:

The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, moderate language and disinterested professions at Petersburg and London; active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations.

It is equally interesting to read these same basic ideas, further developed a few years later in 1856 by Commodore M. C. Perry, which I quoted in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD of January 18, 1950.

During the last 40 years the march of events, as clearly foreseen by De Tocqueville, Palmerston, and Perry, have brought the situation anticipated by them closer. Two world wars, by destroying the great stabilizing military powers separating the antagonistic exponents of despotism and constitutional liberty, have served to hasten foreseen events toward their culmination.

Throughout it all we have failed to develop a consistent foreign policy based upon our true national interests. For years such policy, as we have had, has sprung from pure political expediency and opportunism without the slightest regard for the basic considerations of our permanent welfare and stability, or

for the great principles upon which our Government was founded.

The debate today brings home to the American people proof that the legislative branch of our great Government is now thoroughly alert to the shaping of our destiny. With a Nation united and with the coordinated help of the free nations of this earth we will meet the challenge hurled at us from behind the iron curtain.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I require, which will not be long.

Mr. Chairman, we are here under a somewhat unusual rule, in that the debate is to run through the course of the day. The minority have had considerable to say and they have also been facing a party conference to elect a minority clerk, which will take place in this room as soon as we adjourn today.

Under this rule, I presume it would have been the right of the majority to require the chairman to hold an even balance on the time. That has not been done, and we Republicans have had the time to express ourselves fully even though we took more than our exact half of the afternoon. I want to express my appreciation to our courteous, courageous, patient, and patriotic chairman, Judge KEE, for the bipartisan way in which he has permitted the debate to proceed this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], who has been a constant supporter of this legislation and who is wholeheartedly in favor of this bill, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the shadow of the Korean crisis looms over us as we debate this legislation to extend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. We are concerned with hard, brutal, fast-moving facts, rather than theories or possibilities. United States forces are engaged in what may well be a long and bitter struggle to restore peace in the Far East. This Nation once again has demonstrated its ability to act quickly and decisively in a crisis, and the United Nations has shown the strength and will to take effective international action against aggressors.

These momentous events have occurred in the few short weeks since the pending legislation was drafted. They have demonstrated beyond question the necessity for the free nations of the world to continue mutual defense assistance measures. Nothing we can say here in debate regarding this bill can be as convincing an argument as the actual march of world events.

Just 6 months ago, a bill providing \$60,000,000 for economic aid to Korea came to a vote on the floor of the House, and failed of passage by one vote. A few weeks later, wiser judgment prevailed and the House passed a Korean-aid bill.

Unfortunately, however, even this bill was a scaled-down version of the bill passed by the Senate. I voted for and gave my full support to both of these aid bills, as I did regarding the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. I sincerely hope that those Members who voted against these bills now have been convinced by hard facts that this program is necessary.

Of the total authorization of \$1,222,500,000 contained in S. 3809, only \$16,000,000 is allocated to Korea and the Philippines. My first thought when the Korean crisis developed was that this sum should be increased substantially. However, investigation has convinced me that such action will not be necessary for the effective prosecution of the efforts to resist the north Korean aggressors. In the first place, the \$75,000,000 which would be authorized for the general area of China could be allocated to Korea, and the President has authority under the bill to transfer approximately \$100,000,000 from other titles of the bill for Korean aid is necessary. In addition, the bill provides authority for the transfer of up to \$250,000,000 in excess equipment, and as much of this as is needed could go to the south Korean forces.

Secondly, we must remember that our own military operations in Korea will be financed by appropriations to the Armed Forces, rather than under the authorization of funds for the mutual defense assistance program. The general appropriations bill is before the Senate, and any additional appropriation for the Armed Forces can be made easily and without delay. These facts indicate that there is no pressing need to increase the authorization contained in S. 3809 for aid to Korea.

Mr. Chairman, it is natural for us to lay stress on the Korean crisis in our consideration of this bill. However, the bill is much more far-reaching in its purposes. The great bulk of the aid which would be authorized by S. 3809 is designed for the North Atlantic nations and for Greece, Turkey, and Iran. The fundamental importance of this bill is not its provisions for Korean aid; it is that this legislation is an essential part of our efforts to prevent an outbreak of aggression anywhere in the world.

When the North Korean forces marched below the thirty-eighth parallel they initiated a psychological as well as a military attack. The men behind the Korean attack have far broader objectives than the subjugation of the South Korean forces; they are striking a blow at the minds of men and women in all the nations outside the Soviet orbit. They are hoping to build fear and timidity in the nations of western Europe and the Middle East, and to tear down the will of these countries to stand against aggression.

Consider the effect upon the world if President Truman had not acted promptly and decisively in Korea. Any weakness upon our part would have been interpreted as a warning that the United States would not back up the free nations in the event of pressure from Russia or her satellites. A crippling blow would have been struck at the North At-

lantic Pact and all our other efforts to unite the free world against aggression.

Undoubtedly the planners of the North Korean attack were hoping that we would display weakness rather than strength. Once again, they have underestimated the united will of the American people.

The Korean attack was not an isolated incident. It is part of a plan which has included the guerrilla warfare in Greece, the attempt to set up a puppet government in Iran, the Czechoslovakian coup, the Berlin blockade, and the inciting of strife and disunity in Italy, France, and the Far East. We may assume that this is not the last incident in the series. Pressure of one sort or another will be applied wherever it appears the non-Russian nations are weakest. It is our task to do everything possible to eliminate weak spots, and thus to preserve peace.

The nations which will be aided by Senate bill 3809 are in critical areas of the world. Iran, for instance, is adjacent to the Russian border, and it is under constant pressure to enter the Soviet fold. In Greece, the guerrilla forces have been checked, but there still is a Communist nucleus in the nation, and guerrilla forces across the frontier in Bulgaria could cause a flare-up of the civil war. Turkey occupies an extremely strategic position, and her continued resistance to communism is vital. Guerrilla warfare in the Philippines is menacing the security of that nation, and strife and disunity are present in other nations of the Far East. There is no need to emphasize the necessity of building up the strength of our partners in the North Atlantic Pact, for a major portion of our entire postwar peace effort has been devoted to increasing the strength and stability of the nations of western Europe.

The present bill continues the policies laid down in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. These policies are based on the North Atlantic Treaty. Since the treaty went into effect on August 24, 1949, the North Atlantic Council has become a working organization, bilateral agreements with the North Atlantic nations have been signed, a unified concept for the integrated defense of the North Atlantic nations has been agreed upon, and substantial deliveries of military matériel have been made.

As Senator CONNALLY, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said during the Senate debate on Senate bill 3809:

I think it is safe to say that never before in our peacetime history has so much constructive planning been accomplished by so many nations in such a short period of time.

We must continue this program and accelerate it if possible. In Korea we have learned that there is no quick or easy method of checking a determined aggressor. Through the principle of mutual assistance and self-help, the free nations must increase their collective strength.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill will make possible the continuation of this vital program. In addition, it will be an indication to the Soviet states, as well as the nations outside of the Rus-

sian orbit, that the United States is strong and determined. It will be a clear demonstration of our united will to maintain peace and freedom in the world. The mutual-defense-assistance program, like the action now being taken in Korea, is thoroughly consistent with the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter. It is action in support of peace, not war. An overwhelming majority of the people of the United States are united behind this program. I am confident that the House will give its prompt approval to this most necessary measure.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the acting leader on the minority side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS], for the very fine compliment he paid to me this afternoon. I want to say that I have not shown to him any more courtesies than he has always shown to me, and it has always been a pleasure to be associated with him in any effort for the common good.

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. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3809) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file eight privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGUIRE. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune of July 12 carries a column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in which these writers state that "Not more than three divisions"—outside of Germany—"are in a condition of partial readiness." They go on to say that "although ostensibly the United States disposes of nine and a half Army divisions and two marine divisions, this is paper strength." The point the Alsops hope to make is we have not appropriated sufficient funds to our Armed Forces since the end of World War II and that we should step up our appropriation several billions.

But an entirely different question is involved here, if their figures regarding our puny military strength are correct,

Since the close of World War II, Congress has allocated roughly \$60,000,000,000 to our Armed Forces. Is it possible that the expenditure of all this money—roughly 10 times the annual cost of our total Federal Government before World War II—has resulted only in a partial preparation of only three fighting divisions outside of Germany? This is a serious matter and, I hope, one which we will examine closely without delay. For the defense dollar has no meaning unless it is related to value received. We must answer this question immediately and if we have received little in return for our outlay, then we must act with dispatch to correct this dangerous situation, no matter what the individual consequences.

I am sending a copy of this statement to Secretary Johnson for his comment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Mr. Ben May, of Mobile, Ala., notwithstanding the fact that it will take 4¾ pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$389.50.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include excerpts and quotations.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in several instances and in each to include newspaper clippings.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include additional extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article from the Farm Journal.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

THE ARMY'S NEW ARTIFICIAL HAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are hearing of the fearful casualties in Korea it is nice to read about the things that have been done to alleviate the distress and agony of mind of arm and hand amputees not only of the last war, but of the present war, and also civilians. I would like to praise a group of Army men who have devoted day after day and day after day to this tedious, not uninteresting, but difficult, work of developing an improved artificial hand, the universal hand. But they worked even with enthusiasm because their cause is great. It is their first major product.

The prosthetic device is almost indistinguishable from the real thing and has a comparable efficiency of 40 to 60 percent, according to the developers.

May I say that it is fortunate this has been done because up to a few years ago nothing then was done to assist men who lost their hands and their arms. The amputees had only archaic aids to use.

The following is the article which appeared in this morning's paper:

ARMY'S NEW ARTIFICIAL HAND DEEMED 40 TO 60 PERCENT EFFICIENT

A crew of Army men, working quietly for 4 years, yesterday unveiled its first major product—the universal hand.

The prosthetic device is almost indistinguishable from the real thing and has a comparable efficiency of 40 to 60 percent, according to the developers, the prosthetic research laboratory of the Army Medical Center here. It is the seventh in line of steadily improving models.

Virgil Pittman, 24-year-old former Air Force buck sergeant, of Indianhead, Md., demonstrated the deft facility of the mechanical hand for newsmen yesterday. He lost all but a short stump of an arm in an auto accident last November.

FACILITIES JOINED

Lt. Col. Maurice J. Fletcher, laboratory director, told how the project to help amputees was developed. Back in October 1945 an artificial-hand laboratory was opened and about 6 months later this was blended, with other phases of research, into the prosthetics laboratory.

After hundreds of studies of existing material on artificial limb design gave little hope for a really successful hand, the laboratory set about on "completely fundamental research in the development of prosthetic devices."

The first major work is the mechanical hand. Its development involved studies of exact positioning and curvature of fingers, anthropomorphic characteristics, size and coloring, and also mechanical phases, such as pressure required for security of grasp, ease of maintenance and movement, tolerable weight, practical methods of manufacture and cost.

MECHANICAL THUMB

The developed device has a mechanical thumb, index and second finger, and oper-

ates on a voluntary-motion basis, with a built-in automatic lock for greater security of grasp.

While this research was going forward, plastic workers were concentrating on a cosmetic glove to cover the mechanism—one which would be tinted to match a person's skin tones, was easily cleanable and readily replaceable.

To provide individuality, the workers added small skin blemishes, freckles, and nail bruises, and threaded in nylon matched to the patient's hair.

This accomplished, amputees tested the hand in all ways of daily life, in each case making some reference to the hand, and in most situations the public was unaware the hand was not real, Colonel Fletcher said.

One amputee, a ticket taker in a theater, accidentally singed a portion of the hand. A patron, spotting the mark, declared:

"That looks like the same ailment I have. If you like, I'll give you the name of a good ointment to cure it."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. 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. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, following disposition of the military assistance bill, the next order of business will be consideration of the bill (S. 2822) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The rule on that bill provides for 2 hours general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be taken up tomorrow if consideration of the present bill is concluded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. There are eight rules reported on bills concerning the Federal Judiciary. These bills will be brought up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Eight different bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

These bills will be brought up with the understanding, however, that if rules are reported or other legislation which the leadership feels should have priority they will not be called up one after the other.

Would the gentleman like me to state what these judgeship bills are?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes. Mr. McCORMACK. These bills are as follows:

H. R. 5137, to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal judge for the eastern district of Texas.

H. R. 6450, providing two additional judgeships for the Northern District of Illinois.

H. R. 7009, to repeal the proviso against filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. Someone has stated to me that this has a relationship to our old friend Dick Duncan. Those who were here when Dick Duncan was a Member of the House will remember what a valuable Member he was.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no political favoritism in any of these bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

The next is H. R. 6836, to repeal prohibition against filling the vacancy in the office of district judge for the district of Delaware. I think our friend from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is very much interested in that bill.

The next one is H. R. 6869, to repeal prohibition against filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 6240, to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana.

H. R. 7570, providing for an additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

H. R. 3775, providing for an additional district judge for the third division of the district of Alaska.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Did I understand from the majority leader that those bills had already received Rules Committee clearance?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; rules have been reported out.

Mr. KEATING. Today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Does the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appear in support of those bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that.

Mr. KEATING. I was opposed to the bills and was told to come before the Rules Committee tomorrow morning at 11:15. I wonder if it is possible the majority leader might have been misinformed as to these bills having Rules Committee clearance?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can state upon competent authority that the eight of them have been reported out. Prior to that I would have stated to the best of my information and belief, but now I have been advised by authority that I consider is most competent that they have been reported.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sure the Rules Committee will be glad to hear the gentleman on tomorrow just the same.

Mr. KEATING. I have no doubt about that. Normally I do not like to be treated in that manner and I know the majority leader would not like it. I feel sure that there has been some misunderstanding between the distinguished gentleman of the Committee on the Judiciary and myself, since he told me this morning that the hearing would be tomorrow morning on these judgeship bills before the Committee on Rules. The matter came up while the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and myself were attending another hearing, and at that time the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary directed his secretary to defer the hearing on these particular bills until tomorrow morning before the Committee on Rules. That is the last I heard of it, and knowing the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary as I do, I feel sure that there has been some mis-

understanding in the matter and would not, for a moment, care to leave the implication that anything has been done without my knowledge and over my objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I state that I know nothing about that, except that about which I was informed, and now it has been confirmed, that these rules have been reported out, and I wanted to advise the membership of the House that they would be brought up from time to time. If the gentleman from New York has any understanding otherwise, I really know nothing about that. I am just giving the information to the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might add, I think that those rules were reported out with the understanding that there will be Republican judges named in each of these vacancies, with the exception of one, probably.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio wields tremendous influence everywhere.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 940. An act to authorize construction of the Eklutna project, hydroelectric generating plant and transmission facilities in connection therewith, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5966. An act to adjust and define the boundary between Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee-Pisgah-Nantahala National Forests and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1562. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the Tenth Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period January to June 1950, pursuant to the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1563. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1949, pursuant to a request by Government Services, Inc.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4579. A bill to amend section 333 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the attendance at judicial conferences of the ninth judicial circuit of the district judges in Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 2576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8144. A bill to authorize the sale of a small tract of land at Great Falls, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9158. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6257. A bill to provide a comprehensive and adequate water resources basic-data program; with amendment (Rept. No. 2584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6929. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3520. An act to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6900. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 702. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6454, a bill to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 2588). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 703. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6240, a bill to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 2589). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 704. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6836, a bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge for the district of Delaware; without amendment (Rept. No. 2590). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 705. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3775, a bill to provide for an additional district judge for the Third Division of the District Court for the District of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2591). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 706. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5137, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Texas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2592). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 707. Resolution for con-

sideration of H. R. 7570, a bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 708. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7009, a bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 2594). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 709. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6869, a bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 2595). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6959. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Watt; without amendment (Rept. No. 2577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6960. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Wilbur Watt; without amendment (Rept. No. 2578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6961. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary E. White Watt; without amendment (Rept. No. 2579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6962. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Minnie M. Watt Kopac; without amendment (Rept. No. 2580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7773. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Nancy Takes Enemy Under Baggage; with amendment (Rept. No. 2583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 9156. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Medical Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 9157. A bill to create the United States Medical Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 9158. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9159. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to reduce the Federal employee payroll by providing additional opportunities for optional retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9160. A bill to provide for the development and improvement of aircraft in-

tended for industrial or personal use, and adaptable for military service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 9161. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the annuities payable to retired railroad employees and their surviving widows; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9162. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to transfer and convey certain lands to the Federal Communications Commission in connection with the Federal Communications Commission's radio-monitoring program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 9163. A bill to provide that, in the administration of veterans' laws, service heretofore, or hereafter performed outside the United States shall be held and considered to be wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 9164. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and the United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 698. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to investigate and study the recent increase in the price of bread in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 699. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 698; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 700. Resolution for the investigation of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. Res. 701. Resolution fixing salary of House messengers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 710. Resolution to authorize an investigation and study of veterans' education and training under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 711. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 710; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 712. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3520, a bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 9165. A bill for the relief of Maija Sisko Erkkila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 9166. A bill for the relief of Louis J. T. Hendrickx; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9167. A bill for the relief of Henry Hasenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9168. A bill for the relief of Mr. Selim Salloum, also known as Robert Salloum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9169. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arthur Kirc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano; 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:

2264. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Resolution of the board of directors of the McHenry County Farm Bureau, opposing the provisions of Senate bill 3424; to the Committee on Public Works.

2265. By the SPEAKER: petition of J. Ben Critz, vice president, Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex., relative to the Supreme Court decision handed down pertaining to the tidelands off the shore of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2266. Also, petition of Al Gordon, president, Radio News Club, Hollywood, Calif., relative to a statement issued by Radio News Club of Southern California on Federal Communications Commission's hearing on news-slanting charges against radio station KMPG; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2267. Also, petition of H. F. Kirk, vice president, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, Inc., Baltimore, Md., condemning the unprovoked, unjustified, and reprehensible attack of South Korea by the Communist-led North Korean forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2268. Also, petition of Roy M. Nishikawa, chairman, Japanese American Citizens League, Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution 238, which provides for extending equality in naturalization to all resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1950

(Legislative day of Saturday, July 1, 1950)

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

Rev. L. Oakey Wilburn, D. D., superintendent, Petersburg, Va., district, the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

O God, make us eternally grateful for Thy many mercies. Give us a feeling of gratitude, too, for Thy loving forgiveness through the ages. As we call upon Thee this day, may we exalt Thee and praise Thy name in the land of a people who stand for freedom.

In an hour of trouble and anxious concern, help us to be steady and to have the judgment to mark out a way that is sure and secure before Thee. Ever be with those who serve wherever they may be and in whatever service they are called upon to tender. Give comfort to every soul who feels so keenly the stress and strain in these hours.

Upon these on whom depends so much, and on whom so many depend, give Thy grace and the power of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may make wise decisions. May there be none in our land who will not stand for time-honored and proven principles that bring justice and righteousness.

Above all else, make our faith equal to our needs at all times. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.